

**THIS IS A DOCUMENT IN PROGRESS! REVISIONS ARE BEING MADE ON  
A REGULAR BASIS!! Latest Revision Monday, May 19, 2014**

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST  
INTERPRETATION OF TWO TIME PROPHECIES IN THE BOOK OF  
DANIEL - THE 2300 DAYS OF DANIEL 8 AND THE 70 WEEKS OF DANIEL 9.**

# **ASSUMPTION 21**

**Above all and beyond all other arguments is the  
“pragmatic” argument, viz., that history confirms the  
validity of the SDA explanation of the two time**

**BY  
FRANK BASTEN**

**NOVEMBER, 1990  
copyright F.A.Basten, 1990**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>The Purpose of This Assumption .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>The Method of This Assumption and its Associated Problems. ....</b>	<b>4</b>
a. Smith.....	7
b. Spangler.....	7
Shea.....	8
Ford.....	8
Gerhard Pfandl.....	9
The Chronological Platform of SDA Historicism .....	9
457 BC: <i>The commandment to rebuild and restore Jerusalem</i> .....	9
27 AD “ <i>Until the Anointed One.</i> ” .....	12
31 AD “ <i>Messiah shall be cut off.</i> ” .....	14
34 AD <i>The Stoning of Stephen.</i> .....	15
538 AD <i>The little horn has the power</i> .....	16
1798 AD <i>The little horn shall be broken.</i> .....	17
August 11, 1840 <i>The End of the Ottoman Empire.</i> .....	22
October 22, 1844 AD “ <i>The hour of his judgment is come.</i> ” .....	40
<i>Establishing the October 22 date.</i> .....	44
<i>Summary of this Chronological Review.</i> .....	48
The Social Construction of History.....	51
<b>The Conclusion .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>57</b>
Material associated with 457 B.C .....	57
Kenneth Richards (son of H.M.S. Richards) .....	57
Material Associated with 408 B.C. ....	59
Material Associated with A.D. 27.....	59
Material Associated with A.D. 31.....	59
Material Associated with A.D. 34.....	59
Material Associated with 1798. ....	59
Material Associated with August 11, 1840 <i>The End of the Ottoman Empire.</i> .....	59
<i>The History behind the Incident in 1840.</i> .....	92
<i>Official British Government Publications</i> .....	111
<i>The New Cambridge Modern History – ChXVI –The Mediterranean</i> .....	133
<i>New Cambridge Modern History –The Crimean War, Vol. X., pp.468-492.</i> ..	146
Material Associated with 1844. ....	151
<i>The Day of Atonement in 1844: Was it October 22, or September 23?</i> .....	151
<i>Establishing the 1843 date.</i> .....	151
<i>Day of Atonement of the Karaite Jews in 1844 by Robert K. Sanders</i> .....	152
<i>When Was the "Day of Atonement in 1844"?</i> by Robert K. Sanders .....	156
<i>A Counter-Argument by Bob Pickle.</i> .....	160
<i>How Shea uses the Babylonian Calendar to justify October 22.</i> .....	164

**The Purpose of This Assumption**

This is the first of two extremely persistent assumptions used to support the SDA interpretation of the two time periods in Daniel and the principle behind their interpretation. This assumption, and its supplement in Assumption 23, is useful for SDA historicists when the weakness of their position is highlighted. It enables them to believe in the validity of their interpretation even in the face of insurmountable evidence showing up the fallacies of the SDA position. It cannot be described as *irrational*; it is

probably better to call it an *arational* assumption, in the sense that no logic can be used to address the shortcomings in this assumption. It is beyond reason. It is blind and will cling to the traditional teachings of the SDA church ‘though the heavens fall.’ It summons their memories of historical events that they feel endorse the SDA position and they take stock in these. It believes the SDA position is correct even though valid objections are raised that have no answer from SDA historicists. These memories will encourage the hope that God will provide answers to these objections in time and that the old positions will stand.

For years many of us have looked at the Book of Revelation from strictly the "historical-prophetic" overlay. This overlay has given us much confidence as we have looked at the great prophetic waymarks down through history.

<http://www.streamofhealing.org/Devotionals/index.htm>

The type of thinking associated with this assumption are as follows:

“It does not matter that you bring arguments to show the traditional SDA teaching on the 2300 days and the seventy weeks is incorrect. When all is said and done, history, the great arbiter of truth, has confirmed the SDA position, and no matter what you say or try and prove, these great historical facts remain.”

- “You cannot deny the decrees to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple starting in 457 BC;
- “You cannot deny the coming of Jesus to be anointed by the Holy Spirit in AD 27;
- “You cannot deny the death of Christ on Nisan 14, 31 AD;
- “You cannot deny the historicity of the stoning of Stephen in 34 AD;
- “You cannot deny the legal supremacy of the papal powers beginning in March, 538 AD;
- “You cannot deny the persecution of Christians by the Roman pagan and papal power throughout the 1260 years up to 1798;
- “You cannot deny the 1260 years ended exactly to the month, in February, 1798 with the removal of the papal power from its seat in 1798 AD;
- “You cannot deny that Litch’s prophecy concerning the Ottoman empire was fulfilled to the day on 11<sup>th</sup> August, 1840;
- “You cannot deny that the ending of the 2300 year prophecy in 1844 AD and the beginning of a new phase of ministry in heaven was heralded by religious movements both in the Old World and the New World, in accordance with prophecy.”

“These great historical facts cannot be changed or undone. They are anchored in time forever as beacons of light, testifying of the veracity of the predictions they are associated with. To deny these facts is to deny the hand of God in history.”

This assumption is extremely important in the SDA’s reconstruction of history in that it provides a basis for sense of divine endorsement of the SDA interpretation of these time prophecies. These events in history have a strength in themselves transcending any reasoning to the contrary. In the words of Clifford Goldstein, “It’s as solid as world history, as solid as Christ, as solid as the math itself,” (2003, p.112) <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The following statement by Goldstein on the Adventist interpretation of Rome in prophecy expresses this sentiment best: “The Adventist position regarding Rome as the little horn is as firm as world history itself. No matter how politically incorrect this view, we can’t waffle here. Fortunately, we don’t need to.” (2003, p.43) Note: The Adventist position is as firm as world history itself!!!

In this paper, I will look at the claims for the major historical dates in the SDA chronography of world history from a prophetic point of view. I will then examine the empirical validity of each of those major events in history and then finally draw a conclusion together.

## The Method of This Assumption and its Associated Problems.

Seventh-day Adventists have created a history of themselves that portrays them as God's remnant—his special people ordained with a special mission—and this remnancy is also illustrated in the perspective of a 'torchbearer' carrying on the torch from other churches. The flip side of this view is that the other churches, cited by SDA histories as being forebearers of aspects of SDA doctrine and teaching, no longer carry the torch. Dr Geoffrey Paxton, an Australian Anglican ordained minister and principal of the Queensland Bible Institute,<sup>2</sup> highlights the nature and importance of this consciousness within the mind of a Seventh-day Adventist, in the very first chapter "Adventists: Heirs of the Reformation," of his 1978 book "*The Shaking of Adventism*."<sup>3</sup>

The Adventist views himself as standing in the line of the Protestant Reformation. He regards himself as Protestant in the truest sense of the word. Where other Christians would not claim to stand in the line of the sixteenth-century Reformers, the Adventist is in no doubt about it. He is a son of Luther and Calvin.

That, however, is not all. In fact, it is hardly the beginning. At this point some of us evangelical-Reformed Christians might be in for a shock. Yet the fact is that the Seventh-day Adventist sees himself as standing in a unique relation to the Reformation. He believes that God has called him to carry forward the message of the Reformation in such a way as no other Christian or Christian body is able to do. In his opinion the Seventh-day Adventist is God's special heir of the Reformers. Only through the Adventist Church can the work of the Reformation be carried to its God-designed end.

Obviously, the existence of such a stupendous claim will require verification. As far as Adventists are concerned, we could hardly commence with a more prestigious testimony than that of Mrs. Ellen G. White. Mrs. White saw the Adventist movement as standing in the line of Luther and Calvin and, of course, Paul before them.

In her sizeable work, *The Great Controversy*, Mrs. White views the great battle between Christ and Satan as stretching from the antecedents of the Reformation (in such men as Huss and Wycliffe), through the Reformers themselves and their battle against Rome, to the Puritans and Wesley, and finally to the Seventh-day Adventist movement itself. Mrs. White writes:

Thus the Waldenses witnessed for God centuries before the birth of Luther. Scattered over many lands, they planted the seeds of the Reformation that began in the time of Wycliffe, grew broad and deep in the days of Luther, and is to be carried forward to the close of time by those who also are willing to suffer all things for "the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Revelation 1:9. (Paxton footnotes: "Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 78.")

A frequent theme in Adventist writing and speaking is that of forwarding the Reformation. Mrs. White speaks of this as follows: "The Reformation did not, as many suppose, end with Luther. It is to be continued to the close of this world's history Luther had a great work to do..." (Paxton footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 148.") Indeed, the Reformation did not end with Luther. It will end with the Adventist movement, however—at least as far as the Seventh-day Adventist is concerned. He believes that the challenge from God to be "willing to suffer all things for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ" has come to his movement with unique force.

<sup>2</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geoffrey\\_Paxton](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geoffrey_Paxton)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.presenttruthmag.com/7dayadventist/shaking/1.html>

Mrs. White saw Luther as teaching the doctrine of justification by faith with brilliant clarity (Paxton footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 253.") Luther was no inventor or innovator: "Christ was a protestant. ... Luther and his followers did not invent the reformed religion. They simply accepted it as presented by Christ and the apostles." (Paxton footnotes: "Ellen G. White, *Review and Herald*, 1 June 1886.") In such statements from Mrs. White it is clear that she saw neither herself nor Adventism in general as a "Johnny-come-lately" religious phenomenon. The movement was to receive and carry forward the torch of the everlasting gospel of the Reformation.

W. W. Prescott reinforces this perspective of Mrs. White. In the early years of this century Prescott edited an Adventist publication called *The Protestant Magazine*. It makes it clear that Adventists are the guardians of the Protestant heritage in a climate of modernism and spiritual declension. The magazine laments:

The departure of Protestantism from its original principles, and the acceptance of human philosophy in place of revealed truth, are giving to Romanism the opportunity to put forward with a greater show of plausibility the claim that the great Reformation was a delusion and that the only stability of truth is found in the Roman communion. (Paxton footnotes: "*The Protestant Magazine* 1, no. 1 (2nd quarter, 1909): 1.")

No apology is offered for the magazine's being a Protestant publication. Rather, it is said that the times demand such a magazine. The declaration made by the protesting princes at the Diet of Spires in 1529 is adopted as indicative of the magazine's stance. (Paxton footnotes: "*Ibid.*, pp. 32-6...")

Carlyle B. Haynes published a work entitled *The Hour of God's Judgment* and included a chapter on "Completing the Unfinished Reformation." (Paxton footnotes: "Carlyle B. Haynes, *The Hour of God's Judgment*, pp. 67-82.") Haynes carries on the line of reasoning which we found in Mrs. White. The great light of the gospel was given in the Reformation and handed down via the Puritans and Wesley to the little Adventist band in 1844. (Paxton footnotes: "See *ibid.*, pp. 83-91. Here Haynes includes a chapter entitled 'The Remnant Church and Its Message,' which follows his chapter, 'Completing the Unfinished Reformation.'") The mission of the God-chosen torch bearers of 1844 is stated as follows:

... in 1844, the time for the revelation of the fullness of gospel truth came. If the prophecy of Daniel eight be fulfilled, and assuredly it must be, then in 1844, we must confidently look for the beginning of a movement and a message which not only will complete an arrested Reformation, but also will disclose again to the knowledge of mankind all those truths which have been counterfeited during the centuries of the Middle Ages.

To bear this message to the world, it was necessary that God institute another movement and raise up another people, separate from the established churches that had refused to walk in advancing light. (Paxton footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 78.")

Where has this Adventist conviction appeared in critiques of the movement? Has one really plumbed the depths of Adventism if this heart conviction has been bypassed?

One of the most respected of Adventist scholars was LeRoy Edwin Froom, one-time Professor of Historical Theology at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. He wrote some notable volumes which are respected not only in the Adventist movement, but outside the movement as well. (Paxton footnotes: "*Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers, The Conditionalist Faith of Our Fathers, The Coming of the Comforter, and Movement of Destiny.*") Froom smarted under the ignominy of his movement's being classified as a sect, and he labored to show its true catholicity. In the publication, *Our Firm Foundation*, he contributed a paper which was a digest of his much larger four-volume work, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*. In this paper Dr. Froom sought to show that the Adventist prophetic interpretation is not an innovation but a restoration of the true historical position of the Reformers themselves. He writes as follows:

In these latter days, as God's remnant workmen, we are called upon not only to reconstruct the Reformation edifice but to restore the early Church structure as well,

and to bring everything into harmony with the divine blueprint. We are even to restore original features omitted by the Reformers. And we are likewise to rebuild the parts distorted and rejected by the latter-day perverters of the Reformation positions. Not only are we confronted by this dual task, but we are commissioned to finish this uncompleted structure, carrying it through to consummation with the capstone of the present truth features of these latter days, thus bringing the full structure to completion. (Paxton footnotes: "LeRoy Edwin Froom, "The Advent Message Built upon the Foundations of Many Generations," in *Our Firm Foundation*, 2:81.")

For Froom the bounden commission of the Advent movement is

fundamentally a restoration, not the formation of a new structure. It is tied inseparably with the efforts of all past builders of prophetic truth..., we shall truly build again the foundations and superstructure of "many generations" into the stately edifice of truth originally designed by God. That is our bounden commission under the Advent movement. (Paxton footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 82.")

This stupendous consciousness of being special heirs of the historical Reformation position receives heightened expression when Froom says: "..... the floodlight of the world's pitiless scrutiny will soon be turned full upon us.... More is demanded of us than our fathers and much more than our forefathers in generations past." (Paxton footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 83. One cannot fail to get the point when Froom says: 'Herein lies our supreme opportunity of now stepping into our rightful place as the avowed restorers of the true Protestant positions of the founding fathers of all branches of Protestantism as it formerly obtained in all Protestant lands in both hemispheres. Instead of meekly accepting an unjust consignment to the ranks of modern heretics, as concerns our prophetic faith, we should humbly but effectively assert and establish, by sound reasoning and irrefutable evidence, our actual position as the champions and sustainers of the true, historical interpretations now regrettably abandoned by most of Protestantism's spiritual descendants. We should now rise to our full and allotted place as the revivers and continuers of the true Protestant interpretation of the Reformation. This is our rightful heritage. We are simply the last segment in God's sevenfold true church of the centuries. These former expositors of the true interpretations were of God's true church and were true expositors in their time. We are in the line of true succession' (pp. 99-100).") It is no coincidence that Froom concludes with words attributed to Martin Luther: "So, irrespective of others, here we stand, God helping us. We cannot do otherwise." (Paxton footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 182.")

More support for our thesis covering the fundamental conviction of Adventists would only prove tedious. (Paxton footnotes: "E.g., 'Is There a Relationship between Luther and Seventh-day Adventists,' *The Ministry*, June 1955, pp. 39f. The article claims that both Lutheranism and Adventism are reform movements, both having been announced in Bible prophecy. Of Luther it says: 'Justification by faith was to him the breath of life. It shaped his thinking.' The article continues: 'To Seventh-day Adventists this teaching of justification by faith is just as important.'") We will conclude this aspect of our examination with the words of Professor H. K. LaRondelle of Andrews University. (Paxton footnotes: "Hans K. LaRondelle is Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Andrews University. He studied for his doctorate under the famous Reformed theologian, G. C. Berkouwer, at the Free University of Amsterdam. LaRondelle received his doctorate for the dissertation, *Perfection and Perfectionism: A Dogmatic-Ethical Study of Biblical Perfection and Phenomenal Perfectionism.*") In his lectures on justification and sanctification in the fall of 1966, LaRondelle sums up the Adventist position as follows:

Truly it can be said with LeRoy E. Froom, that the Advent movement after 1844 is the second great Reformation, continuing and completing the work of the first Reformation of the sixteenth century. The second Reformation, therefore, is not a revoking of the first Reformation, but on the contrary, its consummation, its recognition and perfection! If the first Reformation is the restoration of the Gospel with the saving doctrine of justification by faith alone, then the second Reformation is the restoration of the holy law of God in the doctrine of sanctification by faith and submission. (Paxton footnotes: "Hans K. LaRondelle, *Righteousness by Faith*, p. 144.")

With this Adventist mindset in focus, we turn now to one of probably most quoted statements of Ellen White in regard to cherishing the Advent heritage, is the following:

“...we have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history.” (Life Sketches, p. 196).

The confirmation of the validity of the Adventist tradition and the divine source of their origin and the message they preach, is sought by them in their rehearsal of past historical events that have special significance to them as a people. They quote the fulfillment of prophetic dates in the books of Daniel and the Revelation as though they are milestones –precursors of their own existence; and in essence this is how they see them—for the fulfillment of all these time prophecies in past brings the argument inexorably forward to the time of the birth of the Advent movement in world history—an event predicted long ago by the prophet Daniel and John the Revelator. The development and success of the Advent movement is as sure in the “time of the end” as the coming of the Messiah to Israel was assured to occur in the “fullness of time” as defined by the seventy weeks prophecy of Daniel 9.

The following quotations illustrate the nature of this assumption. These quotations argue for the validity of the year-day principle based on the fulfillment of the items that they can ‘trace out in history:

**a. Smith.**

But that which demonstrates beyond question the correctness of the year-day principle, is the fact that we, living down in the last years of prophetic fulfillment, are now able to trace out in history the accomplishment of these predictions; and we find that the seventy weeks of Daniel 9; the 1260, 1290, and 1335 days, of Daniel 7 and 12, and the 1260 days and forty-two months of Revelation 12 and 13; and the five months of Rev.9:15, have all been exactly fulfilled, a day for a year. The 2300 days of Daniel 8:14 are therefore 2300 literal years. [Smith, 1898, p. 167](#) (Smith in [Gordon, 1983b, Gordon, Paul A., p. 61](#))

Smith argues:

1. We, living in our time, can trace out the fulfillment of the time prophecies;
2. The “exact” fulfillment of these time periods, including the 2300 days, shows that it is appropriate to apply the year-day principle to them.

**b. Spangler.**

The pragmatic test is the final arbiter in determining whether the time prophecies are literal or symbolic...There is no reason why the year-day principle should not be accepted as a Biblical principle, especially when the historical fulfillment of all the above time prophecies [Dn7:25; 8:14; Rev11:2; 12:16;13:5] provides ample evidence of its validity. It is in this context that the faith-inspiring function of prophecy manifests itself as “the sure word of prophecy,” and “a light that shineth in a dark place” (2 Peter 1:19) until the Second Advent....

It is true that with God all things are possible, but His prophetic word to Daniel reveals that history would not be consummated in everlasting kingdom within the first century A.D. It is unfruitful for us, who have had the privilege of seeing the sure fulfillment of Daniel’s prophecies over the span of history, to develop theories regarding what could have happened but in reality did not take place.

[Spangler, 1980, pp. 46, 29ff](#)

Spangler, in his post-Glacier-View edition of *the Ministry*, argues:

1. “...the historical fulfillment of all the above time prophecies [Dn7:25; 8:14; Rev11:2; 12:16;13:5] provides ample evidence of its [the year-day principle] validity.”

2. Because these prophecies have been fulfilled, “the faith-inspiring function of prophecy manifests itself” to inspire hope and faith in the prophetic teachings of the SDA church “until the Second Advent.”

**Shea.**

Firstly, the applications made of this [year-day] principle have been examined to see how well it has worked. This has been done through examining historical dates supplied by extra-biblical sources for the events of the prophecy of Dan 9:24-27. Within the limits provided by the sources available, they appear to fit together quite satisfactorily.

This principle has also been employed by commentators on Daniel and Revelation to predict events that were still in the future from their own time. In some instances predictions were made on this basis have been fulfilled in a remarkably accurate fashion. The year-day principle appears to have passed both these pragmatic tests in ways that lend further support to its validity.

Shea, 1982, p.87f.

Shea, arguing similarly to the others above, says:

1. “The applications made of this [year-day] principle have been examined to see how well it has worked.” He does it firstly with the 70-weeks.

2. “Within the limits provided by the [extra-biblical] sources available, they [the predictions of Dn9: 24-27] appear to fit together quite satisfactorily.”

3. He also looks at the use of the year-day principle to some of the time prophecies in the book of Revelation, and in particular, the prediction by Cressner concerning the fall of “the Beast” “about the year 1800.” (Shea, 1982, p. 84) People like Cressner made use of these time prophecies “to predict events that were still in the future from their own time. In some instances predictions were made on this basis have been fulfilled in a remarkably accurate fashion.”<sup>4</sup>

4. He concludes, “The year-day principle appears to have passed both these pragmatic tests in ways that lend further support to its validity.”

**Ford.**

The pragmatic test should now be applied and the question asked: Have any of Daniel’s prophecies already met with a precise fulfillment that accords with principles we are studying? Dan 9:24-27, the prophecy of the seventy weeks, seems to offer just such a fulfillment. While the Hebrew word here for weeks, *shabu‘a* simply means a hebdomad (a unit of seven days), nevertheless the Scriptural usage of this term is

---

<sup>4</sup> THIS SHOULD GO LATER WHEN THE ARGUMENTATION IS BEING DONE. Shea conveniently fails to note the myriads of scholars using the year-day principle since its introduction in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, who had predicted many a time, over hundreds of years, *without validity*, the soon advent of Christ, the fall of the Antichrist and a host of other events based on the prophecies of the books of Daniel and Revelation. This is also documented by Froom. The prediction by Cressner was only one among many. With so many of these year-day scholars firing off predictions like a Gatling gun, just from the point of probability one of those predictions would have to come close to some event esteemed prophetic by the year-day adherents. 1798 was one date that they latched onto. Do we, like Shea, trawl through the false proclamations of hundreds of year-day adherents to find one that fits our ideal model and ignore all the false predictions that the year-day principle had also misled? Is this best practise? Should it not be more fairly called “groping at straws?” Newton indicated in his writings that the beginning of the 1260 years was not known and would not be known until the end of the 1260 years became obvious. Now if Newton was expressing the opinion of the informed, then Cressner’s ‘stab in the dark’ is to viewed as just that, and not a product of some valid and reliable method of interpretation. It definitely did not represent the consensus at the time. According to The Great Controversy, Luther had predicted the fall of the papacy 300 years from his day. (1950, p.REF?) It is no great exercise of intelligence to go one step further and print the date of “about 1800” as the time meant by Luther’s statement.

The validity of 1798 as a valid prophetic datum is refuted in Assumption 9.

always for a week of days (see Gn29:27, 28; Dan10:2 It is not used, for example, in Lev25:1-10 for this seven-year period). Inasmuch as other evidence shows that this period of 490 years is cut off from the longer period of 2300, it is obvious that the latter must consist of years also. Thus here in Dan 9 we have the pragmatic test met, and the year-day principle justified, despite the fact that the word day is nowhere used in this passage.<sup>5</sup>

Ford, 1978, pp302f.

Ford also uses the 70-week prophecy to endorse the validity of the year-day principle. His argument is as follows:

1. The 70-week prophecy provides us with evidence of the precise fulfillment of the prophecy through the use of the year-day principle.

2. Scripture only uses a “week of days” and never a “week of years.” This means that a week of days is also used in Dn9. This would mean the year-day principle would need to be used to interpret it properly.

3. Since other evidence shows that the 490 years represented by the 70 weeks is cut off from the 2300 days, it necessitates that the 2300 days must be 2300 years, since 490 years cannot be cut off from 2300 literal days. This is further proof that the year-day principle is being used in Dn8 and 9.

### ***Gerhard Pfandl***

Gerhard Pfandl reiterates the views of Shea and others, using the application of the year-day principle to the 70-weeks to confirm its validity as a principle:

In Daniel 9:24-27 the 70-weeks time prophecy met its fulfillment at the exact time if we use the year-day principle to interpret it. Many interpreters, who in other apocalyptic texts do not employ the year-day principle, recognize that the 70 weeks are in fact “weeks of years” reaching from the Persian period to the time of Christ. Thus the pragmatic test in Daniel 9 confirms the validity of the year-day principle. (Pfandl, 2004, pp.60-62)<sup>6</sup>

So we can read the pragmatic argument being invoked by Pfandl as one of the evidences of its validity.

So speaks some of the scholars of the church.

### ***The Chronological Platform of SDA Historicism***

The following dates make up the central chronological platform for the calculation of the seventy weeks and the 2300 day prophecy, and so these must be considered central to any discussion on the topic. Conversely, by overthrowing these time periods, the whole chronology is thrown out of sync.

### **457 BC: The commandment to rebuild and restore Jerusalem**

**Question:** Is the date 457 B.C., as the beginning of the seventy-week prophecy of Dn9, a verifiable historical fact?

Ellen White’s Position:

Seventy weeks, representing 490 years, are declared by the angel to be cut off, as specially pertaining to the Jews. But from what were they cut off? As the 2300 days was the only period of time mentioned in chapter 8, it must be the period from which the seventy weeks were cut off; the seventy weeks must therefore be a part of the 2300 days, and the two periods must begin together. The seventy weeks were declared by the angel to date from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem.

<sup>5</sup> Answer this issue. Shea also comments on this, in his 1982 booklet.

<sup>6</sup> Assumption 16 shows how an alternate view of interpreting the 70 weeks *without* the year-day principle has much more evidence, with support from past SDA Ministerial Association statements, other SDA scholars and pagan primary sources.

If the date of this commandment could be found, then the starting point for the great period of the 2300 days would be ascertained.

In the seventh chapter of Ezra the decree is found. Verses 12-26. In its completest form it was issued by Artaxerxes, king of Persia, 457 B.C. But in Ezra 6:14 the house of the Lord at Jerusalem is said to have been built "according to the commandment ["decree," margin] of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia." These three kings, in

originating, reaffirming, and completing the decree, brought it to the perfection required by the prophecy to mark the beginning of the 2300 years. Taking 457 B.C., the time when the decree was completed, as the date of the commandment, every specification of the prophecy concerning the seventy weeks was seen to have been fulfilled.

"From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks"--namely, sixty-nine weeks, or 483 years. The decree of Artaxerxes went into effect in the autumn of 457 B.C. (White, 1950, pp. 326-7)

The current state of play for the accuracy of 457 B.C. is that the last word has not been said on the topic. Even Goldstein admits that this is a hotly debated topic in academic circles.<sup>7</sup> This is an admission that 457 BC is not a foregone conclusion. Even if it is to be acknowledged that the choices are limited to either 458 BC or 457 BC and there is an excellent case in favour of 457 BC, proponents of this date are not "out of the woods" yet, as the question is still uncertain concerning the veracity of this date. And then there is excellent evidence in favour of another date entirely, that of the decree of Cyrus, made around 538-536 B.C.<sup>8</sup> But, even if it is correct to choose 457 BC for the beginning of the seventy-week period, it is a giant leap of faith with the assistance of a great many assumptions to assert that this is also the start for the 2300-day period. As has been shown in this collection of papers, most of these assumptions are invalid.

Goldstein takes a novel approach to the issue on 457 BC:

I want to take a somewhat different approach, one that centers around the chronological historicity of Christ, because as both Sacrifice (the seventy-week prophecy) and High Priest (the 2,300-day prophecy) He is at the center. We can work back from when Jesus lived and died, and from that time-frame establish the beginning of the seventy-week prophecy, which, by default, gives us the end of the 2,300 days. (2003, p.100)

Of course, brother Dale [Ratzlaff] (miming Ford) assaults the dates 457 B.C., A.D. 27. A.D. 31 and A.D. 34...And the fact that it's [the seventy weeks of Dn9] about Jesus adds a crucial element to the question about these dates, an element that critics have to ignore. Des Ford, Dale Ratzlaff, and others all want to debunk 457 B.C.; and that's fine as long as one realizes that by playing with these dates we're tampering with the dates regarding Jesus. As long as one believes that the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 refer to Jesus, one is quite limited in options regarding the starting point of the seventy weeks--and, thus, the 2,300 days. Though we shouldn't be too dogmatic about

<sup>7</sup> "The big debate in the scholarly world over his seventh year is between 457 or 458 B.C. Some say 457, some say 458, depending on which type of calendar they believe that the Jews used. *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, by Horn and Wood, proved – using numerous ancient sources – that the Jews used a fall-to-fall calendar in counting the years of the reign of Artaxerxes, thus putting his seventh year in 457. Indeed, they have locked down that date. Even today, many non-Adventists accept 457 as the seventy year of Artaxerxes, utilizing a fall-to-fall calendar for the Jews." (1988, p.49)

<sup>8</sup> There are other competing dates that Adventist authors propose as well, and are worthy of inspection. H. M. S. Richards' son, Kenneth Richards, proposes 538 B. C. with the decree of Cyrus, as the natural date to begin the seventy-weeks prophecy. (His posting is preserved in the [Appendix](#)) Ford, in his 1996 commentary on Daniel, quoting Ferch, proposes similar ([pp.245-7](#)).

“proving” the exact dates of Jesus’ ministry, Scripture does provide material that can pinpoint the general time frame, and that’s crucial for us (as we’ll soon see) in responding to attacks on 457 B.C...

Why is this important? Because we link the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 with the 2,300 days of Daniel 8, and because we believe that the time prophecy of the seventy weeks sets the starting date for the 2,300-day prophecy. And the starting date of the seventy weeks will determine the end point of the 2,300 days, which we put at 1844. Those who attack the 1844 date simply have to show that the date with which we start the seventy weeks—457 B.C.—is wrong. If that’s off, even by a year, then the 2,300 days (years) don’t end in 1844. (2003, pp.98-100)

Goldstein then adds some thoughtful arguments why 457 B.C is a better choice of dates compared with 538 B.C., 520 B.C., 458 B.C., and 444 B.C. He uses the veracity of his interpretation of the events within the seventy weeks as the criterion to assess each of these dates: The dates 538 B.C., 520 B.C. and 444 B.C. are dismissed because the problems that pose for a wide variation in the events of Christ’s life that do not mesh with known facts of his life and ministry. However, he dismisses the more problematic date of 458 B.C. (which he acknowledges as the preferred choice of the wide spectrum of scholars) without offering *any* reason to choose 457 B.C. over 458 B.C.:

Now, there’s the last proposal as an alternative to 457 B.C.–458 B.C. This amounts to a difference of six months. The following are a few quotes from non – Adventist sources, all putting the seventh year of Artaxerxes as 458 B.C. Though most are writing in another context, notice the date they give for the return of Ezra to Jerusalem:

“Many scholars decided in favour of Artaxerxes I, and so fix the seventh year of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7 as 458...” [Goldstein footnotes: “Otto Eisfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Harper and Row, New York, NY) 1965, p.533”]

“A straightforward reading of the biblical texts places Ezra’s arrival in Judah in 458 B.C.E...” [Goldstein inserts footnote: “Norman Gottwald, *The Hebrew Bible, A Socio-Literary Introduction*, (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, PA) 1985, p. 435.”]

“According to the biblical sources both [Ezra and Nehemiah] were active in the time of Artaxerxes I Longimanus. The date of Ezra’s coming to Jerusalem in the seventh year of the king’s rule would then be 458 B.C.” [Goldstein footnotes: “S. Talmon, ‘Ezra and Nehemiah,’ *IDB Sup*, p.320.”]

In an article attacking the 457 B.C. date as the starting point of the seventy weeks, Desmond Ford wrote the following:

“But there’s a final problem: even those scholars who believe Ezra may refer to the time of Ezra and the decree of Ezra 7 do not accept the 457 B.C. date for the decree! The date most universally accepted is 458 B.C., and in the spring – certainly not October 22. Sadly, 2,300 years from that date does not culminate in 1844.” [Goldstein footnotes: “*Good News Unlimited*, (November, 1990) p. 6”]

No – it culminates in 1843! One year off (not even a full year, either.) Thus, even if we use 458 B.C., this places the heavenly pre-Advent judgment (both in Daniel 7 and 8) in 1843, as opposed to 1844. The fact is though, enough scholarly work has been done to show that 457 is, indeed, the better of the two dates.” [Goldstein footnotes: “For an entire book on the subject see, Siegfried Horn, Lynn Wood, *The Chronology of Ezra 7*, (Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, DC) 1953.”] (2003, pp. 102f)

Thus Goldstein just sidesteps the issues of 458 B.C entirely. He has not answered the reason why “the scholarly world nearly universally chooses” 458 rather than 457 B.C, and his comments seem to indicate that a six-month difference is tolerable (“not even a full year either”), even though those six months could stretch across years. And

if enough scholarly work has been done to solve the issue, why does this not appear to be the case with the wider Christian scholarly world?

### Competing Views.

1.

#### 2. The decree in Dn9 is that of Cyrus's decree.

Typical of this is an article written by Ken. E Richards, who spent his lifetime giving lip-service to the traditional arguments for 457 BC, but has since favored the view that the decree of Cyrus in 538 BC is a much more natural choice. His view is found at [AToday.com](http://AToday.com).

Conclusion:

### 27 AD "Until the Anointed One."

**Question:** Is 27 A.D. as a date for the baptism of Jesus a verifiable historical fact?

Ellen White's Position:

"From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks"--namely, sixty-nine weeks, or 483 years. The decree of Artaxerxes went into effect in the autumn of 457 B.C. From this date, 483 years extend **to the autumn of A.D. 27. (See Appendix.) At that time this prophecy was fulfilled.** The word "Messiah" signifies "the Anointed One." In the autumn of A.D. 27 Christ was baptized by John and received the anointing of the Spirit. The apostle Peter testifies that "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power." Acts 10:38. And the Saviour Himself declared: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor." Luke 4:18. After His baptism He went into Galilee, "preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled." Mark 1:14, 15. (1950, p.327)<sup>9</sup>

There is no independent information to confirm this date. The best that commentators can do is surmise the date, given the rough chronology of the life of Jesus. It does not specify when the beginning of Jesus' ministry took place, and it seems Scripture did not want to be specific in regard to this.

#### From the SDA Bible Commentary:

The lack of conclusive proof for the exact date of the beginning of the ministry of Christ has not only led to differences of opinion as to the events involved, but also caused critics to assert contradictions between the Synoptic Gospels and John, and to attack the historical application of the prophecy of the seventy weeks (Dn9:24-27) to the life of Christ. The great period was to "seal up the vision and prophecy" by pointing out the time of "Messiah the Prince" has, through the centuries, been interpreted by most theological writers as pointing to Christ's first advent, with the crucifixion occurring either in the midst or at the end of the 70<sup>th</sup> week. The standard historicist interpretation since the Reformation has been that the 70<sup>th</sup> week follows immediately the 69<sup>th</sup> week, with no time gap, and that the events prophesied to take place in the 70<sup>th</sup> week find their fulfillment in connection with the life of Christ. This

<sup>9</sup> In the Appendix note for this quote it says: "The historical chronological facts connected with the prophetic periods of Daniel 8 and 9, including many evidences pointing unmistakably to the year 457 B.C. as the proper time from which to begin reckoning these periods, have been clearly outlined by many students of prophecy. See Stanley Leathes, *Old Testament Prophecy*, Lectures, 10, 11 (Warburton Lectures for 1876-1880); W. Goode, *Fulfilled Prophecy*, sermon 10, including Note A (Warburton lectures for 1854-1858); A. Thom, *Chronology of Prophecy*, London ed., 1848, pp.26-106; Sir Isaac Newton, *Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John*, ch.10 (London ed., 1733, pp.128-143); Uriah Smith, *Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*, pt.1, chs. 8, 9. On the date of the crucifixion, see Wm. Hales, *Analysis of Chronology*, 2d London ed., vol. 1, pp.94-101; vol.3, pp.164-258."

commentary sets forth what was the majority interpretation during the 19<sup>th</sup>-century advent movement, namely, that the 70 weeks begin with the 7<sup>th</sup> year of Artaxerxes. This article shows that, by placing the baptism of Christ at the beginning of the seventieth week, and His crucifixion in the “midst of the week,” the available evidence for the dating of the ministry of Christ can be harmonized with that interpretation.

There is no difficulty in locating “the going forth of the commandment” at *the beginning* of the 70 weeks in the autumn of 457 BC. ...The reader who finds a possible harmony between the events portrayed prophetically foretold for the end of that period and the historical data for the life of Christ, can let the weight of prophetic fulfillment decide his preference in the case of dates that are open to varying interpretations such as A.D. 27/28, or 29 for the beginning of Christ’s ministry, and 30, 31, or 33 for His crucifixion.

To summarize: At present there is no *conclusive* historical and chronological proof, neither is there disproof, that Jesus began His ministry in the autumn of A.D. 27, as the end of 69 weeks of years after 457 B.C.; and that He ended the symbolism of the sacrifices and offerings at the cross 3½ years later, in the spring of A.D. 31, with the latter half of the 70<sup>th</sup> week extending 3½ years longer, to the end of the 490 years from the starting point. But though one cannot hold these dates as definitely proved, by direct historical source evidences, one *can* hold them as wholly reasonable deductions from the prophecy – as conclusions not incompatible with any known fact and in harmony with many facts that are known from recent research.

(Nichol, 1980, (1956), p. 247f)

Yet on the other hand, the same commentary can assert with dogmatic definiteness that this event happened, not only in A.D. 27, but even in the *autumn of that year*:

Daniel predicted that the long-looked for Prince Messiah would appear at a specific time. To this time Jesus referred when He declared, “The time is fulfilled” (Mark 1:15; DA: 233). Jesus was anointed at the time of his baptism in the autumn of A.D. 27 (see Luke 3:21,22; Acts 10:38; cf. Luke 4:18). (Nichol, 1976, p.853).

This assertion concerning not only the year, but even the very season of the year when he was baptised, is not done using any data in Scripture; it is done on the basis of using the 70 weeks prophecy and reasoning back from 1844 AD to 457 BC and then up to 27 AD. Nothing in the New Testament can give any support for an autumn baptism. The argument that as long as it does not contradict any known facts then it can be expected, must be questioned. This argument could be developed and highlighted until its tenuous nature becomes ludicrous, but suffice it to say, that it is no good reason to hold to a certain date. If Scripture had wanted us to know not only the year but also that season of the year when it occurred, it would have provided a reference point, which it has not done.

Goldstein also adds a warning against dogmatism on the dates of Christ’s chronology:

Though we shouldn’t be too dogmatic about “proving” the exact dates of Jesus’ ministry, Scripture does provide material that can pinpoint the general time frame, and that’s crucial for us (as we’ll soon see) in responding to attacks on 457 B.C. (2003, p.98)

And then ignoring his own warning, he says, basing his statement on Dn9: if we go with 457 B.C., the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes, (see, Ezra 7:8-26), the numbers come right up to the time of Christ, that is, to 27-34 A.D. Then he backs off from the historicity of that chronology by saying, “and though we can’t be overly dogmatic about proving those exact dates from historical sources, we certainly can be dogmatic about 457 B.C., in contrast to the other dates looked at so far, being the only starting point that could possibly bring us to ‘Messiah the Prince’.” (Ibid, p.101)

But SDA historicists could really go one step further than just naming the season of the year of His baptism. Given their preciseness of the *end* of the date of the 2300 days with a specific date, this can only be achieved if there is precision at every step of the way, including the baptism of Jesus. Notice Goldstein's logic:

Therefore, although reluctant to admit it, the SDA chronology for the 2300 day period forces SDA's to acknowledge that they can even name a certain date in A.D. 27 (and both A.D 31 and A.D 34), if the chronology reaching to a specific day in 1844 is to have any credibility.

Conclusion:

### **31 AD "Messiah shall be cut off."**

**Question:** Is the date 31 A.D. for the crucifixion of Jesus a verifiable historical fact?

Ellen White's Position:

"And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week." The "week" here brought to view is the last one of the seventy; it is the last seven years of the period allotted especially to the Jews. During this time, extending from A.D. 27 to A.D. 34, Christ, at first in person and afterward by His disciples, extended the gospel invitation especially to the Jews. As the apostles went forth with the good tidings of the kingdom, the Saviour's direction was: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Matthew 10:5, 6.

"In the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." In A.D. 31, three and a half years after His baptism, our Lord was crucified. With the great sacrifice offered upon Calvary, ended that system of offerings which for four thousand years had pointed forward to the Lamb of God. Type had met antitype, and all the sacrifices and oblations of the ceremonial system were there to cease. (1950, pp.327-328)

There is a range of dates for this event, as is admitted by SDA scholars. Their choice of 31 AD is based on their calculation of the seventy weeks periods with the starting date of 457 BC.

#### **From the SDA Bible Commentary:**

Those who present evidence that may point to A.D. 31 frankly admit that, in the present state of knowledge, the case for that year cannot be established by astronomical and calendrical proof. But they consider it proper to call attention to facts that indicate equally lack of certainty for A.D. 30, and the advisability of refraining from any dogmatic assertion in behalf of either year. The conclusion may be reached that 31, or some other year, can be considered astronomically possible or probable *if* certain conditions are assumed. But in the absence of source data establishing the now unknown conditions, calendar computation must be subordinated to other factors in making a decision as to the more probable year. The advocates of 31 have generally recognized a 3½ year ministry from late A.D. 27, and have taken also into account the fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy of "the midst of the week" (Dan. 9:27).

The fact remains that at the present time we cannot be sure of the lunar-calendar system of the Jews in the first century. Therefore we cannot say with certainty, "This, according to lunar astronomy, was the year of the crucifixion." With our knowledge of general principles derived from Babylonian records, from earliest Jewish papyri, and from later Jewish tradition, we can say that only three times during the period allowable for the crucifixion can be a possible Friday 14<sup>th</sup> of Nisan be computed from lunar data. Since one of these, A.D. 33 seems untenable, the alternatives are A.D. 30 or 31. We may add, in favor of 31, the consideration of the "midst" of the 70<sup>th</sup> week...3½ years after the baptism of Jesus. *But so far as the lunar-calendar evidence goes*, the field remains open for those who by one system arrive at A.D. 31 (in the mathematically exact "midst" of the "week"), and those who by another method arrive

at A.D. 30 (which some accept as the approximate midst of the week). Other considerations than lunar calculation must decide the choice.

The whole question of the Passover date in connection with the death of Christ is so complex that, as has been stated, no one view has ever been set forth with complete proof from unequivocal astronomical or calendrical data. .... In the face of the absence of adequate proof for either 30 or 31, no one can find fault with the selection of 31, even though it does not at present command majority acceptance. Ibid, p.254,italics his)

Conclusion:

### **34 AD The Stoning of Stephen.**

**Question:** Is the date 34 A.D. for the stoning of Stephen a verifiable historical fact?

Ellen White's Position:

The seventy weeks, or 490 years, especially allotted to the Jews, ended, as we have seen, in A.D. 34. At that time, through the action of the Jewish Sanhedrin, the nation sealed its rejection of the gospel by the martyrdom of Stephen and the persecution of the followers of Christ. Then the message of salvation, no longer restricted to the chosen people, was given to the world. The disciples, forced by persecution to flee from Jerusalem, "went everywhere preaching the word." "Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them." Peter, divinely guided, opened the gospel to the centurion of Caesarea, the God-fearing Cornelius; and the ardent Paul, won to the faith of Christ, was commissioned to carry the glad tidings "far hence unto the Gentiles." Acts 8:4, 5; 22:21. (1950, p.328)

Some SDA historicist writers are even prepared to be candid enough to admit there is no clear cut indication in Dn9:27 for an event to mark the end of the seventy weeks. For instance, Questions on Doctrine argue that since there is no clear event linked to the end of the seventy weeks, none should be sought.

Expositors have long sought for some incontrovertible event to mark the close of the seventy weeks of years of verse 27. Not a few have suggested the stoning of Stephen (Acts 7). But this is variously dated as occurring in A.D. 32, 33, or 34. Others have considered the conversion of Saul (Acts 9), or the declaration, "Lo, we turn to the Gentiles" (Acts 13:46). The timing of these episodes, however, is not at all certain. In this connection the question arises, Is it really necessary to pinpoint some event as marking the close of the 70 weeks? No specific event is predicted in the prophecy, and it would therefore seem that no historic event is actually called for to indicate its close....So although various expositors (such as Hales, Tanner, Taylor et cetera) suggest the martyrdom of Stephen as the closing event of the seventieth week – and such might be quite reasonable – no historical mark is actually necessary, and possibly none can be pointed out with certainty. (*Seventh-day Adventists*, 1957, pp.289-291)

Maxwell says a similar thing:

For the termination of the seventy weeks, Gabriel in Daniel 9:24-27 prescribed no specific event. Gabriel did not say what particular act or transaction, if any, marked the close of the prophetic period which, for 490 years, had counted out the privileges of the Jewish nation. (1981, pp. 234f)

As does Ford:

...while the prophecy itself does not tell of a climactic event at the end of the seventy weeks, it is right to point out that in A.D. 34, the actual close of the literal 490 years, the Jews sealed their rejection of the Christian gospel by stoning Stephen to death. That same year marked the calling of the Apostles to the Gentiles...(1978, p.235)

Note here Ford does not appeal to Scripture, (since there are none), but merely asserts that it is “right” to point to the stoning of Stephen as the close of the seventy weeks prophecy.

And as for the chronology of the stoning of Stephen, the best SDA scholarship can provide is a range of dates between 33-36 AD. There is no chronological information that can assist us to nail down a certain time frame for this event. Most use the events of Paul’s life, as does Shea in his futile efforts to prove 34 AD as the best choice for the stoning of Stephen. But there are so many variables that the average commentator will give a range of error of at least 2-4 years for the chronology.<sup>10</sup>

**From the SDA Bible Commentary:**

GET A COPY OF THIS INFO.

NEED TO GET PERHAPS SOME OTHER COMMENTATORS AS WELL.

Conclusion:

**538 AD The little horn has the power**

**Question:** Is the date 538 A.D. for the beginning of the power of the papacy a verifiable historical fact?

Ellen White’s Position:

In the sixth century the papacy had become firmly established. Its seat of power was fixed in the imperial city, and the bishop of Rome was declared to be the head over the entire church. Paganism had given place to the papacy. The dragon had given to the beast "his power, and his seat, and great authority." Revelation 13:2. And now began the 1260 years of papal oppression foretold in the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation. Daniel 7:25; Revelation 13:5-7. (See Appendix.) Christians were forced to choose either to yield their integrity and accept the papal ceremonies and worship, or to wear away their lives in dungeons or suffer death by the rack, the fagot, or the headsman's ax. Now were fulfilled the words of Jesus: "Ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for My name's sake." Luke 21:16, 17. Persecution opened upon the faithful with greater fury than ever before, and the world became a vast battlefield. For hundreds of years the church of Christ found refuge in seclusion and obscurity. Thus says the prophet: "The woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and three-score days." Revelation 12:6.

The accession of the Roman Church to power marked the beginning of the Dark Ages. As her power increased, the darkness deepened. (1950, pp.54-55)

**MIGHT BE BETTER TO CLARIFY THE ISSUES IN ASSUMPTION 9 BEFORE YOU FINISH OFF THE COMMENTS ON THIS SECTION.**

This has no basis in fact, because the decree of Justinian was issued in 533 AD and Pope Agapetus exercised this power by sacking the bishop of Constantinople with the support of Justinian in 536 AD. This was achieved before the so-called ousting of the Ostrogoths from Rome.<sup>11</sup> This did not fully occur till 555 AD, but in any case it is

<sup>10</sup> Read my material in [Assumption 18](#) on the chronology of Stephen, under the subtitle, “The Chronology of the Stoning of Stephen.”

<sup>11</sup> In [Assumption 9](#) I look at how this did not occur until 552 AD. 538 AD is a date created for the prophetic schema of historicists rather than reflecting any historical facts that correspond to the reality. It is well documented how that the calculation for the 1260 years prophecy was done in reverse. That is to say, when it was decided that 1798 was found to be the end of the papal reign, then a start point was searched for, or at least, some credible event was dredged out of the affairs of 538 that had some association with the topic they were searching for. The argument that the ousting of the Arian Ostrogoths was necessary for the execution of Justinian’s legislation of the pre-eminence of the bishop of Rome is totally incorrect on two counts. Firstly, the ousting of the Arian Ostrogoths was not necessary for

entirely irrelevant to the introduction of legislation by Justinian to enshrine the primacy of the bishop of Rome in the legal code.

In addition, many SDA historicists argue that the 1,260 days is to be applied to the persecution of the people of God, (not the primacy of the pope): "he would have the power to persecute the holy ones of the Most High "for a year, two years, and a half-year." (v. 25). (2002, p.9)

REFER TO JESIS INSTITUTEFORUM and greer in Atoday ON THE DIFFERENT BEGINNINGS OF THE 1260 DAY PERIOD. ALSO REFER THE READERS TO ASSUMPTION 9 RATHER THAN DEALING WITH IT ALL HERE.

1260 days –

Dn7 no specific time

Dn12 beginning of the abomination of desolation

Rev 12 a different start again

Conclusion:

### **1798 AD The little horn shall be broken.**

**Question:** Is the date 1798 A.D. for the end of the power of the papacy a historical fact?

Ellen White's Position:

The suppression of the Scriptures during the period of papal supremacy was foretold by the prophets; and the Revelator points also to the terrible results that were to accrue especially to France from the domination of the "man of sin."

Said the angel of the Lord: "The holy city shall they tread underfoot forty and two months. And I will give power unto My two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. . . . And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified. . . . And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth. And after three days and a half the Spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which saw them." Revelation 11:2-11.

Justinian's legislation to take effect, and secondly, the ousting of the Ostrogoths did not occur for the final time in 538 AD. How can it be said that the Ostrogoths were ousted in 538 when they still controlled the north-eastern areas of Italy until 552 AD? And why was the total ousting of the Ostrogoths from Italy necessary for the bishop of Rome's pre-eminence any way? Italy was made up of local fiefdoms throughout history. The presence of an Arian tribe in Italy would not have any impact on the bishop of Rome's pre-eminence over the other bishops in Christianity. Mansell understands this and calls the breaking of the horn, a weakening of the horn power. (2003, p.?) But how should we interpret the breaking of the other horns in this prophecy? What can we say of the reign of the times of the Ptolemies, or even of the breaking of the first big horn? Just a weakening? If we look at how this date was established, it will be seen that it was done on a countback, after contemporary consensus of Protestant enthusiasts decided that 1798 was the end of the 1260 years. Sir Isaac Newton said the beginning of the 1260-year period could not be calculated until the end of the period had occurred. Clearly, from this statement, 538 AD was a non-event on the historicists' horizon at the time he wrote that, that is, until 1798 was decided upon. Then they had to find an event to signal a beginning. The temporary ousting of the Arians in that year was the only event that year associated with the papacy worth using. CHECK WHAT OTHER EVENTS TOOK PLACE THAT YEAR. That it was not correct or hardly irrelevant was not the issue. The important thing in the thinking of the historicist was that 1798 was correct, regardless of how dubious the connection with the chosen event in 538 AD. Let it also be borne in mind, that the Christian Church has never held 538 A.D in any special significance. It is only with a minority of historicist's that an importance was given to this date. The majority chose 533 A.D as their focus.

The periods here mentioned--"forty and two months," and "a thousand two hundred and threescore days"--are the same, alike representing the time in which the church of Christ was to suffer oppression from Rome. The 1260 years of papal supremacy began in A.D. 538, and would therefore terminate in 1798. (See Appendix note for page 54.)<sup>12</sup> At that time a French army entered Rome and made the pope a prisoner, and he died in exile. Though a new pope was soon afterward elected, the papal hierarchy has never since been able to wield the power which it before possessed.

The persecution of the church did not continue throughout the entire period of the 1260 years. God in mercy to His people cut short the time of their fiery trial. In foretelling the "great tribulation" to befall the church, the Saviour said: "Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." Matthew 24:22. Through the influence of the Reformation the persecution was brought to an end prior to 1798.

Concerning the two witnesses the prophet declares further: "These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth." "Thy word," said the psalmist, "is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." Revelation 11:4; Psalm 119:105. The two witnesses represent the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament. Both are important testimonies to the origin and perpetuity of the law of God. Both are witnesses also to the plan of salvation. The types, sacrifices, and prophecies of the Old Testament point forward to a Saviour to come. The Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament tell of a Saviour who has come in the exact manner foretold by type and prophecy.

"They shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and three-score days, clothed in sackcloth." During the greater part of this period, God's witnesses remained in a state of obscurity. The papal power sought to hide from the people the word of truth, and set before them false witnesses to contradict its testimony. (See Appendix.)<sup>13</sup> When the Bible was proscribed by religious and secular authority; when its testimony was perverted, and every effort made that men and demons could invent to turn the minds of the people from it; when those who dared proclaim its sacred truths were hunted, betrayed, tortured, buried in dungeon cells, martyred for their faith, or compelled to flee to mountain fastnesses, and to dens and caves of the earth--then the faithful witnesses prophesied in sackcloth. Yet they continued their testimony throughout the entire period of 1260 years. (1950, pp.266-267)

The desertion of Rome by the Pope has been a regular, though infrequent event throughout the history of Rome. He has lost his temporal power almost a dozen times, only to regain it again later. But the SDA calculation does not recognise these interruptions in the continuance of his temporal powers, since they see these events as occurring before the end of the 1260 years. It is only the event near the end of this prophetic period that they recognise as a legitimate loss of temporal power. There is no abiding rationale for explaining why one abolition of his temporal power is acceptable and another abolition of his temporal power is not acceptable. To any historian, if there is an abolition of temporal power, there is an abolition of temporal power, regardless of the century or the surrounding circumstances. The only feasible answer to this issue is that SDA historicists use their interpretation of the prophecy to interpret history rather than letting history tell its own story.

The SDABC acknowledges that the supremacy of the papacy only lasted a few centuries, and that it began its decline in the 12<sup>th</sup> –13<sup>th</sup> centuries. REF? It also acknowledges that the decline of the papacy lasted over many centuries, culminating in the eighteenth century. The most obvious answer is that if one is going to choose a time period for the end of this decline, the obvious one is 1870 rather than 1798, since the disruption at that time was much shorter than that from 1870 to 1929 (59 years). Even

<sup>12</sup> The appendix note here is the same as the footnote for 27 A.D.

<sup>13</sup> The appendix note here is the same as the footnote for 27 A.D.

Catholic literature acknowledges the significance of 1870. REF? Catholic literature is strangely silent on any change to papal powers in 1798.

SDA historicists confuse two entirely different factors about the Pope. These two factors are firstly, the *supremacy or primacy* of the Papacy and secondly, its *temporal* power. These are two different things. His supremacy over the other bishops of Christendom, has no coincidence with the temporal power of the Christian church, which is enjoyed by all the bishops of Christendom. The SDA church *starts* the 1260-year with **the supremacy of the papacy over the other bishops**, which they say was not gained until the Ostrogoths evacuated Italy (an issue entirely unrelated to gaining legal primacy from the emperor).<sup>14</sup> They *end* the 1260-year period with **the temporal power of the papacy**, an entirely different issue than his supremacy. The obvious issue one would take immediately with this is if they want to *start* the period with *papal supremacy*, then they should *end* the period with papal supremacy. If however, they want to *end* the period with the *temporal papal power*, then they should *start* the period with temporal papal power.

From tries to circumvent this issue by saying that the 1260 years are to be *started* from the decree of Justinian in 533 AD to give the Roman Bishop pre-eminence over the other bishops. REF? He then *finishes* the 1260-year period with the decree of the Directory to overthrow the pope in 1793. REF? There are obvious problems with this position. The initial one is that although the Bishop of Rome had *legal pre-eminence* with the introduction of the legislation in 533 AD, he did not lose his *temporal power* with the decision of the Directory in 1793 AD. Although the Directory may have decreed the abolition of the Papal temporal power, and may have been the official supporting military machine of the Pontiff for many centuries, their decree never affected the temporal power of the Pontiff. His power remained, though interrupted a number of times, up until 1870, when the Italian government stripped him of his temporal power.

Therefore, one cannot say that the legal end of the temporal power of the pope finished in 1793, or indeed 1798. Napoleon indicated in the 1801 Concordat –the official ratification of the events that occurred under the Roman republic–that he did not recognise the decision of the Directory and did not want the temporal powers taken from the pope. Indeed, the treaty of Tolentino, concluded in 1797, made between the Papacy and Napoleon, ensured the preservation of the temporal power of the pope, regardless of the wishes of the Directory. Furthermore, the 1801 Concordat, being the official confirmation of campaigns won since 1798, indicates that the excesses of 1798 against the papacy can be ignored, and that the papal temporal powers were intact. Had Napoleon wished to strip the pope of his temporal powers, the Concordat of 1801 would have been of the same calibre as the 1809 Concordat, where that action was formally taken, and the pope stripped of his temporal powers. What is difficult in understanding the complexity of Napoleon is that he gives evidence of being a man of two opinions, depending who he was talking to. To the Directory he would say one thing, though other actions indicate that he was of a different persuasion. Such was the case with the position of the pope. Although he gave lip-service to the will of the Directory, he failed

---

<sup>14</sup> If there had been a war between the armies representing the bishop of Rome and the armies representing all the other bishops, then the vanquishing of those armies by the soldiers representing the bishop of Rome would be an event that would have some correspondence between the legal right of the bishop of Rome to be supreme, and his actual supremacy on the field of battle. But this is nowhere near what is represented in the offensive against the Ostrogoths in Italy. The campaigns against the Ostrogoths are not connected *in any way* with the supremacy of the bishop of Rome. In any case the campaign against the Ostrogoths was conducted by the eastern emperor on behalf of his own interests.

to carry out their wishes and in fact, was working in an entirely different direction to ensure the continuation of the Church. In Italy, it was the will of Napoleon that was supreme, not the will of the French Republican Directory. What he purposed, occurred, not what the Directory purposed. Even many of Napoleon's public statements at this time cannot represent his true attitudes, as he was scheming and planning for a new France – a France without a Directory leading it; a France where Napoleon was supreme, and a France where Napoleon's will was the will of the nation. Little wonder then that many of Napoleon's statements at this time contradict the clear message of his actions.

The Concordat of 1801 restored the temporal power of the papacy lost since his exile in 1798, indicating Napoleon's real intention was never to strip the pope of his power. Though the more financially valuable provinces were not returned to the Papacy until Napoleon was overthrown, the Papacy nevertheless, from 1801 to 1809, retained temporal power, until Napoleon stripped the Pope of his power again in the 1809 Concordat. This remained until the Congress of Vienna in 1815 after the fall of Napoleon, which restored almost all its former temporal powers to the papacy.

One of the central points in this debate is whether one is to recognise the authority of Napoleon when he made the Treaty of Tolentino and the 1801 Concordat. Does his view of the matter supercede the opinion of the Directory, even though the Directory was the peak body in France. Then one must ask the question, How did they receive this power? It was usurped from the monarchy. If Napoleon was in the process of usurping the power from the Directory (and the indications are that he was), then one should recognise the efforts and achievements of the soon-to-be Consul as being just as legitimate as the authority of the Directory, and especially so since when he came to power, these treaties were honoured, until they were superceded in 1809.

- a. The SDA church says that the signing of the Concordat by Mussolini in 1929 was the healing of the wound on the papacy. But the wound healed in 1929 was not the one given to it in 1798 but that in 1870. The affront given to the papacy in 1798 was healed in 1800 with the election of a new pope under the financial assistance of Napoleon, and then with the Concordat of 1801. Some SDA writers skirt the reality of this issue by saying the events of 1798 was "the beginning of the deadly wound" that culminated in the total loss of temporal power in 1870. This is deceptive and incorrect. If this logic were correct, then there is no reason we cannot include previous ostracisms of the Pope from Rome as events that are the "beginning" of the deadly wound. In the end, we could include *all* the previous flights of the pope from Rome and have the "beginning" of the deadly wound occurring at the beginning of the temporal power of the pope just after the Donation of Pepin or even the law of Constantine in 321 AD, that is how ridiculous this logic really is!! That would make "the beginning of the deadly wound" more than one thousand years long!!! Who is to decide why the flight of the pope in 1798 is the "first" in a series that culminates in 1870? What are the parameters to guide the selection of the event? Certainly correct science is needed here, if the SDA argument is to be treated with any respect. Unfortunately, there is no such science at present, only orthodox SDA historicism that decides when it begins, and this is determined without an open scholarly debate about the issue.

- b. If 1798 is acknowledged as the loss of the temporal powers of the pope, then we must also consider all the other occasions previous to this when the pope had to flee Rome for his life, and leave the city in the hand of enemies of the papacy. The first time that the pope has to flee Rome after 533 AD is the end of the period between these two events, and this must be the period intimated by the 1260 day prophecy. That event happened in 544 A.D. when the Pope was arrested, exiled and placed under house arrest by the emperor Justinian for eight years until the Pope recanted his position. This occurred after 544A.D. when SDA historicists say that the pope was free to develop his power. The pope was arrested in the midst of a ceremony, in exactly the same manner as Pope Pius VI in 1798, and was placed under house arrest by the emperor for eight years until the Pope recanted his position and yielded to the emperor’s superior position and opinion.
- c. If SDA historicists were to say somehow that both the temporal power of the pope and the pre-eminence of the bishop of Rome were two inseparable factors to be considered in the power of the little horn, then the obvious thing to do is to *take the earliest date of either of them as the starting point and the latest of both of them as the ending point.*

Doing that would yield the following results:

	<b>Start of the period</b>	<b>End of the period</b>	<b>Period Involved</b>
The <b>pre-eminence</b> of the Bishop of Rome	Since the 1 <sup>st</sup> -2 <sup>nd</sup> century, but legally since 533 AD	This has never been rescinded; it is still current today, OR Should be considered annulled with the overthrow of Constantinople in 1453 AD	1472-1805 yrs  1453-533=920 yrs
The <b>temporal power</b> of the bishop of Rome.	The law of Constantine giving church power to hold and transfer property. 321 AD. Or Donation of Pepin/Pippin in 756 AD.	1870.	1549 yrs or 1114yrs.

THE CODE OF JUSTINIAN IS JUST A RECOGNITION OF THE PRE-EMINENCE OF THE BISHOP OF ROME, NOT A PROCLAMATION OF HIS PRE-EMINENCE.

This would yield the following scheme: either from the first century until the present (2005-year period), or 533 AD until the present (1472 year-period). In either case, it is far enough out of sync with the 1260-year period to render the period inapplicable.

- d. Another point worth noting is that there is strong evidence the pre-eminence of the Bishop of Rome was recognised even before the times of Constantine in the fourth century. (Ref? From catholic encyc) But if it is to be argued for some reason that it is only the *legal* pre-eminence of the Bishop of Rome ratified by legislation that is to be regarded as the correct one, then by that same argument it is to be regarded that the correct event for the *legal* gain or loss of temporal power of the papacy is the one ratified by a legal document or legislation. This would be either a Concordat or a law. The law of Constantine in 321 AD

empowered the church to legally hold or transfer property.<sup>15</sup> Either of these choices eliminates 1798 as an option since there is no legal endorsement of the loss of his power at this time. Although the Directory gave orders for the overthrow of the papacy and this may be considered a legal authorisation, this was not legally ratified by them, and indeed when the ratification of the events of this campaign did occur in 1801, it reinstated his temporal powers over most of his previously owned provinces, recognising that he had in effect, not lost them.

If however, there is an objection to seeking a *legal* ending of the temporal papal power to mirror the *legal* beginning of the papal pre-eminence, then by the same argument, one could seek an *earlier non-legal beginning of papal pre-eminence*, which would take us back to the first or at the latest second century, thereby increasing the period under review.

Conclusion:

### **August 11, 1840 The End of the Ottoman Empire.**

The bulk of the material for this section of the paper is contained in the [Appendix](#). It includes articles and will include primary sources in time to prove the validity of these points. Please refer there for documentation.

**Question:** Is the date 1840 A.D. for the end of the Ottoman Empire's independence a verifiable historical fact?

Below is a collection of references relevant to the answering of this question.  
Ellen White's Position:

In the year 1840 another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest.

Two years before, Josiah Litch, one of the leading ministers preaching the second advent, published an exposition of Revelation 9, predicting the fall of the Ottoman Empire. According to his calculations, this power was to be overthrown "in A.D. 1840, sometime in the month of August;" and only a few days previous to its accomplishment he wrote: "Allowing the first period, 150 years, to have been exactly fulfilled before Deacozes ascended the throne by permission of the Turks, and that the 391 years, fifteen days, commenced at the close of the first period, it will end on the 11<sup>th</sup> of August, 1840, when the Ottoman power in Constantinople may be expected to be broken. And this, I believe, will be found to be the case." Josiah Litch, in *Signs of the Times, and Expositor of Prophecy*, Aug 1, 1840.<sup>16</sup>

At the very time specified, Turkey, though her ambassadors, accepted the protection of the allied powers of Europe, and thus placed herself under the control of

<sup>15</sup> See the comment from the Catholic Encyclopedia on the [Patrimony of St Peter and the Papal States](#): "The law of Constantine the Great (321), by which the Christian Church was declared qualified to hold and transmit property, first gave a legal basis to the possessions of the Church of Rome. Subsequently the possessions were rapidly augmented by donations. Constantine himself set the example, the Lateran Palace being most probably presented by him. Constantine's gifts formed the historical nucleus, which the Sylvester Legend later surrounded with that network of myth, that gave rise to the forged document known as the "Donation of Constantine". The example of Constantine was followed by wealthy families of the Roman nobility, whose memory frequently survived, after the families themselves had become extinct, in the names of the properties which they had once presented to the Roman See. ..." (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14257a.htm>)

<sup>16</sup> How she can get from a meaning of "broken," which according to the title of the article she is quoting from means the "Fall of the Ottoman Empire" and is reinforced by Miller's position, who also saw it as the "dissolution of the Ottoman empire," to a sense of a "loss of independence," is a question begging an honest answer.

Christian nations. The event exactly fulfilled the prediction. (See Appendix).<sup>17</sup> When it became known, multitudes were convinced of the correctness of the principles of prophetic interpretation adopted by Miller and his associates, and a wonderful impetus was given to the Advent movement. Men of learning and position united with Miller, both in preaching and in publishing his views, and from 1840 to 1844 the work rapidly extended. (1950, pp.334-335)<sup>18</sup>

From Ellen White's perspective, the interpretation of this prophecy by Litch and Miller is a verifiable historical fact.

Haskell, writing in 1905, supported E. G. White's view:

In 1838 Josiah Litch and William Miller published an exposition on the ninth chapter of Revelation, in which it was predicted that the Ottoman Empire would fall in 1840. The exact fulfillment of this prophecy on August 11, 1840, when the Turkish government surrendered its independence, and has since been known as "the sick man of the East," was a startling proof to many that prophecy could be understood, and that men were living in the end of time. (1977, p.78)

Litch and those who supported his view saw the initial fulfillment of this prophetic event as the ending of the Turkish power. When this did not occur the story was changed so that it then become the ending of the independence of the Turkish power. And recently, when even that cannot be proved, the prophetic interpretation of Litch and also the endorsement of Ellen White for his interpretation has been abandoned altogether for another period altogether.

SDA historicists allege that August 11, 1840 was the fulfillment of a time prophecy promulgated by Miller and Litch, and later refined by Litch toward the end of

<sup>17</sup> The appendix note is the same as that for the comment on pp.334, 335.

<sup>18</sup> There was a discrepancy in some of these statements between the 1888 edition of GC and the 1911 edition. The following comes from <http://www.whiteestate.org/issues/GC-Prescott.html> :

1. "The statement is made that Josiah Litch, in interpreting the prophecy of Revelation 9, specified "not only the year but the very day on which" the Ottoman empire would fall. It appears from one of Litch's pamphlets which is preserved in the General Conference Library that he did not name the definite day until after the event, but simply claimed that the prophecy would be fulfilled "in August, 1840."

**Response:** Criticism considered, and a review of sources led to a change in the text.

**1888 book read:** "In the year 1840, another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest. Two years before, Josiah Litch, one of the leading ministers preaching the second advent, published an exposition of Revelation 9, predicting the fall of the Ottoman empire, and specifying not only the year but the very day on which this would take place. **According to the exposition, which was purely a matter of calculation on the prophetic periods of Scripture, the Turkish government would surrender its independence on the eleventh day of August, 1840. The prediction was widely published, and thousands watched the course of events with eager interest.**"

**1911 edition** changed to read: "In the year 1840, another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited wide-spread interest. Two years before, Josiah Litch, one of the leading ministers preaching the second advent, published an exposition of Revelation 9, predicting the fall of the Ottoman empire. **According to his calculations, this power was to be overthrown 'in A. D. 1840, sometime in the month of August;' and only a few days previous to its accomplishment he wrote: 'Allowing the first period, 150 years, to have been exactly fulfilled before Deacozes ascended the throne by permission of the Turks, and that the 391 years, fifteen days, commenced at the close of the first period, it will end on the 11th of August, 1840, when the Ottoman power in Constantinople may be expected to be broken. And this, I believe, will be found to be the case.'**"

2. At the bottom of the page, referring to the 11th day of August, 1840, it states: "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."

The history of this period shows that on that date the demand of the allied powers was placed in the hands of the Pasha of Egypt, this being some time after these powers had assumed the control of Turkey. The explanation as here given does not harmonize with that which is found in other books which we have published.

**Response:** Negative. No change made in the text.

the 1841. Some assert that Litch made the prediction before August 11, 1840, whereas others, like Prescott, assert that Litch did not name the date until early 1841, after the news had been clarified.

Litch asserted that the Ottoman empire would :

**come to its end:** Allowing the first period, 150 years, to have been exactly fulfilled before Deacozes ascended the throne by permission of the Turks, and that the 391 years, fifteen days, commenced at the close of the first period, it will end on the 11th of August, 1840, when the Ottoman power in Constantinople **may be expected to be broken**. And this, I believe, will be found to be the case.

After the event, when it was clear that the Ottoman Empire was not “broken,” it was modified to mean that it lost its “*independence*.” White, Haskell, Woosley, Smith took this position, as the standard historicist position. Haskell was still waiting in 1904 for Turkey to be overthrown and move its seat of power to Jerusalem.

J.N. Andrews , in his book, “*Three Messages of Revelation 14*” correctly states the belief of SDA historicists back then:

The prophetic period connected with the second woe terminated with the political power of the Ottoman Empire, Aug. 11, 1840....We firmly believe that this proclamation [of Rev14-FB] has been made, and that the preaching of the immediate advent of our Lord has been in fulfillment in this prophecy[Rev14-FB]. Prior to the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1840, [note: Andrews adheres to the belief that the *fall* of the Ottoman Empire occurred in 1840-FB] it had been shown by those who were preaching the immediate advent of Christ, that the hour, day, month, and year of Ottoman supremacy would expire on 11<sup>th</sup> of August, 1840. [Note how Andrews now turns the *fall* into a *loss of supremacy!*-FB] When the event verified the truthfulness of this calculation, the way was prepared for the advent message to go with mighty power. The prophecies were not only unsealed, but, in the providence of God, a demonstration of the truthfulness of the mode of calculation respecting the prophetic times was given to the world. (1970, pp.26.28)

Eric Anderson, author of a paper on Litch in Prof. R. Numbers’ book “*The Disappointed*,” documents this change of position by the SDA historicists and Loughborough in particular, without showing this change of position between 1840 and 1841. YOU SHOULD ILLUSTRATE THIS POINT BY QUOTE FROM ANDERSON HERE.

Lin takes a different view, and sees the refusal of the four Powers to explain their strategy, as the event marking the loss of independence by the Ottoman power.

**Ellen White:** “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.” (Ibid)

**Haskell:** “The ruler of Turkey agreed to abide by their decision and was only too glad to have his life saved by their intervention. He thereby voluntarily surrendered all rights into the hands of the combined forces of Western Europe.” (loc.cit)

**Woosley:** “As events transpired, that was the very date that the Ottoman sultan acquiesced to an arrangement whereby the powers of Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia decided affairs of state for him.”

**Smith:** “GET THIS FROM SMITH ONLINE.”

**David Lin:** “Assuming that one day should be added for every 162 years (approximately), then the July 27, 1299, date Litch used for the beginning of the fifth trumpet should be updated eight days, thus bringing the end of the sixth trumpet to August 19, 1840--eight days after the historic words "provision had been made" were announced to the Sultan of Turkey by the four imperial powers on August 11, 1840. **Inasmuch as *this incident* marked the loss of independent power by Turkey**, any political incident happening eight days later could only be a further advancement of

this crucial situation--bringing Turkey's dependence on foreign imperialism to greater maturity, thereby verifying Litch's prediction more clearly." David Lin is of the opinion that when the sultan was told not to bother himself with the decisions and plans for the forceful exit of the pasha's son's forces from Syria, that was the crucial signal for the loss of independence by the Ottoman Empire..."(see Appendix for full posting)

What is problematic in the SDA historicists positions on the sixth trumpet is that they cannot be verified. This applies, not only to the end of the period in 1840, but to both the beginning of the period in 1299 A.D. and the middle of the period, in 1449 A.D.

*For instance, in regard to the start of the 150-year period:*

1. The date 1299 A.D. cannot be verified historically;

*In regard to the end of the 150-year period and the beginning of the 391-year period in 1449AD.*

2. The absence of two credible events to mark the end of the 150-year period and the start of the 391-year period, both in the same year –1448;
3. The seeking the permission of the Turks by the Greek emperor for permission was not first done in 1449;
4. The independence of the Ottoman Empire was not surrendered in the London Treaty of July 1840; it was a coalition, as acknowledged by the wording of the Treaty;
5. The telling of the Sultan by the four ambassadors of the Powers of Europe, not to concern himself about how they were going to implement the Treaty was not a sign of the loss of Turkey's independence.
6. Turkey did not come to its end on August 11, 1840;
7. Turkey did not lose its independence on August 11, 1840. (Note: If Turkey lost its independence at the Treaty of London in 1840, which power did it lose its independence to – England? Austria? Russia? Germany?);
8. The signing of a treaty by an ambassador of a country did not make it binding on that country until it was ratified. Sometimes treaties were signed but later refused to be ratified by either the people or the government; The Treaty of London was not legal until the 17<sup>th</sup> September, 1840 when all powers ratified the treaty.
9. The Treaty of London was not delivered to Mehemet/ Muhammed Ali, Pasha of Egypt, in Alexandria, on August 11, 1840;
10. The Pasha of Egypt did not reject the conditions of the Treaty until August 15, 1840;
11. The Sultan of the Ottoman had sought the assistance of the major powers of Europe before 1840. This was not the first time the Sultan called for help from other European powers.
12. When there was a Treaty that intimated the loss of independence of Turkey's sovereignty, it was rejected out-of-hand by both the people and government of Turkey.
13. The later Treaties concerning the Pacification of the Levant and the regulation of the movement and access of shipping in the Black Sea and through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles were also conducted with Turkey in a coalition, and in recognition of the sovereign independence of each power, including Turkey.

These numerous points need to be looked at more fully, but we can summarise the main thrust of each of these points a little more. A complete examination of them is reserved to the appendix. THE EXAMINATION OF THESE POINTS SHOULD NOT

BE DELEGATED TO THE APPENDIX. IT SHOULD BE THE MAIN BODY OF ARGUMENT.

***Looking at these issues in more detail:***

**1. The date 1299 AD cannot be confirmed historically.**

Professor Prescott and W.A Spicer argued for this position during the 1919 Bible Conference:

W. W. PRESCOTT: No, the day July 27, 1299 is absolutely discredited. I had the original Greek history out of the Congressional Library for quite a while a long time, and went over the whole matter. It is a history in Greek with a parallel column translated into Latin, and accompanied by a chronological table, and the author put that event that Gibbon refers to as occurring in 1302. Von Hammer puts it in 1301. Someone else in 1300, I believe. From my standpoint it doesn't make any difference which it is, and there is no occasion to attempt to prove which it is, because just so long as we interpret the symbols as applying to the Saracens, we certainly must give the time to the Saracens and not to the Ottoman empire, and what was presented this morning was simply to show in a general way the beginning of the Ottoman power here at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. But the same authority said that from these small beginnings rose a power that was established in 1453. Now we don't date our interpretation of the prophecy of the Roman power from 754 BC, and yet Rome had its beginnings in 754. Now all I ask for is that he shall be consistent with ourselves so that when we stand up before an audience or appear in print we don't expose ourselves any longer to that shocking inconsistency of applying the symbols to two powers, and then turn right around and give the time that belongs right in that prophecy and date it five centuries at least after the power had ceased to be aggressive as a tormentory. (Ford, *Ibid*, pp.A-204-204)

....I will also enclose some material on the dates of the prophetic periods of Rev. 9. Some time ago, Professor Prescott and I went to the Library of Congress. He looked up the history of Pachymeris, translated into Latin by Possinus. It is from this book that Gibbon got his date, July 27, 1299. I looked up Von Hammer, who is the heaviest German author on Ottoman history, and *it is very clear that Gibbon made a distinct error*, which Von Hammer and others have corrected all these years. Gibbon's mistake is easily seen by looking at the book. He saw July 27 at the opening of chapter 25, and then over in the chronological tables given by Possinus he saw the date 1299 for the beginning of the events dealt with in this chapter. But he failed to note that the chapter *began* with July 27, it later went back and dealt with earlier events. These earlier events were the events of 1299. and it was not until 1301 or 1302, as various authorities compute the Mohammedan era, that the battle of July 27 took place. (Ford, *Ibid*)

**2. The absence of two credible events to mark the end of the 150-year period and the start of the 391-year period, both in the same year –1449, and both on the same day – July 27.**

The first devastating issue for the issue of the continuity of these two time periods in the sequence put forward by Miller was raised by Professor Prescott at the 1919 Bible Conference. Says Prescott:

Before 1844 in William Miller's lectures, he gives both symbols to the Ottoman power. He adds the periods together, makes 514 years and 15 days date from July 27, 1299, and follows it straight through. Now when you go further you say we will start from July 27, 1299, and we come to 1499 [sic]. What happened then? We must have something on a day. What happened July 27, 1449, that both marked the ending of one period and the beginning of another, because you must not begin the next day. That is, when we are trying to arrive at Aug. 11, 1840 you can't say this period ends July 27, 1449, and the next began July 28. You have got to make them lap one day or else you are thrown out when you get to the end. That question must be answered. What marked the close of the 150 years on July 27, 1449? What event on that day marked the beginning of the next period? What marked the close of the next period? Until that is

out of the way I don't see that we shall be helped very much by any papers to establish a date for something relating to the Ottoman Empire. (1919 Bible Conference)

Litch also made a comment on this topic:

The time during which they [the Turks] were to continue their conquests, was an hour, 15 days, a day, one year, a month, 30 years, and a year, 360 years, the whole amounting to 391 years, 15 days.

Allowing the first period, 150 years to have been exactly fulfilled before Deacozes ascended the throne by permission of the Turks, and that the 391 years 15 days commenced at the close of the first period, it will end in the 11<sup>th</sup> August, 1840, when the Ottoman power in Constantinople may be expected to be broken. And this I believe, will be found to be the case.

But still there is not *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 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 years variation for that calculation; we must wait patiently for the issue. (Litch, *ST*, Vol I, No.9, August 1, 1840, p.70)

### 3. The Seeking the permission of the Turks by the Greek Emperor for permission was not first done in 1449;

The second devastating thing about the event usually associated with the date 1449 – the requesting of permission to the Turkish sultan for the Greek heir to assume the Greek throne– is that it is not a point of historical note because the Greek emperor had been paying tax for many decades to the sultan just to remain on the throne. Says Gibbon:

After a siege of two months, Amurath was recalled to Bursa by a domestic revolt, which had been kindled by Greek treachery, and was soon extinguished by the death of a guiltless brother. While he led his Janizaries to new conquests in Europe and Asia, the Byzantine empire was indulged in a servile and precarious respite of thirty years. Manuel sank into the grave; *The emperor John Palaeologus II. A.D. 1425, July 21 - 1448, October 31.* and John Palaeologus was permitted to reign, for an annual tribute of three hundred thousand aspers, and the dereliction of almost all that he held beyond the suburbs of Constantinople.<sup>19</sup>

<http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/volume2/chap65.htm#Greek>

Being in a position of such servitude in 1425, we can hardly say that the requesting of permission to place a successor on the Ottoman throne is of great significance.<sup>20</sup> Having paid a tax for the privilege of reigning for twenty-three years, for every year John reigned both he, his family, his royal court, and the populace of the empire were reminded of their servitude to the Turks. It is of little moment then, that the successor of the sultan continues the same tradition of servitude as his predecessor.

Smith quotes Dr. Litch as concluding on this event in 1449:

"Let this historical fact be carefully examined in connection with the prediction [given] above. This was not a violent assault made on the Greeks, by which their empire was overthrown and their independence taken away, but simply a voluntary surrender of that independence into the hands of the Turks, by saying, 'I cannot reign

<sup>19</sup> An asper was current coinage, with one asper equal to 6 cents (U.S. in 1830). (300,000 aspers would then equal about \$18,750 USD p.a. (What would that be worth today in USD? And what it was worth in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.)

[http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/ncps:@field\(DOCID+@lit\(ABQ7578-0031-16\)](http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/r?ammem/ncps:@field(DOCID+@lit(ABQ7578-0031-16))

<sup>20</sup> "His brother Constantine, the lawful successor, would not venture to ascend the throne without the consent of the Turkish sultan. Ambassadors therefore went to Adrianople, received the approbation of the sultan, and returned with gifts for the new sovereign." (Smith, 1944, p.506)

unless you permit.' " [Smith footnotes: "Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, Vol. II, pp. 182, 183." ] (1944, p.507)

This statement shows how far from the facts Litch really was. He had not given the history of the period close attention. Either that, or his choice of material, and his neglect of other relevant material, was biased, selecting only those items of history that suited his theories. Of course, the Ottomans needed the permission of the sultan. The empire had been the Turk's servant for longer than the successor of John had been alive.<sup>21</sup>

Notice what Prescott wrote on this:

I notice that in the issue of the *Signs* for Nov.21 [year?], you have let loose the Turk--and some other things besides. I had known for some time that the date, August 11, 1840, would not stand examination. Two years ago we presented full information on this at the Fall Council, but nothing has been done and in the meantime our books and publications are repeating the old unwarranted statements ...<sup>22</sup>

If the Emperor John, who died in 1448, "never forgot that he was a vassal of the Ottoman Empire," how can we assert that the Byzantine Empire did not become subject to Turkey until 1449?

Yours faithfully,

W. W. Prescott

(Ford, 1980, pp.A-204, 205)

The third devastating issue for the date of 1449, was that the event, even though we have showed that it was not significant historically, occurred in 1448, not 1449.

Spicer says:

....Our folks have taught right along that John Palaeologus died, one would infer, July 27, 1449; but he didn't, he died in the previous year.

(Signed) W A. Spicer.

(Nov. 30, 1914)

(Ford, 1980, loc. cit)<sup>23</sup>

#### **4. The independence of the Ottoman Empire was not surrendered in the London Treaty of July,1840; it was a coalition, as acknowledged by the wording of the Treaty.**

The actual wording of the Treaty is specific. It is a coalition of the Four Powers coming to the assistance of Turkey after her request for help to put down the Pasha. The treaty, in Article II, refers to the Four Powers as "allies" of the Sultan, not masters:

Dans l'intervalle, le Sultan ayant invité ses **alliés** à se joindre à lui pour l'aider à interrompre la communication par mer entre l'Eypte at la Syrie

<sup>21</sup> How is it that *the very material* that shows the conclusions of these historicists to be incorrect, is present in *the very authority* they use to try and prove their point? This occurs so many times. Why do they not see it when they are doing their research? Do they think that we are not able of doing our own reading and checking the sources ourselves?

<sup>22</sup> This seems to indicate the 1917 GC Autumn Council.

<sup>23</sup> A copy of this text was also found in a net search in the Netherlands in a Benedictine monastery, called "Sint Willibrords Abij. The Bibliographical details are: (CBH XXVIII, 1.) GEORGII PACHYMERIS, *Historia Rerum a Michaele Palaeologo*. Ed. P. Possinus. Romae, 1666, and was found at <http://www.willibrords-abbey.nl/library/history.htm> It is priced at 52 Euro. Presumably that is for a photocopy of the microfiche.

In the same Article , it also says:

. Leurs dites Majestés promettent en outré, que les Commandans de leurs escadres, selon les moyens dont ils disposent, donneront, **au nom de l'Alliance**, tout l'appui et toute l'assistance en leur pouvoir à ceux sujets du Sultan qui manifesteront leur fidélité et obeissance à leur Souverain. ...(see full context in Appendix)

Furthermore, there is no hint of a compromise of the sovereign independence in the Treaty. On the contrary, the actual wording of the Treaty says the Four Powers were concerned to maintain and protect the sovereignty of the Sultan:

Sa Hautesse le Sultan ayant eu recours á Leurs Majestés La Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne at d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie at de Bohême, le Roi de Prusse, et l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, pour réclamer leur appui et leur assistance au milieu des difficultés dans lesquelles il se trouve placé par suite de la conduite hostile de Méhémet Ali, Pacha de l'Egypte, - **difficultés qui menacent de porter atteinte à l'intégrité de l'Empire Ottoman et à l'indépendance de Trône du Sultan**:-Leurs dites Majestés mûes par le sentiment d'amitié sinère qui subsiste entr' Elles et le Sultan; **animées du désir de veiller au maintien de l'intégrité et l'indépendance de l'Empire Ottoman**, dans l'intérêt de l'affermissement de la Paix de l'Europe; fidèles à l'engagement qu'Elles ont contracté par la Note Collective remise à la Porte par Leurs Représentants à Constantinople, le 27 Juillet 1839; et désirant de plus prévenir l'effusion de sang qu'occasionement la continuation des hostilités qui ont récement éclaté en Syrie entre les Autorités du Pacha d'Egypte et les sujets de Sa Hautesse;

Leurs dites Majestés et Sa Hautesse le Sultan ont résolu, dans le but susdit, de conclure entr'Elles une Convention....(See the full Treaty for the Pacification of the Levant, July 15, 1840, in the Appendix)

The purpose of the Treaty was to protect the independence of the Turkish throne, not compromise it. The Four Powers were “**animées du désir de veiller au maintien de l'intégrité et l'indépendance de l'Empire Ottoman.**” This wording puts paid to any notion regarding the diminution of the sovereign independence of Turkey. And further, in the Protocol of 17<sup>th</sup> September 1840, with the hostilities about to commence, and the subsequent taking of territory back from the Pasha of Egypt, the Four Powers agree among themselves they would not take advantage of any gain (whether territory, exclusive influence, or commercial advantage) that the other powers could not also equally gain:

Les Plénipotentiaires des Cours de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, et de Russie, après avoir échangé les ratifications de la Convention conclue le 15 Juillet dernier, ont résolu, dans le but de placer dans son vrai jour le désintéressement qui a guidé leurs Cours dans la conclusion de cet Acte, de déclarer formellement:

Que dans l'exécution des engagements résultant de la susdite Convention pour les Puissances Contractants, ces Puissances ne chercheront aucune augmentation de territoire, aucune influence exclusive, aucun avantage de commerce pour leurs sujets, que ceux de toute autre nation ne puissent également obtenir.

Given that this was an unnatural alliance between East and Western European Powers (with the omission of France), this clause effectively meant that there would be no gain for *any* of the Powers in this conflict.

Another important consideration in this matter is the dating of the London Conference. If, according to SDA historicists, the loss of independence is signalled by the Sultan's surrendering the decision about the evacuation of Muhammed Ali's son from Syria to the Four Powers, then that loss of independence must be dated from the time that the London Accord was *ratified*, rather than when it is delivered to the pasha of Egypt. The important thing, in this scenario, is *not* when the pasha gets the

ultimatum, or any other action of the powers. The important action, according to SDA historicist's logic, is when the independence was surrendered. That is an action *by the sultan towards the powers of Europe*, not an action of *the pasha of Egypt*. And that action of the sultan must be the one on the 17<sup>th</sup> September, when the sultan ratified the Treaty of London. This is the sultan's ratification for the later actions of the powers.

The principle this point wants to promulgate is that when a power goes to other foreign powers for assistance in a situation, the very request for assistance is indicative of its loss of independence. That is to say, any alliance, made through treaty, is an act of surrendering independence. This is of course, not correct, but that is what is being offered. For example, what occurred in the Treaty of London, occurred early in the history of the Ottoman empire, when the Byzantine emperor sought assistance from the Persians against the Turks:

The victories around Nicaea made Osman famous, and thousands of immigrant Turkish households flocked to his standard. As a result the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus became so concerned by the Ottoman threat that he sought alliances. A deal was struck with the Persian Ilkhan Oljeitu, to whom the emperor offered his sister in marriage.

<http://www.ottomanonline.net/history/1.html>

Does this incident mean that the Greek Roman emperor had surrendered his independence, in seeking the assistance of the Persian Empire? Was the Greek Roman Empire now subservient to the Persian Empire? What Emperor Andronicus did has been done since time immemorial as a defensive move against the actions of an impending aggressor.

##### **5. The telling of the Sultan not to concern himself about how the Four Powers were going to implement the Treaty was not a sign of the loss of independence.**

This is a desperated grab at some event on August 11, 1840 to provide a marker to end the 391-year period on time. (This ignores the fact that the beginning of the 391-year period is hopelessly flawed as well.)

Says Smith:

The correspondent of the London *Morning Chronicle*, in a communication dated "Constantinople, August 12, 1840," says:

"I can add but little to my last letter on the subject of the plans of the Four Powers; and I believe that the details I then gave you compose everything that is yet decided on. The portion of the Pacha, as I then stated, is not to extend beyond the line of Acre, and does not include either Arabia or Candia. Egypt alone is to be hereditary in his family, and the province of Acre to be considered as a pachalik, to be governed by his son during his lifetime, but afterwards to depend on the will of the Porte; and even this latter is only to be granted to him on the condition of his accepting these terms and delivering up the Ottoman fleet within the period of ten days. In the event of his not doing so, this pachalik is to be cut off. Egypt alone is then to be offered, with another ten days for him to deliberate on it before actual force be employed against him. The manner, however, of applying the force, should he refuse to comply with these terms--whether a simple blockade is to be established on the coast, or whether his capital is to be bombarded and his armies attacked in the Syrians provinces--is the point which still remains to be learned; *nor does a note delivered yesterday by the four ambassadors, in answer to a question put to them by the Porte, as to the plan to be adopted in such an event, throw the least light on this subject. It simply states that provision had been made, and there was no necessity for the Divan alarming itself about any contingency that might afterward arise.*"<sup>24</sup>

Let us analyze the foregoing quotations:

<sup>24</sup> Smith footnotes: "*Ibid.*, September 3, 1840."

*First.*--The ultimatum reached Alexandria on August 11, 1840.

*Second.*--The letter of the correspondent of the *London Morning Chronicle* is dated August 12, 1840.

*Third.*--The correspondent states that the question of the Sublime Porte was put to the representatives of the four great powers, and the answer received "*yesterday*." So in his own capital, "*yesterday*" the Sublime Porte applied to the ambassadors of the four Christian powers of Europe as to what measures had been taken in reference to a circumstance vitally affecting his empire; and was told that "*provision had been made*," but he could not know what it was; and that he need not give himself any alarm "about any contingency which might arise"! From that day, "*yesterday*," which was *August 11, 1840*--they, the four Christian powers of Europe, and not he, would manage that.

On August 11, 1840, the period of three hundred ninety-one years and fifteen days, allotted to the continuance of the Ottoman power, ended; and *where was the sultan's independence?*--GONE! Who had the supremacy of the Ottoman empire in their hands?--The *four great powers*; and that empire has existed ever since only by the *sufferance* of these Christian powers. Thus was the prophecy fulfilled to the very letter.

From the first publication of the calculation of this matter in 1838, before referred to, the time set for the fulfillment of the prophecy was watched by thousands with intense interest. The exact accomplishment of the event predicted, showing, as it did, the right application of the prophecy, gave a mighty impetus to the great advent movement then beginning to attract the attention of the world. (U. Smith, 1944, pp.515-517)

.From Woolsey:

Later he [Litch] settled on August 11, as the exact date. As events transpired, that was the very date that the Ottoman sultan acquiesced to an arrangement whereby the powers of Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia decided affairs of state for him. (R. Woolsey, 2001, p.74f)

Says Nichol:

It was about this time that Litch announced that he anticipated the Turkish power to come to an end on August 11. On that day the Turkish emissary, Rifat Bey, arrived at Alexandria, with the terms of the London Convention. On that day also the ambassadors of the four powers received a communication from the sultan inquiring as to what measures were to be taken in reference to a circumstance vitally affecting his empire. He was told that "provision had been made," but he could not know what it was. Litch interpreted these events as a recognition by the Turkish government that its independent power was gone. (Nicole, 1957, p.796)

Are we to follow Smith's lead and trust to sensationalist journalism to decide that the independence of Turkey had disappeared? Would it not be far more valuable, in evaluating the event historically, to trust to official government documents and actions, rather than an article of a journalist? Is it not the position of the British documents and the treaties made after that date that the major European powers still considered Turkey an independent power with whom they could contract treaties?

If the journalist of the *London Morning Chronicle* had taken the time to examine the articles in the treaty, he would have seen in Article I and II, the understanding that the Powers were going to act according to their own planning and resources:

Art.I. Sa Hautesse le Sultan s'étant entendu avec Leurs Majestés le Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohème, le Roi de Prusse, et l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, sur les conditions de l'arrangement qu'il est de l'intention de Sa Hautesse d'accorder à Méhémet Ali, - conditions lesquelles se trouvent spécifiées dans l'Acte Séparé ci-annexé, - **Leurs Majestés s'engagent à agir un parfait accord, et d'unir leurs efforts pour déterminer Méhémet Ali à se conformer à cet arrangement; chacune**

**des Hautes Parties Contractantes se réservant de co-opérer à ce but selon les moyens d'action dont chacune d'elles peut disposer.**

II. Si le Pacha d'Egypte refusait d'adhérer au susdit arrangement qui lui sera communiqué par le Sultan avec le concours de Leurs dites Majestés, **celles-ci s'engagent à prendre, à la réquisition du Sultan, des mesures concertées et arrêtées entr' Elles, afin de mettre cet arrangement à execution.** Dans l'intervalle, le Sultan ayant invité ses alliés à se joindre à lui pour l'aider à interrompre la communication par mer entre l'Egypte et la Syrie, et à empêcher l'expédition de troupes, chevaux armes, munitions, et approvisionnements du guerre de tout genre d'une de ces provinces à l'autre; Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, et l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, s'engagent à donner immédiatement à cet effet les ordres nécessaires aux Commandans de leurs forces navales dans la Méditerranée. Leurs dites Majestés promettent en outre, que les Commandans de leurs escadres, **selon les moyens dont ils disposent**, donneront, au nom de l'Alliance, tout l'appui et toute l'assistance en leur pouvoir à ceux sujets du Sultan qui manifesteront leur fidélité et obéissance à leur Souverain.

What is simplistic here in the reasoning of Smith is that it ignores the dynamics going on between the Four Powers – a complicated diplomatic intrigue that continued for decades. These issues were beyond the issues of the Levant, and not anything the Sultan could contribute towards. In many ways, his country lay at the centre of the struggle between these empires, and the correct manoeuvring over the issue of the Levant was hypercritical to the maintenance of peace in Eastern Europe. The ignoring of the broader perspective by SDA historicists dulls their historical comments and places them in a position of embarrassment, in making such silly comments as those of Smith above.

This is acknowledged in the “Protol Réserve” of the Treaty. It refers to the ramifications of the pacification to the power play going on between the major players, who were signatories to this treaty:

Les Plénipotentiaires des Cours de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, de Russie, et de la Sublime Porte Ottomane, ayant, en vertu de leurs pleins pouvoirs, conclu et signé en ce jour une Convention entre leurs Souverains respectifs, pour la pacification du Levant;

Considérant que, vû la distance qui sépare les capitales de leurs Cours respectives, un certain espace du temps devra s'écouler nécessairement avant que l'échange des Ratifications de la dite Convention puisse s'effectuer, et que les ordres fondés sur cet Acte puissent être mis à execution;

Et les dits Plénipotentiaires étant profondément pénétrés de la conviction, que vû l'état actuel des choses in Syrie, des intérêts d'humanité, aussi bien que les graves considérations de politique Européenne qui consistent l'objet de la sollicitude commune des Puissances signataires de la Convention de ce jour, réclamant impérieusement d'éviter, autant que possible, tout retard dans l'accomplissement de la pacification que la dite transaction est destinée à atteindre.

Les dits Plénipotentiaires, en vertu de leurs pleins pouvoirs, sont convenus entr'eux que les mesures préliminaires mentionnées à l'Article II de la dite Convention, seront mises à execution tout de suite, sans attendre l'échange des ratifications; les Plénipotentiaires respectifs constatent formellement par le présent Acte l'assentiment de leurs Cours à l'exécution immédiate de ces mesures.

Clearly the issues behind the pacification of the Levant were greater in the minds of the Powers than just the issue between the Pasha and the Sultan. Litch understood this. He acknowledged as much in his writings in the *Signs of the Times* in 1840. He says:

The news from the old world are very important. Things are fast tending to a general conflict between the nations of Europe and Asia. Turkey is the bone of

contention. *Constantinople* is the point of attack, and defence. Russia wants Constantinople; but England is unwilling she should possess it, lest Nicholas should intervene with her East India possessions. The safety and peace of Austria, and Prussia are connected with the integrity of the Porte and therefore, they have united with England and Russia, in a treaty for its support. France, in the mean time, stands aloof from the *four powers*, and is giving her support to MEHEMET ALI, in his claims upon Syria and Egypt for a hereditary possession....The moment that the four powers attempt to coerce the Pacha of Egypt to accept their terms, that moment all Europe will be in arms. (Litch, *ST*, Vol I, No.13, October 1, 1840, p.101)

Litch was not ignorant to the complexity of diplomatic relations in the affair, and the simplistic comment that the unwillingness of the four powers to admit the sultan into the intrigues between the Four Powers shows an utter misunderstanding of the dynamics between these “friendly” rivals.

Litch learnt his lesson and later had the good sense to change his opinion on the matter and the interpretation of the time periods in the fifth and sixth trumpets altogether. The same thing cannot be said for the SDA historicists. Being misled by the authority of Ellen White who endorsed Litch’s 1841 interpretation of the events in 1840, they were not prepared to look closely at the matter, even though leaders in the church were advised by their own teaching authorities like Dr Benson, and Prof. Prescott and W. A. Spicer, who argued that the traditional SDA historicist position could not be sustained.

#### **6. Turkey did not come to its end in 1840.**

This is self-evident, much to the disappointment of those who believed Litch’s prophecy. The version given in Ellen White’s *Great Controversy* is that the issue Litch focused on was the *loss of sovereign independence* by Turkey. Litch said in 1840 that the prophecy foretold the end of the Ottoman Empire. “He argued that ‘the Ottoman power in Constantinople may be expected to be broken’ on the eleventh day of August, 1840.” (Anderson, 1993, p.84)

Miller had the same view. A Rev. Mr Cook, in correspondence to the *Signs of the Times*, confirms that Miller was expecting the demise of the Ottoman Empire, not the loss of its independence:

Mr. Miller in his Bible 8<sup>th</sup> lectures, makes the following remarks – “And whoever lives until the year 1839\* [Himes footnotes: “Gibbon fixes on the rise of the Turkish empire 1299 which is the correct date; its fall therefore would be 1840. Ed.”] will see the final dissolution of the Turkish empire, for then the sixth trumpet will have finished its sounding; which, if I am correct, will be the final overthrow of the Ottoman power. And then will the seventh trump and last wo begin, under which the kingdoms of the earth and the anti-christian beast will be destroyed, the powers of darkness chained, the world cleansed, and the church purified.”

(*ST*, Vol I, No.15, November 1, 1840, p.117)

Clearly, Miller saw the event in 1840 as the “final dissolution of the Turkish empire.” Why does not Ellen White refer to Miller’s position? She appears to be well-informed of the other positions of Miller’s.

This version was later modified to mean the loss of independence, and even that was not correct. Ellen White seems to have followed the version of events given by Loughborough in *The Great Second Advent Movement*. She is in error. Even Haskell was expecting at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the end of the Ottoman Empire, as expected way back in the 1840s. Anderson has illuminated sufficiently in his paper that the retelling of the history of these events among the advent movement in 1840 was molded by later SDA writers to try and save face,. Ellen White’s version does the same; hers is not a historical presentation, but a remoulded version.

### 7. If Turkey lost its sovereign independence at the Treaty of London, which power did it lose its independence to – England? Austria? Russia? Germany?

According to Smith, Turkey surrendered her sovereign independence to all Four Powers:

On August 11, 1840, the period of three hundred ninety-one years and fifteen days, allotted to the continuance of the Ottoman power, ended; and *where was the sultan's independence?*--GONE! Who had the supremacy of the Ottoman empire in their hands?--The *four great powers*; and that empire has existed ever since only by the *sufferance* of these Christian powers. Thus was the prophecy fulfilled to the very letter. (Smith, loc.cit)

As soon as this question is asked, the nonsensical nature of this statement by SDA historicists becomes apparent. Which power is Turkey now subject to? If it is not independent, then Turkey is subservient to another power. But which one? The treaties of these powers (including France which was not a party to the Treaty of London), made in later years, had so many combinations of one power in alignment with another power for one incident, and then another combination in the next treaty that to say Turkey was subservient to them all really meant it was subservient to none of them. Since the arrangement between the Four Powers in the Treaty of London was an “alliance,” either they all had control of Turkey or none of them did. There is however, no provision in the Articles of the Treaty explaining how this joint management of Turkey was to be carried out by the Four Powers. Surely if this was the case, and Turkey did surrender its independence to these Four Powers, they would have understood the actions, as well as the implications of it, and would have been jealous enough to ensure that none of the other parties in the Treaty would have got a better part of the deal than they. Considering the Reserve Protocol and the other addenda to the Treaty of London (see Appendix), one would expect an addendum item discussing this arrangement for the joint ownership of Turkey. But there is none. Clearly then, in the minds of those nations who were signatories to the treaty, the sovereign independence of Turkey was *not* an issue.

To highlight the stupidity of Smith’s logic even further, attention needs to be drawn to one of the signed protocols of 1840, concerning the advantages the Four Powers may get out of their intervention in the Levant:

...ces Puissances ne chercheront aucune augmentation de territoire, aucune influence exclusive, aucun avantage de commerce pour leurs sujets, que ceux de toute autre nation ne puissent également obtenir.

If Turkey lost its independence to the Four Powers collectively, then surely this would be covered by this reserve protocol, and we would expect to have seen a carving up of Turkish interests, with an associated treaty or protocol explaining this dividing of Turkey, or even another protocol written perhaps as a separate Treaty explaining the Joint Ownership of Turkey by the Four Powers in the event of them deciding not to carve up Turkey. But nothing of the sort exists.

If Turkey lost its independence in 1840, how can we explain the action of sovereign states making treaties with Turkey *after* that date, if Turkey was no longer a sovereign entity? For example, the Treaty between Turkey and Denmark in 1841 on trading matters,? Why did Denmark sign this treaty with Turkey at all, when, according to SDA historicists, Turkey was no longer a sovereign state, making her ineligible to sign treaties? Why did not Denmark make a treaty concerning trade with Turkey with the Four Powers? Then we must consider all the other treaties made between the five Powers and Turkey regarding the Bosphorus and the Black Sea made in later years well into the 1870s.

The countries of France, Britain, Russia, Prussia and Austria recognized the sovereignty of Turkey in 1841 when they made the Convention respecting the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, and signed at Paris, 13 July, 1841. This is after August 11, 1840, and negates any efforts of SDA historicists to establish the subservience of Turkey the previous year. And what about the Treaty of 1856, made between the Five Powers (France included) and Turkey? Surely these powers should have made a treaty only with the sovereign nations involved, which would have ruled out Turkey, if it were no longer a sovereign state.

There were earlier incidents when treaties made by Turkey with other powers had more relevant issues to Turkey's sovereign independence. How about Russia's and Austria's legal right to intervene in Ottoman affairs, on behalf of the sultan's Christian subject in the 18<sup>th</sup> century? (Encycl.Brit. [Ibid](#) ). They were able to intervene in Turkish domestic affairs to try and establish some modicum of human rights for the Christians in the Turkish realm.

Again, with the treaty between the Ottoman Empire and Russia in 1839. Surely this treaty augurs well for the loss of independence since Russia could interfere with domestic affairs in Turkey? When Ibrahim, son of Mehemet Ali, invaded Syria and was moving towards Constantinople in 1839, the Russian interposed a naval fleet and an army in the Bosphorus as a part of their agreement with the Ottoman Empire under the Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi, signed on July 8, 1833. This treaty of Turkey with Russia predates the Treaty of London, and therefore must negate any validity in the historicist's argument regarding the independence of the Ottoman Empire at the Treaty of London. If SDA historicists wish to persistently hold to the assertion that treaties for assistance constitute a loss of independence, then we would have to take this treaty of 1833, or even earlier ones made by Turkey, as the point for the loss of its sovereign independence.

All these assertions by Smith, perpetuated by later SDA church editors who revised the book after Smith's decease, are erroneous fabrications, designed to dupe a willing audience. Another word that comes to mind are "lies." It has taken 60 years since the 1919 Bible Conference for another author to question Litch's position (ie., Spangler in 1980) in official SDA Church literature, and 120 years since Litch published his alternate position, discrediting his earlier position entirely. And this, on such a minor point of interpretation!!!

**8. The signing of a treaty by an ambassador of a country did not make it binding on that country until it was ratified. Sometimes treaties were signed but later refused to be ratified by either the people or the government. The Treaty of London was not legal until the 17<sup>th</sup> September, 1840 when all powers ratified the treaty.**

Unless otherwise stated, agreements between powers were not legally binding in international law and convention until they were ratified. This is still common practise. The fact that Litch tries to use some other means as an indicator of a legally important point is just either just wishful thinking, sheer ignorance of international convention regarding treaties, or worse, it was the disregard of these matters in favour of some event that corresponded with his theories. Notice these explanations from the University of New South Wales Law Library on International Treaties. The UNSW guidelines for treaty negotiations comes from the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969:

"A treaty is a written agreement between States which is governed by international law.

A treaty may also be concluded by States and international organizations. The *Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969*, sets out the rules for the negotiation of treaties between States.

A treaty may also be known as a "convention", "protocol", "covenant" or "exchange of letters".

**"Signatories**

“A nation State, that is, an independent sovereign nation, will express its consent to be bound by the terms of a treaty by signing it. The authority to sign is usually vested in the diplomats assigned to negotiate the treaty's terms. In most cases the treaty is not binding until it is ratified.

**“Ratification**

“Once the treaty has been signed, the Heads of State or the governments of the signatory countries then 'confirm' that the country agrees to be bound by the provisions of the treaty. This procedure is known as ratification. In Australia, treaties are tabled in both Houses of Parliament for at least 15 sitting days before the Government takes action to bring the treaty into force.

“The terms of a treaty will usually stipulate if ratification is necessary and this procedure is implemented for multilateral treaties (treaties to which there are more than two parties). However, in the case of bilateral treaties (treaties between two parties), ratification rarely occurs as it is viewed as an onerous task and a signature is usually viewed as sufficient. The ratification of a bilateral treaty usually occurs only if one of the parties insists on it. (<http://info.library.unsw.edu.au/law/guides/intlaw.html> )

This protocol was the method of diplomacy even in the eighteenth century in the incident under review here. This explanation of treaty protocol clearly shows that the mere signing of a treaty is not binding on a nation if ratifications are explained in the treaty, as was the case in the London Treaty for the Pacification of the Levant in 1840. And the treaty was not ratified until September 17, 1840, an embarrassing date for Litch's theory, and Ellen White's credibility.

**9. The London Accord was not delivered to Mehemet/ Muhammed Ali, Pasha of Egypt, in Alexandria, on August 11, 1840.**

The 1919 Bible Conference has this comment from W.A. Spicer:

Well then, about this time Professor Benson, who is not with us here, formerly of Union College, came on with Blue Books that he had received from London, showing conclusively that *the ultimatum of the Powers was not delivered to the Pasha of Egypt on Aug. 11, 1840*. Then we began to look the thing up a bit, and presented some of these features to the recent council. You may well understand that the brethren had to sit up and take notice (Letter W.W. Spicer to L.R. Conradi, November 30, 1914, in Ford, 1980, pp.A-204-205)

Litch admits in his letter to Mr. Himes, that the ultimatum coming from the Treaty of London, did not reach the Pasha until the 15<sup>th</sup> August. Published in the *Signs of the Times*, he says:

The world have, since the 11th of August, had a strong disposition to triumph, as though they were past all danger, and could give full scope to their opposition to the doctrine Christ's near approach. But what will they say now? The calculation on the prophetic periods of Revelation, 9th chapter, were, that they would end August 11th, and that up to that period the Ottoman power would stand; but that that time would seal its doom.

Now what are the facts? Why, that on the 15th of August, the Sultan, by his ambassador, presented to the Pacha of Egypt the ultimatum of the four powers. He replied by an oath of God, or in other words, in the name of God, he signed the death warrant of the Ottoman Power.

"An OATH BY GOD I will not give up one foot of the land I possess, and if the powers make war upon me, I will turn the empire upside, down, and be buried in its ruins:"

MEHEMET ALI. ([Litch](#), *ST*, Vol. I, No.15, pp.117-118)

Smith realized this and so rather than acknowledging the discrepancy of four days, as Litch and Himes are prepared to do, he changes tack and seeks to use the event in the Porte between the ambassadors there and the Sultan's inquiry as the event that marks the end of the prophetic time period. And this gross error was left in later editions of the book by SDA editors.

**10. The Pasha of Egypt did not reject the conditions of the Treaty until August 15, 1840;**

Smith wants us to date the end of the Ottoman independence until the Pasha had rejected the ultimatum of the Four Powers:

I have not been able to verify these facts myself but Eric Anderson, in his paper in the book *The Disappointed*, indicates that the Pasha, Mehemet Ali, did not indicate his rejection of the ultimatum in the Treaty of London until August 15, 1840. YOU WILL FIND THIS IN THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES ONLINE AT GCARCHIVES. LITCH ADMITS IT AS WELL IN PRINT. Litch took this as the prophetically significant event that marked the end of the 391-year period of the sixth trumpet:

The Great Powers of Europe had tried to end the conflict between the Sultan of Turkey and his rebellious vassal, Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt. On August 15, 1840, Litch noted with great interest, Mehemet Ali had rejected the four European Powers' ultimatum, thus assuring war – and the doom of the Ottoman empire. “It is a very striking fulfillment of the calculation; for that decision was but four days after the 11<sup>th</sup> August, the period fixed for the termination of the prophecy. The like singular accuracy in the fulfillment of a prophetic period cannot be found in history. Will men lay it to heart?” (An editorial note explained explained that the fulfillment could not have been more precise, since four days were only 16 prophetic minutes!) [Anderson footnotes: “*Signs of the Times*, November 1, 1840, pp.117-118. Litch later recalled: ‘As the spring opened, and the summer came, the entire community were excited, and expectation on tiptoe, in reference to the 11<sup>th</sup> of August and its anticipated events, the fall of the Ottoman empire, &c, &c. Many were the predictions that when the day should have passed by, as it certainly would do, without the event being realized, that then the spell would be broken, and Adventism would die.’ ‘Rise and Progress,’ p.59.”] (Anderson, 1993, p.85)

**11. The Sultan of the Ottoman had sought the assistance of the major powers of Europe before 1840. This action, performed by the sultan in July, 1840, which we are told, signalled the end of his supremacy *had been done by him before*. This was not the first time the Sultan called for help from other powers. A convenient oversight by SDA historicists in perpetuating their errors.**

Some of these occasions include the following:

- Selim III, in 1806-7 sought French assistance to regain territory lost to Russia. They also assisted against the English endeavour to seize the Dardenelles. The French also helped against the British attempt in 1807 to invade Egypt. Encycl. Brit. “Ottoman Empire, Turkey, History of.”
- In 1825-27, Egyptian help was sought to put down an uprising in the Peloponnesus against the Russian, French and British forces backing the Greek revolt;
- In 1833, (after the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-1829), the sultan seeking Russian aid, against Muhammed Ali, July 8, 1833, signed the Treaty of Hünkâr İskelesi, (Unkiar Skelessi) with Russia for both Russia and the Ottoman Empire to provide mutual assistance in case they were attacked by a hostile power.

This implies either two choices are open to the SDA historicist:

1. Either the dating of the loss of his independence must be done earlier than 1840 or;
2. The seeking of the assistance of the major European powers to help an international situation, is *not* a signal of the loss of independence.

As the reader can see, either option confounds the traditional SDA historicist's interpretation.

**12. When there was a Treaty that intimated the loss of independence of Turkey's sovereignty, it was rejected out-of-hand by both the people and government of Turkey.**

The classic example of this comes from the complex negotiations of the Crimean War. The following comments on Treaty negotiations to try and prevent hostilities comes from the *New Cambridge Modern History*. It discusses the radical propositions in Russian ambassador Menshikov's draft treaty or convention, and its threat on the sovereign independence to Turkey:

There was little likelihood of any friendship from the side of the Turks. They regarded Menshikov's draft treaty or convention as incompatible with their sovereign independence and tantamount to recognising Russia as arbiter in all matters relating to the Orthodox in Turkey, a view strongly supported by Stratford de Redcliffe and de Lacour and later shared by Claredon and Drouyn de Lhuys. Although Menshikov greatly modified his original terms, deferred his departure and in the end proposed a note from the sultan to the emperor instead of a treaty or convention, he failed to obtain anything...Menshikov's brighter hopes were shattered when a Grand Council decided overwhelmingly to reject the Russian requirements (17 May). The final Turkish reply of 20 May referred only to the spiritual immunities and not in the binding form required. In consequence, Menshikov left Constantinople on 21 May and diplomatic relations were broken off. (p.473)

Both in London and Paris suspicions of Russian's intentions, already aroused by her military and naval measures, were deepened when only a part of Menshikov's instructions, and that the least important, was communicated to them. They concluded that the Turkish interpretation of Menshikov's demands was justified. Further, a Russian armed counterstroke, probably in the shape of an occupation of the Principalities, seemed imminent.

...Menshikov's brighter hopes were shattered when **a Grand Council decided overwhelmingly to reject the Russian requirements** (17 May). The final Turkish reply of 20 May referred only to the spiritual immunities and not in the binding form required. In consequence, Menshikov left Constantinople on 21 May and diplomatic relations were broken off. (p.473) (Bury, 1964, pp.472-478, emphasis mine)<sup>25</sup>

This simple example shows that if either people of the Ottoman Empire or the sultan had seen any waiver of their sovereign independence in the signing of the Treaty of London in 1840, they would have made the same outcry at they made in the times before the Crimean War. From both the perspective of the people of Turkey and the sultan, there was no loss of independence in the signing of the Treaty of London in July 1840. Litch and consequently, Ellen White, were both wrong. Litch was prepared to change his view. Modern writers either just ignore the issue of Ellen White's erroneous endorsement like Spangler has done, or like Olson has done, attempted to explain it away, as though Ellen White was not giving an exegesis of the time periods in the trumpets, without success.

<sup>25</sup> An important point to note here as far as Litch's reasoning goes, is if the Turkish, Britain and France justifiably saw that Menshikov's draft treaty or convention threatened the sovereign independence of the Turkish throne, then Turkey must have had, in the thinking of these powers, even at this time, sovereign independence still, contrary to what Ellen White endorsed in the assertions of Litch.

**13. The later Treaties concerning the Pacification of the Levant and the regulation of the movement and access of shipping in the Black Sea and through the Bosphorus and the Dardenelles were also conducted with Turkey in a coalition, and in recognition of the sovereign independence of each power, including Turkey.**

This is clear evidence that the powers of Europe still regarded the Turkish power as a sovereign independent power in 1856, and that Litch's position was incorrect. By inference Loughborough's explanation of the history and Ellen White's confirmation of Litch's position are also both erroneous.

**Conclusion:**

The validity of the date 1840 depends on a chain of dates and the accuracy of details related to each of these dates. It depends on the dates 1299; 1449 as the end of the 150-year period *and* the start of the 391-year period. It also depends on false historical reasoning, and the fabrication of historical moments of significance where there are none, and the avoidance of those historical moments of significance when it provides evidence contrary to SDA historicists' prophetic interpretation.

From the foregoing evidence, it is clear why contemporary SDA historicists avoid supporting the traditional interpretation of the periods in the fifth and sixth trumpet altogether, and look to an alternative interpretation, as evidenced in the contributions of Spalding and Maxwell. Their efforts of course, fly in the face of Ellen White's endorsement of Litch's erroneous position.

It also depends on ignoring a multiplicity of historical facts and events occurring before 1840 relating to international relations of the Ottoman Empire.

Noting again the words of Andrews,

When the event verified the truthfulness of this calculation, the way was prepared for the advent message to go with mighty power. The prophecies were not only unsealed, but, in the providence of God, a demonstration of the truthfulness of the mode of calculation respecting the prophetic times was given to the world. (1970, pp.26.28)

And one must ask now, if God gave a demonstration of the calculation involved in the events related to Turkey in 1840 as proposedly covered by prophecy, what conclusion can an enlightened mind come to other than His demonstration that the historicists' principle is not light but confusion, and a principle to be shunned; as not holding the truth of the matter on Biblical prophecy. Even SDA historicists are turning the time prophecy of the second woe into a different prophecy terminating at 1844 instead of 1840, because they can see that this "demonstration of the mode of calculating respecting the prophetic times" divinely sent to ratify the historicists' position on the second woe, has left them with nothing but egg on their faces.

Arasola comment on the failure of this prediction. Says Arasola:

A perusal of Millerite material shows that neither interpretation matches fully with the facts. The lack of dramatic events at the expected time prevented Miller's and Litch's idea from growing into a spectacular advertisement for Millerite exegesis, neither can the slightly hesitant enthusiasm, with which the "fulfillment" was pronounced, be designated a disappointment. The Millerites did not realize that the events failed to measure up to their assumptions. (1989, p. 139)

Recent writers on the book of Revelation avoid the topic entirely. For example, Paulien says:

The locust, moreover, sting like scorpions though their bite is not deadly (Rev.9:5). In spite of everything, the church will survive the plague. According to this prophecy, the church's torment will not exceed five months (5 x 30 days), that is, 150

year (according to prophetic rules of one day equaling one year). Such a disaster is without precedent in the history of the church. The French Revolution even dares to imprison the pope (1798). The church would recover on in the period after World War II, thanks to the ratification of the Lateran Treaty (1929).....(2002, p.86)

As can be seen here, although Paulien defines the historicist's interpretation of the time period to appease his historicist employers, no commitment is given as to what the time period is applied. Of course, he refers to a "disaster...without precedent" but then he fails to elucidate any further. Was he unprepared to compromise his reputation as a scholar by attempting to explicate this 'unprecedented disaster' in a manner that his historicist readers would expect?

### **October 22, 1844 AD "The hour of his judgment is come."**

There are two aspects of this important date in SDA chronography: firstly, the validity of the year chosen; and secondly, the actual day chosen by Samuel Snow as the Day of Atonement for that year.

#### **First Question: Is 1844 A.D. for either the second coming of Jesus or the beginning of the Investigative Judgment a verifiable historical fact?**

Ellen White's Position:

A great religious awakening under the proclamation of Christ's soon coming is foretold in the prophecy of the first angel's message of Revelation 14....The message itself sheds light as to the time when this movement is to take place...it announces the opening of the judgment...since 1798 the book of Daniel has been unsealed, knowledge of the prophecies has increased, and many have proclaimed the solemn message of the judgment near.

The testimony of the prophecies which seemed to point to the coming of Christ in the spring of 1844 took deep hold of the minds of the people...The tenth day of the seventh month, the great Day of Atonement, the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, which in the year 1844 fell on the twenty-second of October, was regarded as the time of the Lord's coming. This was in harmony with the proofs already presented that the 2300 days would terminate in the autumn, and the conclusion seemed irresistible...those who followed in the light of the prophetic word saw that, instead of coming to the earth at the termination of the 2300 days in 1844, Christ then entered the most holy place of the heavenly sanctuary to perform the closing work of atonement preparatory to His coming...Christ had come, not to the earth, as they expected, but, as foreshadowed in the type, to the most holy place of the temple of God in heaven.

This work of examination of character, of determining who are prepared for the kingdom of God, is that of the investigative judgment, the closing work in the sanctuary above...While the investigative judgment is going forward in heaven, while the sins of the penitent believers are being removed from the sanctuary, there is to be a special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God's people on earth. This work is more clearly presented in the messages of Revelation 14. When the work of investigation shall be ended, when the cases of those who in all ages have professed to be followers of Christ shall have been examined and decided, then, and not till then, probation will close, and the door of mercy will be shut. When this work shall have been accomplished, the followers of Christ will be ready for His appearing...those who are living upon the earth when the intercession of Christ shall cease in the sanctuary above are to stand in the sight of a holy God without a mediator. Their robes must be spotless, their characters must be purified from sin by the blood of sprinkling. Through the grace of God and their own diligent effort they must be conquerors in the battle with evil. (1950, pp.355, 356, 368, 400, 422, 428, 425.)

There is a whole cluster of assumptions associated with this time period:

It assumes all the assumptions in these papers in order to align the two times periods in a way to yield their conclusion, (and with the use of the year-day principle) that yields this calculation.

The 2300 days do not apply only to the actions of the little horn etc., but to the whole vision of Dn8.

The 70 weeks provide the beginning for the 2300-day period.

There was a religious uprising that confirmed the God-inspired movement. Some of the characteristics that confirm its authenticity include:

It was spontaneous from different parts of the world, different religions, and different age groups (e.g., child preachers in Scandinavia).

These spontaneous movements occurred about the same time.

It was endorsed with supernatural signs from heaven, such as the darkening of the sun, the great earthquake and the falling of the stars.

The truths taught by the movement are enduring truths still taught today by the heaven-ordained movement who were led to continue teaching the message of the movement. The growth of the SDA church is testimony to its God-inspired beginnings;

The more problematic question concerning the prediction of the second Advent of Christ in 1844, is that the event is validated on the nature of the movement. There was nothing physical that can be literally seen or pointed to as being the validation of the time.

But even the nature of the event, as proclaimed by those people whose experience is quoted by SDA historicists as a proof of its authenticity, was different. These people proclaimed the near return of the Second Advent of Jesus, not the beginning of the second phase of the high priestly ministry. *None* of the people held up by SDA historicists made a prediction that reflected the actual events SDA historicists say actually happened. If these peoples' proclamation is to be judged, even Cressner's, (check out the charts and tables in Froom's books for a list of the range of predictions of historicists.) then we would have to say they were misinformed, since the time period does not, in the SDA historicists' view, point to the second coming of Christ. If the Lord was in this proclamation, and the book of Daniel was truly "opened" after 1798 AD, then surely we would expect to see the *true* proclamation of the events to come, and not a *false* prediction being proclaimed worldwide? Of course there is an excuse rehashed over time that it was necessary to proclaim the near coming of Christ in order to test people's hearts, so that they can see what spirit that are of. But does this mean that God should inspire a new time line each generation in order to show people what heart they are of? And what about the other generations that have not had the experience of a revival based on the preaching of time. Are they disadvantaged by not having one? Is it not the work of the Holy Spirit to test people in the common affairs of life, and sanctify them in that manner? And what about all the preaching of time periods throughout the history of the Christian era? Are they also inspired by the same Spirit? Is the Second Advent movement one of many revivals throughout the millennium? Was God sanctifying believers through the preaching of error in those cases too, even though they were using the year-day principle? And what about the preaching of different times during the twentieth century? Jehovah's Witnesses preached the return of Jesus in 1914 and 1975 – events that did not occur. Are these examples of false preaching of time used by God as sanctifying events as well? In the end one could argue that any preaching of error is a sanctifying experience since it is leading people to see what is in their hearts. Since when does the Holy Spirit sanctify believers through error? We are told that we are to test the spirits to see if they are of God. How are we to test them if not by the Word? And the test of the Word condemns

the view that the second coming of Christ was to occur in 1844. And those who opposed Miller on the basis that no man knows the hour when the Lord would come, were shown to be arguing the correct argument. Of course, those who were unfamiliar with the prophecies of Daniel may have been convinced of the genuineness of the chronology presented by Miller, but how do we judge people like Hengstenberg, Keil and Delitzsch and the multitude of ministers and laypersons who had a more informed view of the prophecies of Daniel, and would never endorse the positions proclaimed by the Second Advent movement? Surely, rather than judging them as willing opponents of such a movement, they are to be judged as being on the side of right, since their position was correct?

Of course, there are a whole bunch of ideas that are put up as justification as to why God could not proclaim the truth at that time, but one must ask the question, Why not use *truth* to test the hearts of people, rather than using error to *test* whether people are faithful? When Jesus was on earth he only presented truth to people. We do not read of any incident where he taught something incorrect with a view to testing the heart of a person, then later revealing that what he said was an error and he was really just testing the person to see where their allegiances lie. He *only* used the truth to test hearts. It is to be acknowledged that the perceptions of both John the Baptist and his disciples, as well as the disciples were incorrect concerning the import of what they were teaching. But what they were teaching the public was correct; it was only their perception that was incorrect. That is entirely different from what Ellen White and SDA historicists assert concerning the comparison with the misperceptions of the Millerite movement. *What was taught was incorrect as well as what they perceived.* There is no comparison between the Millerites and either the disciples of John or the disciples of Jesus. The perceptions of those in the Millerite movement were *identical* to what they taught publicly. They taught that the second coming would come at the end of the 2300 days, and that is what they perceived.

The basic principle of Protestantism is that we should only base our belief on the facts of the Bible, regardless of how convincing or deceptive another proposition might be. Ellen White quotes the grandeur of Romanism as a very appealing motive for inviting people to embrace Catholicism. REF? But we are told not to follow this type of reasoning when choosing a position on a Biblical issue. Apart from biblical evidence, all other evidence is to be disregarded, in spite of its appealing nature. This would include either the demeanour of the proponents of a certain idea, the spirit of the movement of a certain proposal, its popularity or more correctly, its unpopularity, or the respectability of the people endorsing that view.

Yet the arguments of Ellen White and SDA historicists are that we are not to take the arguments of the leaders of the Second Advent Movement and measure them against the Word. We are to judge the movement on other principles; viz., the spiritual character of the people involved, the spiritual character of the meetings, its unpopularity with worldly hearts and minds, etc. But this is not a Protestant principle. We are not to judge by appearances, because, as she says, even the devil himself will come in the form of an angel of light. (2 Thess 2) His movement will exhibit all the characteristics extolled in the Second Advent movement and more. But we are told not to trust these. We are to trust to a “thus saith the Lord.” If then we apply this principle to the Second Advent movement, then it was as William Miller later said—a mistake. The Word *did not* proclaim a second coming in 1844. That is what they had wrongly proclaimed. The Bible condemns this view as incorrect. Their experience condemns this view as incorrect. Without doubt, the Lord used the movement for His own purposes, and one cannot deny the spiritual experiences created by the movement. But as for the thrust of

its message, it cannot be extolled as being Biblical. Any window dressing on the thrust of the message likewise cannot be endorsed, as evidenced in the efforts of those remnants of the Second Advent movement who eventually became the SDA church. The basic foundation of the chronology of the movement was, and still is, unbiblical, as is evidenced in these papers, and so any revisions on the concept of the predicted event must also be faulted.<sup>26</sup>

### **Second question: Did the Day of Atonement fall on October 22 in 1844?**

What did the Advent movement use as the basis of their claim to October 22 as being the Day of Atonement in 1844? S. Snow was the first to promote the the actual date of October 22, based on the Karaite calendar during 1844. It was not promoted initially by William Miller. The following comments by Robert Sanders on his website highlight this fact succinctly:

Samuel Snow, was first to espouse the October 22, 1844 date and claimed that it was from the calendar of the Karaite Jews.

"SNOW, SAMUEL S. (1806-1870). A Congregationalist, then a skeptic, later a Millerite minister; initiator of the "seventh-month movement." Beginning with an article written Feb. 16, 1843, he emphasized the tenth day of the Jewish seventh month, *Tishri*, the Jewish Day of Atonement, as the true ending date of the prophetic 2300 years. Later he set forth the specific *day* as Oct. 22, 1844, our calendar equivalent of the tenth day of the seventh month in that year according to the old Karaite Jewish calendar. At first there was but little interest or response, but when Snow preached on July 21 in the large Boston Tabernacle on the text, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh [on the tenth day of the seventh month]; go ye out to meet him," some began to be roused." *From the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia Volume 10*, p. 1357.

Ellen G. White put her prophetic stamp of approval on the false Karaite date that S. S. Snow thought up. Ellen was not aware that the Karaite "Day of Atonement," was the same as the Rabbinical date of September 23, 1844.

Ellen G. White: "*The tenth day of the seventh month, the great Day of Atonement, the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, which in the year 1844 fell upon the 22d of October, was regarded as the time of the Lord's coming. This was in harmony with the proofs already presented that the 2300 days would terminate in the autumn ... the close of the 2300 days in the autumn of 1844, stand without impeachment.*" -- *The Great Controversy*, pp. 400, 457.

So clearly, Ellen White has endorsed the belief that the seventh day of the tenth month in 1844 fell on October 22, in concert with the teachings of the Second Advent movement. One needs to look at the justification of this date from these speakers and writers so that we can assess the nature and the strength of their logic. What did Snow argue in regard to October 22? What did Miller and Himes say about the dating of the event? What do the primary sources say?

<sup>26</sup> One can certainly argue from scripture either way, but that does not provide proof that the event did or did not occur. That can only be done with verifiable facts.

SDA historicists can argue this on the basis of Acts2. They would say the empirical evidence of the inauguration of Jesus as Lord of this earth, and of the human family on the Day of Pentecost was the manifestation of the Holy Spirit poured out on his followers, which resulted in a great revival among the people. On the same line then they could say the inauguration of the Investigative Judgment was the spiritual revival as manifest in the Second Advent Movement across the Old and New World.

This rationale however, is dependent on the interpretation of the revival. The revival was not based in the beginning on the investigative judgment. It was based on a belief on the soon return of Jesus. But it was a false belief. The belief of the disciples was correct; the belief of those in the Second Advent movement. It was based on error.

From S. S. Snow.

Here is the following material from S. Snow in February, 1843 regarding the use of the Day of Atonement as being appropriate for the Second Coming of Christ:

QUOTE FROM HIS FIRST ARTICLE HERE

Here is the material as to how he dated it and the sources he used:

INSERT QUOTE HERE

From other Advent speakers and writers:

From other Jewish Writers.

### **Establishing the October 22 date.**

In the writings of Seventh-day Adventist writers, the topic of the correct day being chosen from the Jewish calendar seems to be a closed topic, substantiated by a multitude of witnesses and not needing defense. YOU MIGHT LIKE TO CHECK FOR ARTICLES ON THIS IN EARLY EDITIONS OF PUBLICATIONS. SEE DAMSTEEGT'S FOOTNOTE ON STORRS BELOW FOR DATES OF ARTICLES ON THE TOPIC FROM MIDNIGHT CRY.

LOOK AT THE ARGUMENTS BY HALE FOR OCTOBER 22 RATHER THAN SEPTEMBER FOR DOA.

For example, James White does not see the need to justify the tenth day of the seventh month in 1844 as October 22. He seems to take it as granted:

With the great fact before us, that the 2300 days of Daniel, which reached to the cleansing of the sanctuary, would terminate at that time and also with the light of the types, that the high priest in "the example and shadow of heavenly things," on the tenth day of the seventh month entered within the second vail to cleanse the sanctuary, we confidently expected the advent of our Redeemer in the seventh month, 1844, The prophecy said, "Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." The type said that at that season of the year the high priest should pass from the holy place of the earthly sanctuary to most holy, to cleanse the sanctuary. Lev. 16.

With these facts before us, we reasoned as follows: (1) The sanctuary is the earth, or the land of Palestine. (2) The cleansing of the sanctuary is the burning of the earth, or the purification, at the coming of Christ. (3) And hence our great High Priest will leave the tabernacle of God in Heaven, and descend in flaming fire on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the autumn of 1844.

It is needless to say we were bitterly disappointed. (J. White, 1970, pp.145f)

In the Providence of God, in the seventh-month movement of 1844, the attention of the people was turned to the types of the law of Moses. The argument which had been given – that as the vernal types, namely, the passover, the wave sheaf, and the meat offering, were fulfilled in their order and time in the crucifixion, the resurrection of Christ, and the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, so would the autumnal types be fulfilled as to time, in the events connected with the second advent – seemed to be conclusive and satisfactory. The position taken was, that as the high priest came out of the typical sanctuary on the tenth day of the seventh month and blessed the people, so Christ, our great High Priest, would, on that day, come out of Heaven to bless his waiting people. (Ibid, pp.184f)

Uriah Smith does the same as White, when he is writing an apologetic for the time of the Day of Atonement in 1844:

We have seen that the closing work in the sanctuary is the work of atonement. In the type, one day out of the year was allotted to this work, called the day of atonement. This was the tenth day of the seventh month.

It will be noticed that in the fulfillment of the types, scrupulous exactness is observed in reference to the time; that is, the fulfillment occurs in the same month of the year, and on the same day of the month, as that on which the type was set forth. The fulfillment of the types of the spring is recorded in the New Testament, so that we have a divine exposition of this part of the typical system.

Thus the passover was killed on the fourteenth day of the first month...Christ is our passover; and he was sacrificed for us in the same month and on the same day, the fourteenth day of the first month.<sup>27</sup>...The sheaf of the firstfruits was waved on the sixteenth day of the first month. This met its antitype in the resurrection of our Lord, the firstfruits of them that slept, the sixteenth of the first month...The feast of weeks, or Pentecost, occurred on the fiftieth day from the offering of the firstfruits. The antitype of this feast, the Pentecost of Acts 2, was fulfilled on that very day, fifty days from the resurrection of Christ, in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the disciples.

The fulfillment of these types shows us these facts: That the great event for which the passover, the day of firstfruits, and the Pentecost were apparently noted, met their antitype on the very day of the types. Applying the same principle to the work on the tenth day of the seventh month, we are led to expect the antitype of the great work which characterized that day of atonement, namely, that the cleansing of the sanctuary, on the tenth day of the seventh month of that year in which the 2300 days ended, as it was at that point that the sanctuary was to be cleansed.

As those days ended in 1844, an effort was made to find the tenth day of the seventh month, Jewish time, of that year; and it was found to fall on the 22d of October. The historical and numeral arguments on the 2300 days have shown that those days terminated in the autumn of that year; and the argument from the types would confine us to that month and that day. This is why that day was set for the coming of Christ....In the light of the preceding argument, it is unnecessary to add that all any one had a warrant to conclude was that on that day the great work in the second apartment of the heavenly sanctuary would commence. (Smith, 1876, p.564)

As can be seen, no detail is given why October 22 was chosen. The same is the case in most presentations on this topic. The date is just assumed to be the Jewish Yom Kippur for that year.

Damsteegt, commenting on the actual choice of October 22, has the following footnote after his comment: "the commencement of the tarrying time he [Storrs] dated in 'March or April' 1844 and the termination of the 10<sup>th</sup> of the seventh month as not "farther off than October 22 or 23: it may be sooner."

Storrs, "Go ye Out," p. [2]. To clear the uncertainty about the exact dating of the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the 7<sup>th</sup> month on the Gregorian calendar, Hale published Oct. 22, 1844 as the Jewish Day of Atonement according to the Karaite reckoning ("Seventh Month," p.60). Although the editor of the *Midnight Cry* suggested Oct. 23, 1844 (Editorial, "Jewish Year," p.117), the periodical also published articles favoring Oct.22 for the parousia. There was also the suggestion that the event could take place between Oct. 22 and 24 (Editorial, "Time at Jerusalem," *MC*, Oct. 19, 1844, p.132). In the last issue before the expected event, Oct. 22 was favored (Himes, "Disturbances at the Tabernacle," *MC*, Oct. 19, 1844, p.136). Because of circumstances due to variations of the moon and the ripening of the harvest by which the Karaite year was determined,

<sup>27</sup> The discussion by Edwin Thiele and Martin Thurber concerning the change of custom of the - Passover by the Jews after the exile can be found in Ford, 1980, A-81-106. The custom had changed from killing the Passover and eating it on the evening of Nisan 14, to killing the Passover on the afternoon of Nisan 14 and then ate on the evening of Nisan 15. The Last Supper however, was held according to the custom - on the evening of Nisan 14.

it could sometimes occur that the Karaite and the Rabbinical year commenced with the same new moon. This resulted in the idea that there was even a possibility that the 7<sup>th</sup> month would commence with the new moon in Sept. 1844 (Peavey, "Seventh Month," p. 75). Cf. Editorial, "The Seventh Month," *AH*, Sept. 11, 1844, p.45. (Damsteegt, 1977, p.97)

**The wrong day.** The problem in verifying October 22, 1844, is the admission by Jewish sources that Yom Kipper (the day of atonement) in 1844, occurred on a day other than October 22. For example, "The following letter was sent by Yousef Ibrahim Marzouk, head of the Karaites in Cairo Egypt (back in 1939) to a Mr. C. L. Price in answer to a question regarding the date the Karaites celebrated as the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur/10th of Tishri) in 1844. Portions of this letter were printed in the May-June, 1941, No. 3 issue of *The Gathering Call*" by E. S. Ballenger. The reason Mr. Price asked this question in the first place is because Seventh-day Adventists claim the Karaite Jews celebrated the Day of Atonement on October 22, 1844. As Marzouk's letter clearly shows, the SDA claim is wrong. Both the Rabinnical Jews, and the Karaite Jews celebrated the Day of Atonement on September 23 in 1844: This document and it's date of September 23, 1844 has been verified by modern Karaites, Jewish calendar calculations, and even dates on the headstones in Jewish cemeteries. It is simply beyond question. Having been forced to admit that both the Karaite and Rabbinical Jews celebrated the Day of Atonement on September 23, 1844, Seventh-day Adventist scholars are now claiming the *Babylonian* calendar as the source of the October 22 date. However, this is simply a smoke screen to throw readers off track." From DoveNet and quoted at [http://www.geometry.net/detail/religion/karaite\\_page\\_no\\_3.html](http://www.geometry.net/detail/religion/karaite_page_no_3.html).

It is definitely not a clear-cut issue that October 22 was the correct date. This is just another of many issues related to October 22.

Readers may use the Jewish calendar reckoning to determine for themselves the date that the tenth day of the seventh month for 1844 would have been.

Go to the site <http://www.jewishgen.org/jos/josdates.htm>. The page will give you the following screen:

By typing 22<sup>nd</sup> Day of October (10<sup>th</sup> mth) in 1844 it will give you the 9 Heshvan 5605. This gives you the Jewish year for 1844. For the second step, select in the second line the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the seventh month (Tishri) in the year 5605, and see what it produces – Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 1844. This is the Jewish reckoning. We do not need to go to the Babylonian calendar to determine Jewish time, as some SDA scholars want us to do to try and get to October 22, 1844.

Robert Sanders discusses the issues even further at his website <http://www.caic.org.au/biblebase/sda/karaite1.htm> with the bulk of this information being included in the [appendix](#) of this paper.

#### **The Babylonian Calendar and the Day of Atonement in 1844.**

The recent efforts by Shea and others to find some authentication of October 22 as the Day of Atonement for 1844 is flawed in a number of ways. First, Ellen White endorses the method used by Snow as being "without impeachment." This infers a couple of things. The first one being that Snow did not use a Babylonian calendar to establish his date, and any attempt to verify Snow's date has to use the methods he used. Snow used the Karaite calendar, not the Babylonian calendar, and so one must refer to the chronological calculations of the Karaites for support to the Day of Atonement in 1844.

Another fault of recent attempts to justify the dating of the Day of Atonement in 1844 as October 22, is that we have to look at the way it was established by the original

arguments of those in the Advent movement, and establish the validity of the points they used, not go to an entirely different method of approach to the dating.

In regard to the ridiculous nature of using a Babylonian calendar to try and fudge the dates, Jesus told his Jewish audience in Matthew 24, to understand the book of Daniel. SDA historicists like Froom argue that when Jesus proclaimed, "The time is fulfilled," he was referring to the end of the seventy-week prophecy. Two things need to be observed with this assertion. The first is that Jesus would not have asserted such a command based on an obscure Babylonian calendar, unused and unfamiliar to the Palestinian Jews. Shea assumes that the Babylonian calendar is the correct calendar. But the assertions of Jesus are based, not on a calendar used in Babylon, but as used by Jews contemporary with him, and with a calendar used in Palestine. He would have asserted it based on the calendar at hand to Himself and all his listeners.

The second thing to be observed with his assertion, is that you cannot use a Jewish calendar for the fulfillment of the details in the seventy-week prophecy and then use a Babylonian calendar for the fulfillment of the details of the 2300-day prophecy, especially since, in SDA historicist's thought, the 2300-days is appended to the seventy-week prophecy. A Jewish calendar is a necessity for the 2300-days as it is for the seventy weeks.

If Shea wanted to make his research worthwhile, he would have attempted to show why the present Karaite and Rabbinical method of calculating the Day of Atonement in 1844 is flawed, and presented evidence to substantiate such a claim, instead of going off in a tangent and trying to find some other esoteric evidence of support for SDA historicist's dating. The chronological data focused on by these recent writers is not what Snow used, and it is not what we should use to examine the validity of October 22. We should be looking at the basis of the evidence used by Snow. This is the material endorsed by Ellen White, and this is the material that Shea should examine. If the Karaites do not argue for October 22, then the whole validity of this day falls apart, since this is the basis of the claim: this was the Day of Atonement according to Karaite reckoning. The date should be candidly admitted as a mistake.

**Conclusions:** Looking at the actual activity of Jesus as explained by SDA historicists, there is no way to either support or deny the proposition that the second phase of Christ's heavenly ministry (if indeed, there is one) began in 1844.<sup>28</sup> This is an argument that has no evidence either one way or the other. The chronology can certainly be faulted, as I have done, but the actual event of Jesus beginning a new phase of his heavenly ministry cannot be proved or disproved, in much the same way as creation cannot be proved or disproved. But we must ask the question, should we base our belief on these concepts or on the Bible alone? If we are to base our belief on things that cannot be substantiated, how are we following the Protestant principle? If the chronology is wrong, and the actual proof of the predicted event is beyond the reach of any human, then how can this be said to be a Biblical truth to be recommended to the world?

The SDA historicists' interpretation of the Second Advent movement of 1844 is a rationale that justifies the events of a failed prophecy, but also, for the believers of this

---

<sup>28</sup> There are plenty of biblical texts that speaks of this ministry being inaugurated after Pentecost, but the evidence referred to here is empirical evidence. What physical evidence can be sighted? What did people in the nineteenth century see of Christ? Of course, no-one saw him. SDA historicists will cite the visions of Ellen White as the answer to this question, thereby showing that the basis of their belief in this doctrine rests, not on the authority of the Bible, but on a vision of Ellen White. There is no other empirical evidence that can be cited to endorse or deny the view.

view, it reveals the purpose for the will of God during the Second Advent movement. It is a classical example of Berger and Luckman's theory of the social construction of reality. The Sabbatarian Adventists explained the movement so that it could harmonise with the many issues under question and still keep their own sense of integrity towards the message of the advent movement.<sup>29</sup> They developed their own collective definition of what they considered the reality of their experience. They wished neither to deny the genuineness of the movement and its message, nor the validity of their own experience. For a great many of these people, they dated their Christian experience from their conversion during the movement. They could not deny everything dear to their religious experience. The creation of a new view that harmonised all these issues was formulated over time, until a plausible "reconstruction of reality" was forged, and one that enabled people to hold to a certain view of the activity of heaven during and after that movement. Their cognitive dissonance was resolved satisfactorily.

The date 1844, signaling firstly, the second coming of Jesus, was a false proclamation. It was incorrect. And there is verifiable evidence that it did not occur. On the other hand, the idea of 1844 beginning of the judgment in heaven cannot be denied or verified by any historical data, since no-one can show that that is either the case or not.

The evidence provided by SDA historicists in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the revival of the 1840s is no evidence that the judgment began in heaven, because that proclamation was related to another event; viz., the second coming of Christ. There was nothing in the Second Advent movement that was related to the proclamation of the beginning of the judgment in heaven. Therefore, SDA historicists are incorrect to associate the fervour of a revival based on a false prediction for the Second Coming of Christ, to be the proclamation by the Holy Spirit of the beginning of the judgment in heaven. The Second Coming of Christ and the judgment in heaven are two entirely different topics. It is similar to ascribing the fervour of one side to their victory of a football game, to the other side. They are entirely different teams. The support for one team does not mean they are supporting another.

The evidence that the revival did not begin again once the "true" explanation of the event was realized is proof that one could not associate the fervour of the previous movement with the doctrine of the investigative judgment. Miller had changed his opinion a number of times and the spirit of the people endorsed those changes and embraced them.<sup>30</sup> There were also other incorrect proclamations, such as the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1840, that people examined and then embraced. If then, the message of the judgment interpretation of "cleansing of the sanctuary" were the correct one, then the spirit of those involved in the proclamation would have been in it. But that was not the case. Therefore, we must conclude with the majority of those who judged the doctrine at the time, that his interpretation was not the continuation of that revival.

And further, as Arasola has pointed out in his doctorate, the 1844 revival was the end of the line for historicism. The Christian world saw the vagaries of the historicist's method and eschewed them, and began to look for another method of interpretation.<sup>31</sup>

### **Summary of this Chronological Review.**

I have examined the critical chronology dates above, and came to the following conclusions:

<sup>29</sup> This is the name given to those of the Second Advent movement who would later form the Seventh-day Adventist church after 1863. (Damsteegt, 1977, p.xv)

<sup>30</sup> What were these? The issue re the loss of a year in the change from B.C. to A.D. What other things did he change?

<sup>31</sup> Arasola, 1989.

457 BC may or may not be correct but only as the start for the seventy weeks, not the 2300 days. Its validity is nevertheless an ongoing debate indicating the factual nature of 457 BC as the correct choice does not have the consensus of scholars as yet. The other problem is identifying the correct decree to rebuild Jerusalem. Which one is intended? Some find the command of Cyrus, the Lord's anointed, in 538 B.C. a more natural fit (See Kenneth Richards' position in Appendix).

27 AD has no empirical evidence for support; it is based entirely on the SDA calculations of the seventy weeks of Dn9. The "facts" in this date are that there is nothing chronological on which to base this calculation.

31 AD has no empirical evidence for support; it is based entirely on the SDA calculations of the seventy weeks of Dn9. The "facts" in this date are that 30 AD and 31 AD are equal contenders for the correct date. There is no way of determining which of these years had Nisan 14 on a Friday. Therefore one cannot conclude that 31 AD is the date of the crucifixion.

34 AD has no empirical evidence for support; it is based entirely on the SDA calculations of the seventy weeks of Dn9. The best evidence offers the range of 33-36 AD and nothing can limit it any closer than that.

1840 AD is utterly discredited. The initial date of 1299 cannot be confirmed; 1449 is out by a year, and is the wrong event anyway; and Turkey was not "broken" in 1840.

1844 definitely has no chronological or scriptural evidence for support; it is based entirely on the chain of invalid assumptions listed in these papers, and an invalid use of the seventy weeks prophecy.

October 22 is discredited as being the Jewish Day of Atonement in 1844, by both Orthodox and Karaite Jews. The correct date is September 23. This issue, raised by Ballenger and Conradi, has never been overthrown. Desperate attempts using the Babylonian chronology does not answer the issue.

To express the details of this study tabularly:

Question	What can be found in History		The SDA Version of History	
	Answer	Why?	Answer	How?
Is 457 BC a verifiable historical fact?	NO	The evidence is inconclusive.	YES	Using
Is the baptism of Jesus in 27 AD a verifiable historical fact?	NO	No evidence at all.	YES	Using the 70 week prophecy.
Is the death of Jesus in 31AD a verifiable historical fact?	NO	Could be either 30 or 31 AD depending on which year had a Friday Passover.	YES	Using the 70 week prophecy.
Is the stoning of Steven in 34 AD a verifiable historical fact?	NO	The closest chronology is to 33-36 AD	YES	Using the 70 week prophecy.
Is 538A.D. the	NO	The facts do not suit the	YES	Using 1798 as the end

Question	What can be found in History		The SDA Version of History	
	Answer	Why?	Answer	How?
beginning of the power of the papacy verifiable by history?		claims. The pope did not increase in power in 538 or even in that century.		point of the 1260 years
Is 1798 AD as the end of the power of the papacy verifiable in history?	NO	The facts do not suit the claims. The papal powers did not end then. It was no more a mortal wound than any of the other times the Pope was imprisoned in history.	YES	
Is 1840 AD as the end of the Ottoman Empire verifiable in history?	NO	The facts do not suit the claims. The Empire did not end in 1840.	YES	Using the prophecy interpretation of Revelation of Josiah Litch alone.
Is 1844 AD as the beginning of the Investigative Judgment in heaven verifiable in history?	NO	There is nothing in history that can verify this claim.	YES	2300 day and 70 week prophecies in the book of Daniel
Is October 22, 1844 the Day of Atonement in Jewish calendar for that year	NO	The correct date for it is September 23,	YES	We must use the Babylonian calendar to verify this.

Historical facts can only be valued as they support valid positions. For instance, we hold our faith firm in Christ because of the historical fact of his death, resurrection and ascension to heaven, though the dates of these events are not accurate at this time. These will stand firm, though all manner of persons attack the historicity of Jesus. The chronological “facts” of 27 AD, 31 AD, 34 AD are certainly not so; and both 1798 AD and 1844 AD are not valid as interpreted by SDA historicists; rather, are a contrived reinterpretation of the actual event to suit their own purposes. Timely though the

Second Advent message may have been, given the intellectual and spiritual climate of the times, the actual validity of the prediction is not judged by its timeliness, but rather, its truthfulness. Miller argued on the basis of its truthfulness, not its timeliness.

The mistake of this movement must be directly attributed to yet another application of the invalid biblical concept of a year-day principle. There had been a score of others previously in history, as Froom documents, and this was just another one among many. This is not denying the presence of God in and through the movement. One cannot do that without doing violence to an abundance of phenomenological data. The same God who can use inanimate stones to praise His name if necessary is also quite able to use, much more effectively, a religious revival by dedicated Christians like that of the second Advent movement.

### ***The Social Construction of History.***

GET THE BOOK BY TAYLOR ON THIS IN RELIGION AND BERGER "THE SACRED CANOPY"

SDA historicists misuse history for their own ends. They have constructed a version of history based on a *prophetic* use of history, in which they see themselves as the significant contemporary centre of the present will of God in the world. This is especially demonstrated in their application of specific sections of Scripture where they see it applying to them especially. For example, they interpret Revelation 10 in terms of the Second Advent movement; they interpret Revelation 14 in terms of the "three angels message" as proclaimed by the SDA church; they see the opening of the sealed sections of the book of Daniel as the explanation of the 2300 days as proclaimed by William Miller, and later incorporated into SDA dogma, and they use of other texts as a secondary explanation of their movement, such as the parable of the marriage in Matthew 25 etc. Over time, a theory of their place in history was gradually formed by common consensus. This is what is meant by the social construction of SDA history. Their history was not sent from heaven; it was not seen and verified by those not of their persuasion; in short it is not independently valid; it was constructed by common consensus over time, and the endorsement of a particular view of the history of the SDA church given through the writings of Ellen White. For many, this endorsement by her writings made this view a divine interpretation of history rather than a social construct. To add to this, there is a venerable history of tradition of the historicist's school of interpretation, which is invoked to give secular credibility to the theories endorsed by SDA historicism. This is quoted, and names, respected in non-Adventist circles are thrown around to give respectability to their interpretation.

This version has undergone modification in time, with the theme of "torchbearers" taking a new and significant addition to the old view. This "torchbearer" view, espoused most lucidly by Froom, take an selectively inclusive view of the history of other Protestant denominations, thereby polishing some of the eccentric aspects of SDA history and embedding this history fair and square in the centre of the stream of 'the true Protestant tradition.' The choice of the word "selective" is used because not every aspect of the denominations used in this "torchbearer" view is endorsed; rather, sometimes only a few or even one doctrine is seen as the significant link.

But this is not the scientific approach to history. And they are not the first. There is a venerable tradition of this type of history-writing among historicists long before the Second Advent movement. The fertile imagination of historicists of former periods as revealed in their writings illustrate the veracity of this point. One need only peruse the charts and tables contained in Froom's monumental work "[The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers](#)" to catch a glimpse of the overfertile imagination of historicists in former periods. Adventist writers carried on the same venerable tradition, using the same

methods, and displaying great inventiveness in the process. EXAMPLES? They created their own version of what happened in history, and presented the events filtered through the historicist's kaleidoscope. These are the perspectives provided by a particular writer who takes historical details and then distorts these details to make them suit the interpretation favourable to the SDA philosophy of history. EXAMPLES <sup>32</sup>

## The Conclusion

This assumption dealt with a favourite issue in SDA thinking – that history has endorsed the historicist's view of prophecy. They argue that the outplaying of historical events fit in with how the historicist says they should have occurred, even sometimes to within an error range of less than one month. (cf., Mansell, 2002, p.10f, 19, 24<sup>33</sup>) They have created a history of themselves that portrays them as God's remnant—his special people ordained with a special mission—and this remnancy is also illustrated in the perspective of a 'torchbearer' carrying on the torch from other churches. The flip side of this view is that the other churches, cited by SDA histories as being forebearers of aspects of SDA doctrine and teaching, no longer carry the torch.

In the introduction, I suggested Assumption 21 is better called an *arational* assumption, in that it defies logic and reason. The reason this is the case is that regardless of any evidence to the contrary on the crucial dates listed above, SDA historicists will still cling to the old dates and events with increasing tenacity and stubbornness. They cling to the concept that they are the present 'torchbearers' in this world, regardless of the SDA church's shortcomings. The SDA historicist may congratulate him-/ herself with the idea that history has confirmed the SDA explanation of the time periods in Daniel, but he should be cognisant that the only history confirming this explanation is the one concocted by SDA historicists or carried on an antiquated previous age to support their theories. Their view of history cannot be presented and conceded by any peer review of non-SDA historians. It is an idiosyncratic relic, and is only conceded within the walls of Adventism where the climate of critical review is not openly encouraged within the ranks. Congratulate yourself if you may, when you study the SDA version of these events but know that no other institution of learning or informed historian would take the position that you take on these things. Check out an independent view on the history of those events and make an informed decision.

Hanganu, in his critical review of the year-day principle says of this "pragmatic test:"

<sup>32</sup> Froom's explanation of how the year-day principle was endorsed in pre-Christian times and by Jesus himself is a classic example of this. Other examples of this distortion include the following: The multiple issues surrounding the 1260 days; the interpretation of the darkening of the sun, moon, the falling of the stars, the Lisbon earthquake etc; the misinterpretation of the signing of the Concordat in 1929; the Stoning of Stephen and; the events predicted in Revelation.

<sup>33</sup> Mansell, 2002 argues that there was only less than one month difference over the 1260 years between the instigation of the law in AD 538 and the deposition of the pope in AD 1798. "In this imperial rescript, Justinian decreed that the pope should be 'the head of all the churches.' However Justinian's decree could not be implemented until March, 538, when the Ostrogoths were driven from the city of Rome. So, 538 is the logical date from which to begin the 1,260 years of papal ascendancy. If this is true, the 1,260 years must have terminated around the end of February, 1798. Did it? *It did!* ...Berthier entered Rome on [the] tenth [of] February, 1798, and proclaimed a Republic. The aged Pontiff refused to violate his oath by recognizing it, and was [escorted out of Rome on February 20<sup>th</sup> and] hurried from prison to prison in France...

"The Reformers believed that they saw in the rise of the papacy beginning with the laying low of the last of the three barbarian kingdoms in 538, a clear fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 7. (2002, pp.10f, 19, 34)

The ‘principle’ is applied where it fits, and it [sic] not applied where it doesn’t fit. The fact that it seems to fit certain texts is claimed to be evidence that the ‘principle’ has passed the ‘pragmatic test’. The contrary is never stated, that is, that the fact that the ‘principle’ fails to fit in an overwhelming number of instances, would be evidence that the ‘principle’ has no empirical validity. ( 2003, p.3)

The relationship between the seventy weeks and the 2300 days is just an institutional item to justify the rationale for its existence—but they are an historical chimera. The date of 457 B.C. is not confirmed and the choice of what decree is meant; AD 27, 31, and 34 are just as inconclusive, as admitted by the writings of the SDA church. The baptism of Jesus around AD 27 does not have any independent chronological reference point; the crucifixion could be either AD 30 or 31; and the stoning of Stephen could be any date between AD 33-36, since there are no independent chronological markers anchored to this event. This is the closest the best research can get to accuracy, and anything closer is unsubstantiated at present. The dates of 538 A.D. and 1798 A.D. are just as fictitious as 1840.

Far from confirming the validity of the SDA historicist’s interpretation of the 2300 days and the seventy weeks, their idiosyncratic interpretation of the history associated with these time prophecies merely highlights the incurable state of the historicists’ viewpoint, since it uses a circular argument to bolster its own argument: It is the historicist’s dubious selection and interpretation of highly questionable “historical” events that determines his explanation of prophecy, and yet his explanation of these prophecies determine his selection and interpretation of historical events, in a loop of circular logic. Other similar events in history or other acceptable variations of dates are rejected on the basis of falling outside the parameters of the SDA interpretation of the prophecy.

## Bibliography

**Anderson, Eric,**

1993 “The Millerite Use of Prophecy: A Case Study of a ‘Striking Fulfillment’”, in The Disappointed: Millerism and Millerianism in the Nineteenth Century, by Ronald L. Numbers and Jonathan M. Butler (Eds.), Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, pp.78-91.

**Andrews, J.N.,**

1970 (1892) Three Messages of Revelation XIV,6-12, Particularly the Third Angel’s Message, and the Two-Horned Beast, Fifth Edition, Revised, Battle Creek, Michigan: Review and Herald Publishing Association, Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association.

**Arasola, Kai,**

1989 The End of Historicism: Millerite Hermeneutic of the Time Prophecies in the Old Testament, Sigtuna: Datem Publishing.

**Bliss, Edwin Munsell**

1896 Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities, Edgewood Publishing Company.

**Bury, J. P. T. (Ed.),**

1964 The New Cambridge Modern History, Volume X: *The Zenith of European Power*, Cambridge: University Press.

**Damsteegt, P Gerard,**

1977 Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

**Doukhan, Jacques B.,**

- 2000 Secrets of Daniel, Wisdoms and Dreams of a Jewish Prince in Exile, Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 2002 Secrets of Revelation: The Apocalypse through Hebrew Eyes, Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

**Encyclopedia Britannica,**

- 1975 "Ottoman Empire and Turkey, History of the," 15<sup>th</sup> Edition., Vol 13, 771-797.

**Ford, Desmond,**

- 1978 Daniel, Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association
- 1980 Daniel 8:14: The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment. Casselberry, Florida: Evangelion Press.
- 1982 Crisis! a Commentary on the Book of Revelation. Vol.1; A Hermeneutic for Revelation; Vol.2: A Verse by Commentary; Vol. 3: Index. Newcastle, Calif.: Desmond Ford Publications
- 1996 Daniel and the Coming King, Rocklin, Calif: J & M Printing.

**From, LeRoy E.,**

- 1946 The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, Volume I. Early Church Exposition, Subsequent Deflections, and Medieval Revival, Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 1948 The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation, Volume II, Pre-Reformation and Reformation Restoration, and Second Departure, Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 1950 The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, Volume III, Part. 1: Colonial and Early National American Exposition, Part. 2: Old World Nineteenth Century Advent Awakening, Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 1954 The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, Volume IV, New World Recovery and Consummation of Prophetic Interpretation. , Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 1971 Movement of Destiny, Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

**Goldstein, Clifford,**

- 1988 1844 Made Simple, Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- 2003 Graffiti in the Holy of Holies, an impassioned response to recent attacks on the sanctuary and Ellen White, Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

**Gordon, Paul A.,**

- 1983 The Sanctuary, 1844, and the Pioneers. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.
- 1983 Pioneer Articles on The Sanctuary, Daniel 8: 14, The Judgment, 2300 Days, Year- Day Principle, Atonement: 1846-1905, Collected by Paul A. Gordon, Ellen G. White Estate, (No Publisher).

**Haskell, Stephen N.,**

- 1999 [1904] The Story of Daniel the Prophet, New York City: Bible Training School, Facsimile reproduction, Teach Services Inc., Brushton, New York, 1999.

- 1977 (1905) The Story of the Seer of Patmos. Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association, 1905, (Heritage Library Series).
- Haganu, Eduard,**  
2003 “A Linguist Examines the “Year-Day Principle,” *Adventist Today*, September-October. Source: [www.atoday.com/160.0.html](http://www.atoday.com/160.0.html)
- Litch, Rev. Josiah,**  
1840 “Fall of the Ottoman Power in Constantinople, (Millerite) *Signs of the Times* of the Second Coming of Christ, Vol I, No.9, August 1, 1840.  
1840 “The Battle Begun!” (Millerite) *Signs of the Times* of the Second Coming of Christ, Vol. I, No. 15, November 1, 1840.  
Found online at:  
<http://www.adventistarchives.org/documents.asp?CatID=30&SortBy=0&ShowDateOrder=False>
- Loughborough, J,N,**  
1905 The Great Second Advent Movement, its Rise and Progress, Nashville, Tenn: Southern Publishing Association.
- Mansell, Donald Ernest,**  
2002 Open Secrets of the Antichrist, Has the beast of Bible prophecy identified itself? Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- Maxwell, C. Mervyn.,**  
1981 God Cares. Volume 1: The Message of Daniel for You and Your Family, Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.  
1985 God Cares. Volume 2: The Message of Revelation for You and Your Family, Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press Publishing Association.
- Nichol, Francis D. (Ed.),**  
1957 The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary: The Holy Bible with Exegetical and Expository Comment in Seven Volumes. Volume 7: Philippians to Revelation. Washington, D.C: Review and Herald Publishing Association.  
1980 (1956) The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary: The Holy Bible with Exegetical and Expository Comment in Seven Volumes. Volume 5: Matthew to John. Washington, D.C: Review and Herald Publishing Association.  
1976 (1957) The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary: The Holy Bible with Exegetical and Expository Comment in seven Volumes. Volume 4: Isaiah to Malachi. Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association. Revised.
- Numbers, Ronald L., and Butler, Jonathan M. (Eds.),**  
1993 The Disappointed: Millerism and Millerianism in the Nineteenth Century, Knoxville, Tennessee: University Of Tennessee Press.
- Olson, Robert W.,**  
1981 101 Questions on the Sanctuary and on Ellen White, Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate.
- Parry, Clive, and Hopkins, Charity,**  
1970 Index of British Treaties 1101-1968. (JX631 A1 G63P). Compiled and annotated under the auspices of the International Law Fund and the British Institute of International and Comparative Law, in 3 volumes. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1970. [Uni of Syd. Ref. R341.242003 2] (some give it as 4 volumes. Reason?)

**Parry, Clive, (Ed.),**

1979-1986 Index-Guide to Treaties : based on the Consolidated Treaty Series, edited and annotated by Clive Parry, LL.D., and all other series therein utilised. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. : Oceana Publications. "[pt. 1] vol. 1. Irwin, P. General chronological list, 1648-1809 [i.e., 1648-1808]--vol. 2. Hill, Brian H.W. General chronological list, 1648-1809 supplement, 1809-1851.--vol. 3. Hill, Brian H.W. General chronological list, 1852-1885.--vol. 4. Hill, Brian H.W. General chronological list, 1886-1903.--vol. 5. Hill, Brian H.W. General chronological list, 1904-1919.--[pt. 2] Meyer, Michael A. Special chronological list, 1648-1920 (2 v.).--[pt. 3] Hill, Brian H.W. Party index. vol. 1, Afghanistan-Finland.--vol. 2, France-German states.--vol. 3, Great Britain-Italy.--vol. 4, Japan-South Rhodesia.--vol. 5, Spain-Zanzibar".

**Shea, William H.,**

1981 The Relationship between the Prophecies of Daniel 8 and Daniel 9, in The Sanctuary and the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Theological Studies, A.V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner, (Eds.), Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1982 Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation, (Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, Volume 1), Hagerstown, Maryland, USA: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1986 "The Prophecy of Daniel 9: 24-27," in The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus and the Nature of Prophecy. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series volume 3, Frank B. Holbrook (Ed.) Washington, D.C; Biblical Research Institute, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

1991 "When did the Seventy Weeks of Daniel 9:24-27 Begin?" *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, Vol.2, No.1, pp.115-138.

1996 Daniel 7-12, (Prophecies of the End Time), The Abundant Life Bible Amplifier, George R Knight, General Editor, Boise, Idaho and Oshawa, Ontario, Canada: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

1997 "History and Eschatology in the Book of Daniel," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, Vol.8, No.1-2, pp.195-205.

**Smith, U.,**

1876 "The Thirty-seventh Paper. – The Tenth Day of the Seventh Month," in *Review and Herald*, October 26, in Paul Gordon, Pioneer Articles on The Sanctuary, Daniel 8: 14, The Judgment, 2300 Days, Year- Day Principle, Atonement: 1846-1905, Ellen G. White Estate, (No Publisher), 1983, pp.564-5)

1898 Looking Unto Jesus or Christ in Type and Antitype. Warburton, Victoria, Australia: Signs Publishing Company, 1898.

1944 (1865-73) The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation, Revised Edition, Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Company.

**Spangler, J. Robert (Ed.),**

1980 "Christ and His High Priestly Ministry: Special Sanctuary Issue", *Ministry*, Vol. 53, No10, October, 1980.

**Woolsey, Raymond H.,**

2001(1978) On the Edge of Forever: History's Grand Design and Coming Climax, Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

**White, Ellen G.,**

1950 (1888) The Great Controversy between Christ and Satan The Conflict of the Ages in the Christian Dispensation, Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association.

19? Life Sketches, Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

**White, J. S.,**

1970 (1870) Bible Adventism or, Sermons on the Coming and Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, Our Faith and Hope Volume 1, Battle Creek, Michigan: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, n.d., Nashville, Tennessee: Southern Publishing Association.

## Appendix

### *Material associated with 457 B.C*

#### *Kenneth Richards (son of H.M.S. Richards)*

*It used to be that when I read Daniel eight and nine I saw all the support I needed to propagate the standard views of my church regarding those chapters. The little horn could not have anything to do with Antiochus Epiphanes. The 70 weeks began in 457 B.C. and ended in A.D. 34. The 2300 days also began in 457 B.C. but ended in October of 1844.*

The main event of 1844 was the moving of Christ into the most holy place, or second apartment, of the heavenly sanctuary in sync with the beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement and the investigative judgment.

The more I prayed, read my Bible, and thought the more this picture of things diminished. The more it began to take on a different shape. This process of reshaping speeded up after I retired and had more time to study.

Let me give you an overview of where I'm at today when it comes to Daniel eight and nine. I'll deal, due to space constraints, with just a few aspects of my present viewpoint.

The symbols of the ram and the he-goat still speak to me of Medo-Persia and Greece (the Greco-Macedonian kingdom). But the little horn has taken on some additional meaning. The Bible speaks of its rising at a time when all four Grecian kingdoms were still in existence. It even specifies that the rising of this horn is to occur in the "latter time of their kingdom" (Dan. 8:23), that is, towards the end of that period during which the four Greek kingdoms were still in existence. When did Antiochus come to power? In 175 B.C. The four Greek states ceased to exist as a foursome in 168 B.C. when the Romans took over Greece. So it was that Antiochus came on the scene at precisely the time predicted in 8:23. He killed thousands of Jews, confiscated their holy writings, forbade the practice of their religion, desecrated the temple in Jerusalem and stopped the offering of sacrifices as required by the laws of Leviticus (cf. Dan. 8:9-12). No wonder the Jews still continue, from early times (cf. John 10:22), to celebrate Hanukkah in memory of the purification and rededication of the temple which Antiochus had polluted. I'm persuaded that had Antiochus succeeded in eradicating God's people (and their religion), there would not have been a covenant people for the Christ to come from or to come to.

Of course, Antiochus did not fulfill all that was predicted of the little horn. That horn symbolizes more than just one man or one kingdom, but Antiochus IV was the first in the line of those powers who would do the work of the little horn.

For me the 2300 days of Dan. 8:14 began in c.538 B.C. I agree that Dan. 9:25 gives us the beginning point of the 2300 day prophecy. That point in time is when the word would go forth “to restore and to build Jerusalem. . . .” Those words used to remind me of the decree of Artaxerxes which was issued about 457 B.C. But his decree was the third in a series of decrees that God used to promote the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple. Dan. 9:25 did not specify a decree that, among others, would afford God’s people the greatest degree of autonomy, nor did it necessarily speak of a decree that would be most helpful to later interpreters in constructing a precise calculation of the year in which Messiah would appear. When “the” word would go forth to rebuild—that’s when the prophetic period in view was to begin.

Through His prophet God said of king Cyrus,

He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid (Isa. 44:28).

So, now, when I read Dan. 9:25 I think of the decree of Cyrus (538 B.C.) as the beginning point of the 2300 day (actually “evening-morning”) prophecy. It was Cyrus whom God used (Ezra 1:1-3) to set His people free, to loose them from exile, and to start the whole process of rebuilding both city and temple. Later decrees (including that of Artaxerxes) only promoted a process already initiated by the word that had been issued by Cyrus.

For me the 2300 days and the 70 weeks start at the same time. But many reject 538 B.C. as a starting point even though it seems, in my view at least, to be the natural choice. One reason for this rejection is that it wrecks the timing of the 70 week prophecy concerning Messiah. If we start at 457 B.C. things work out “well”—the Messiah’s anointing takes place at the “right” time (A.D. 27). And the crucifixion takes place at the “right” time (A.D. 31). So the argument goes, “Don’t wreck these beautiful calculations that work so well!” As far as I’m concerned these last two dates are close enough, but it’s using the Artaxerxes decree as a starting point in arriving at them that bothers me.

Underlying this “It works better starting at 457” attitude is the assumption that in apocalyptic prophecy a “day” stands for a literal “year.” But this is not what I find in such prophecies. For example, when I read Rev. 12:1-6 I get the distinct impression that the 1260 day prophetic period begins around the time of Christ’s ascension. Maybe that’s because I don’t want to place a multi-century gap between verses 5 and 6 when my Bible doesn’t. Maybe it’s also because I remember that, according to the book of Acts the dragon (Satan, 12:9) began persecuting the woman (church) right away. So I end up with a starting point for the 1260 days—the time of Christ (ascension).

Does this period end 1260 literal years after the ascension? My Bible gently forces me to say no. It does this in Rev. 11. Verse 3 brings to view the “two witnesses” who are to prophesy “a thousand two hundred and threescore days. . . .” That sounds to me like 1260 days. Now, I keep on reading and come to verse 7 where I learn that when these two witnesses finish their testimony, that is, when the 1260 days they were to prophesy come to an end, “the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them,” and even “kill them.” This reminds me of Rev. 13:7 where the “beast” is predicted to “make war with the saints and to overcome them. . . .” So I ask myself, “Has this happened yet?” My answer is no.

I have a beginning point (ascension) for the 1260 days, but I think of its end-point as still in the future—at a time when God’s people appear to have been vanquished by Satan’s agents (cf. Dan. 12:7). The book of Revelation does not supply me with a beginning point and an end-point that fits the year-day idea. The “days” (of the 1260) do not represent literal years to me. They start too early and end far too late for that. So I’m unable to affirm that a “day” stands for a literal “year” in the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation (for information on the symbolic meaning of the 1260 please visit the website mentioned further on).

If the year-day notion does not apply to the prophecies of Daniel, when do the 2300 days and the 70 weeks end? Here’s what makes sense to me at the present time. In Daniel 8, the angel explains the meaning of the symbols—the ram, he-goat, great

horn, four horns, and little horn, but not much is explained about the 2300 days. Gabriel just affirms that the part of the vision about those 2300 evenings and mornings “is true.” I imagine that Daniel was a bit frustrated by the lack of information offered. But years later Gabriel comes to Daniel and invites him to “consider the vision” (Dan. 9:23). I take this to mean the “vision” of Daniel 8.

Someone had asked in that chapter, “How long shall be the vision, . . . “ that had information about Medo-Persia and Greece, but especially the activities of the little horn. The answer was: “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed (Dan. 8:14).” But, as I noted a moment ago, Gabriel just didn’t explain the 2300 days or the cleansing in chapter eight. Now, in chapter nine, he visits Daniel to provide information about those two items. He begins his explanation in 9:24. His first statement provides some information about the 2300 days: “Seventy weeks are determined\* upon thy people and upon thy holy city. . . .” “Seventy weeks” is another way of speaking of the 2300 days. Since I’m reading a book loaded with symbolism, I take these numbers to be symbols (just as were the ram, the goat, the horns, etc.). There’s not enough space here to discuss this numerical symbolism, but I’ll have more to say in the article on Dan. 8:14 soon to be posted at the website of the Jesus Institute Forum (jesusinstituteforum.org).

In the last part of 9:24 Gabriel explains the meaning of “then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.” That is, as I understand it— to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy and to anoint the most Holy is Gabriel’s description of the cleansing/making right/restoring of the sanctuary. This restorative process is completed at the end of the 2300 day (70 weeks) period. This process was, as I see it, completed in the Christ event inaugurally, but is yet to be completed consummatively—when sin and the unrepentant are finally eliminated.

In studying and thinking about 9:24 (and the following verses of Dan. 9) I think I am coming to a much more Biblical understanding of Dan. 8 and 9. As I continue to pray, study, and think, it may be that my views will take on more contours that have not yet developed in my mind.

Don’t worry too much if my present views are not in harmony with yours (which you may consider to be more Biblical). I’m still pursuing knowledge and understanding. There’s still hope that my views will become more biblical in the future than they are today.

\*“Determined” is a good translation of nechtak which is a passive form of its root hatak. The meaning of this root can be either “cut” or “determine.” So nechtak can be expected to reflect one of these meanings. But context is the final arbiter.

Kenneth E. H. Richards

[http://www.atoday.com/6.0.html?&tx\\_ttnews\[tt\\_news\]=358&tx\\_ttnews\[backPid\]=1&cHash=e13dd3e053](http://www.atoday.com/6.0.html?&tx_ttnews[tt_news]=358&tx_ttnews[backPid]=1&cHash=e13dd3e053) Accessed 2007. (Received a 404—“page not found” notice in May, 2008)

***Material Associated with 408 B.C.***

***Material Associated with A.D. 27***

***Material Associated with A.D. 31***

***Material Associated with A.D. 34.***

Readers are referred to Assumption 18 for a thorough discussion on the topic.

***Material Associated with 1798.***

Readers are referred to Assumption 9 for all the information on the topic.

***Material Associated with August 11, 1840 The End of the Ottoman Empire.***

The following websites are worthy of attention on this topic:

- <http://countrystudies.us/turkey/10.htm>
- <http://www.tughranet.f2s.com/paljord.htm>
- 

The following extracts are supporting material for the summary of the arguments associated with this date.

The first one is from Edward Gibbon. Gibbon's view is important, because it is upon his views that Litch and Miller based their view. It is also the accuracy of Gibbon's dating that Prof. W. W. Prescott questions using the work of Von Hammer and Possinus' 1666 Latin translation of Pachymeris' Greek History.

#### **From Edward Gibbon:**

Edward Gibbon was used to support Litch's position. Here is his comment on the matter, starting from the time of Othman: and 1299:

After the retreat of Zingis, the sultan Gelaeddin of Carizme had returned from India to the possession and defence of his Persian kingdoms. In the space of eleven years, than [sic] hero fought in person fourteen battles; and such was his activity, that he led his cavalry in seventeen days from Teflia to Kermand, a march of a thousand miles. Yet he was oppressed by the jealousy of the Moslem princes, and the innumerable armies of the Moguls; and after his last defeat, Gelaeddin perished ignobly in the mountains of Curdistan. His death dissolved a veteran and adventurous army, which included under the name of Carizmians or Corasmins many Turkman hordes, that had attached themselves to the sultan's fortune. The bolder and more powerful chiefs invaded Syria, and violated the holy sepulchre of Jerusalem: the more humble engaged in the service of Aladin, sultan of Iconium; and among these were the obscure fathers of the Ottoman line. They had formerly pitched their tents near the southern banks of the Oxus, in the plains of Mahan and Nesa; and it is somewhat remarkable, that the same spot should have produced the first authors of the Parthian and Turkish empires. At the head, or in the rear, of a Carizman army, Soliman Shah was drowned in the passage of the Euphrates: his son Orthogrul became the soldier and subject of Aladin, and established at Surgut, on the banks of the Sangar, a camp of four hundred families or tents, whom he governed fifty-two years both in peace and war. Reign of Othman, A.D. 1299-1326. He was the father of Thaman, or Athman, whose Turkish name has been melted into the appellation of the caliph Othman; and if we describe that pastoral chief as a shepherd and a robber, we must separate from those characters all idea of ignominy and baseness. Othman possessed, and perhaps surpassed, the ordinary virtues of a soldier; and the circumstances of time and place were propitious to his independence and success. The Seljukian dynasty was no more; and the distance and decline of the Mogul khans soon enfranchised him from the control of a superior. He was situate on the verge of the Greek empire: the Koran sanctified his *gazi*, or holy war, against the infidels; and their political errors unlocked the passes of Mount Olympus, and invited him to descend into the plains of Bithynia. Till the reign of Palaeologus, these passes had been vigilantly guarded by the militia of the country, who were repaid by their own safety and an exemption from taxes. The emperor abolished their privilege and assumed their office; but the tribute was rigorously collected, the custody of the passes was neglected, and the hardy mountaineers degenerated into a trembling crowd of peasants without spirit or discipline. It was on the twenty-seventh of July, in the year twelve hundred and ninety-nine of the Christian aera, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia; [Gibbon footnotes: See Pachymer, l.x.c.25, 26, l.xiii.c.33, 34, 36; and concerning the guard of the mountains, l.i.c.3-6: Nicephorus Gregoras, l.vii.c.l., and the first book of Laonicus Chalcondyles, the Athenian.] and the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose some foresight of the rapid and destructive growth of the monster. The annals of the twenty-seven years of his reign would exhibit a repetition of the same inroads; and his hereditary troops were multiplied in each campaign by the accession of captives and volunteers. Instead of retreating to the hills, he maintained the most useful and defensive posts; fortified the towns and castles which he had first pillaged; and renounced the pastoral life for the baths and palaces of his infant capitals. But it was not till Othman was oppressed by age and infirmities, that he received the welcome news of the conquest of Prusa, which had been surrendered by famine or treachery to the arms of his son Orchan. The glory of Othman is chiefly founded on that of his descendants; but the Turks have transcribed or composed a royal testament of his last counsels of justice and moderation.<sup>34</sup> From the conquest of Prusa, we may date the true aera of the Ottoman empire.

<sup>34</sup> Gibbon footnotes: "I am ignorant whether the Turks have any writers older than Mahomet II., nor can I reach beyond a meagre chronicle (Annales Turcici ad Annum 1550) translated by John Gaudier, and published by Leunclavius, (ad calcem Laonic. Chalcond. p. 311 -350,) with copious pandects, or

Another question Prescott has with Gibbon, is (a) the validity of 1449 instead of 1148 and; (b) a double event in 1449 that supposedly ends the 150 year period and another event that begins the 391 period the same year. As Prescott says it:

Before 1844 in William Miller's lectures, he gives both symbols to the Ottoman power. He adds the periods together, makes 514 years and 15 days date from July 27, 1299, and follow it straight through. Now when you go further you say we will start from July 27, 1299, and we come to 1499 [sic]. What happened then? We must have something on a day. What happened July 27, 1449, that both marked the ending of one period and the beginning of another, because you must not begin the next day. That is, when we are trying to arrive at Aug. 11, 1840 you can't say this period ends July 27, 1449, and the next began July 28. You have got to make them lap one day or else you are thrown out when you get to the end. That question must be answered. What marked the close of the 150 years on July 27, 1449? What event on that day marked the beginning of the next period? What marked the close of the next period? Until that is out of the way I don't see that we shall be helped very much by any papers to establish a date for something relating to the Ottoman Empire. (1919 Bible Conference)

Therefore the comments on 1449, as used by both Miller and Litch are significant.

#### **Gibbon's comments on 1449:**

In the long career of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, I have reached at length the last reign of the princes of Constantinople, who so feebly sustained the name and majesty of the Caesars. On the decease of John Palaeologus, who survived about four years the Hungarian crusade,<sup>(47)</sup> the royal family, by the death of Andronicus and the monastic profession of Isidore, was reduced to three princes, Constantine, Demetrius, and Thomas, the surviving sons of the emperor Manuel. Of these the first and the last were far distant in the Morea; but Demetrius, who possessed the domain of Selybria, was in the suburbs, at the head of a party: his ambition was not chilled by the public distress; and his conspiracy with the Turks and the schismatics had already disturbed the peace of his country. The funeral of the late emperor was accelerated with singular and even suspicious haste: the claim of Demetrius to the vacant throne was justified by a trite and flimsy sophism, that he was born in the purple, the eldest son of his father's reign. But the empress-mother, the senate and soldiers, the clergy and people, were unanimous in the cause of the lawful successor: and the despot Thomas,

---

commentaries. The history of the Growth and Decay (A.D. 1300 - 1683) of the Othman empire was translated into English from the Latin Ms. of Demetrius Cantemir, prince of Moldavia, (London, 1734, in folio.) The author is guilty of strange blunders in Oriental history; but he was conversant with the language, the annals, and institutions of the Turks. Cantemir partly draws his materials from the Synopsis of Saadi Effendi of Larissa, dedicated in the year 1696 to Sultan Mustapha, and a valuable abridgment of the original historians. In one of the Ramblers, Dr Johnson praises Knolles (a *General History of the Turks to the present Year*. London, 1603) as the first of historians, unhappy only in the choice of his subject. Yet I much doubt whether a partial and verbose compilation from Latin writers, thirteen hundred folio pages of speeches and battles, can either instruct or amuse an enlightened age, which requires from the historian some tincture of philosophy and criticism."

Extra note by the Rev. H. H. Milman 1782 (Written), 1845 (Revised)

We could have wished that M. von Hammer had given a more clear and distinct reply to this question of Gibbon. In a note, vol. i. p. 630. M. von Hammer shows that they had not only sheiks (religious writers) and learned lawyers, but poets and authors on medicine. But the inquiry of Gibbon obviously refers to historians. The oldest of their historical works, of which V. Hammer makes use, is the "Tarichi Aaschik Paschasade," i. e. the History of the Great Grandson of Aaschik Pasha, who was a dervis and celebrated ascetic poet in the reign of Murad (Amurath) I. Ahmed, the author of the work, lived during the reign of Bajazet II., but, he says, derived much information from the book of Scheik Jachshi, the son of Elias, who was Imaum to Sultan Orchan, (the second Ottoman king) and who related, from the lips of his father, the circumstances of the earliest Ottoman history. This book (having searched for it in vain for five-and-twenty years) our author found at length in the Vatican. All the other Turkish histories on his list, as indeed this, were written during the reign of Mahomet II. It does not appear whether any of the rest cite earlier authorities of equal value with that claimed by the "Tarichi Aaschik Paschasade." (in Quarterly Review, vol. xlix. p. 292.)]

who, ignorant of the change, accidentally returned to the capital, asserted with becoming zeal the interest of his absent brother. An ambassador, the historian Phranza, was immediately despatched to the court of Adrianople. Amurath received him with honour and dismissed him with gifts; but the gracious approbation of the Turkish sultan announced his supremacy, and the approaching downfall of the Eastern empire. By the hands of two illustrious deputies, the Imperial crown was placed at Sparta on the head of Constantine. In the spring he sailed from the Morea, escaped the encounter of a Turkish squadron, enjoyed the acclamations of his subjects, celebrated the festival of a new reign, and exhausted by his donatives the treasure, or rather the indigence, of the state. The emperor immediately resigned to his brothers the possession of the Morea; and the brittle friendship of the two princes, Demetrius and Thomas, was confirmed in their mother's presence by the frail security of oaths and embraces. His next occupation was the choice of a consort. A daughter of the doge of Venice had been proposed; but the Byzantine nobles objected the distance between an hereditary monarch and an elective magistrate; and in their subsequent distress, the chief of that powerful republic was not unmindful of the affront. Constantine afterwards hesitated between the royal families of Trebizond and Georgia; and the embassy of Phranza represents in his public and private life the last days of the Byzantine empire. [Phranza (l. iii. c. 1 - 6) deserves credit and esteem.]

It should be noticed here that, according to Gibbon, Amurath did not have believe he was yet supreme over the Eastern Empire: “the gracious approbation of the Turkish sultan announced his supremacy, and the *approaching downfall* of the Eastern empire.” That event was still in the future in his mind. He might believe he was superior, but until it was enacted in the conquest of Constantinople, it was merely his personal belief.<sup>35</sup> Prescott adds another comment in this regard regarding the subservience of Emperor John to the Ottoman Empire:

---

<sup>35</sup> Ottoman History: 1400 - 1452

Timour plundered Siwas and moved into Western Anatolia and Syria. Bayezid gathered his forces and attacked Angora in 1402. However, he was routed by Timour and taken prisoner and died in captivity in 1403.

On Bayezid's death, his sons declared separate, independent sultanates - Solyman in Romelia, Isa Chelebi in Balikeseer, Chelebi Mehmed in Amassia and Mousa Chelebi in Brusa.

Subsequently, Chelebi Mehmed became the sole sovereign in 1413. After his death in 1421 his son Amurath the Second took his place.

He suppressed a rebellion led by his brother Moustapha, attacked the Byzantines, made war with Venice and besieged Eghriboz and Morea. In 1430 he regained Salonica from the Venetians and Wallachia and Serbia joined the Ottoman Empire once more. In 1437 Hamidili, Tashili, Koniah and Beysheher were conquered.

Amurath left the throne to his young son Mehmed but this resulted in new attacks by the Crusaders. However, the invaders were routed and Amurath took the throne once more. He defeated another Crusader force in 1448 and then attacked Albania. Akcha-Hissar was besieged but not taken. <http://www.naqshbandi.org/ottomans/history/1400.htm>

On Amurath's death, his son Mehmed succeeded him. Having built the fortress of Roumelia he then besieged Istanbul. After a siege of 53 days the city fell on May 29th, 1453.

Another perspective on the true start of the empire comes from Edwin Bliss:

“The weakening of the Byzantine Empire, and its practical loss of power over the Danubian provinces, tempted these Turks across the Dardanelles, and they measured swords with the Serbs, Wallachs and others. Under Amurath, the founder of the [page 165] CAPTURE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

Janissaries, they became a terror to all, and the flag, whose red color was established by himself as token of the blood that flowed wherever they went, was flaunted in the very face of Christian Emperors. Then, however, came a check; Timour-Lenk (Timour the lame, Tamerlane), who had risen against his Sultan in the small canton of Trans-Oxiana, gathered to his standard the semi-barbarous tribes of Turkestan, spread through Khorassan, Persia, Georgia and Southern Russia; then south through Armenia and Mesopotamia into India. Then he turned again westward, and, influenced not a little, perhaps, by the presence in his court of some Turkish princes, deposed by the Ottoman Sultans, he captured Syria, and just as Bajazet was under the walls of Constantinople he heard that his own kingdoms were in danger. At

If the Emperor John, who died in 1448, "never forgot that he was a vassal of the Ottoman Empire," how can we assert that the Byzantine Empire did not become subject to Turkey until 1449? (quoted in Ford, 1980, A-204-205)

### From J.B. Bury:

#### From Litch:

Litch's rebuttal was contained in the booklet, *Prophetic Significance of Eastern and European Movements*, pp. 15-16. In 1873, in a work entitled *A Complete Harmony of Daniel and the Apocalypse*,<sup>36</sup> Litch commented on the 6th trumpet of Revelation 9:15:

The exact hour for [the angels] to be loosed was fixed. They were prepared *unto* an hour, day, month, and year. That is, the exact time for their loosing was fixed, to a year, a month, a day, and an hour; it is not an exact period during which they should act. (p. 170)<sup>37</sup>

#### From Loughborough:

John Loughborough, who penned one of the earliest Adventist histories of the period, presents the topic this way:

The fifth trumpet presents the rise of Mohammedanism with its cloud of errors, but especially the period of "five months," or one hundred and fifty literal years from the time they "had a king over them." July 27, 1299, Othman, the founder of the Ottoman empire, invaded the territory of Nicomedia. From that time the Ottomans harassed and "tormented" the Eastern empire of Rome till July 27, 1449, the one hundred and fifty years of the sounding of the fifth trumpet. At that time the Turks came with their forces against the city of Constantinople itself, using gunpowder in their warfare; and from a ponderous cannon, which the historian Gibbon says required sixty oxen to draw, they fired great rocks against the walls of Constantinople.

#### The Close of the Sixth Trumpet

About this time John Paleologus, who is set down by historians as the last Greek emperor, died. Constantine Deacozes was the rightful heir to the throne, but it is said that his fears of Amurath, the Turkish sultan, who was waging this warfare against him,

---

the famous battle of Konieh (Iconium) the Ottoman power was broken; but with the death of Timour his empire went to pieces and the Ottoman line again resumed its power. For another half century advance was made even more rapidly than before, and on either side of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles the arms of the Turks were victorious.

The capture of Constantinople, which followed in 1453, really marked the beginning of the Turkish Empire. The series of forays, with the occasional capture of an important city or even of a province in Asia Minor or the Balkan Peninsula, had become an organized campaign for the subjugation of the whole of Western Asia and Southeastern Europe. More than that, an entire change in form of government became necessary. Hitherto all of government that there had been was that of the army, and pertained to the immediate Moslem followers of the Sultan. The various tribes or nations who yielded to his arms, but refused to accept Islam, really had no relation whatever to his rule. They paid what tribute was demanded, but there was no such thing as regular civil government. When, however, Constantinople was captured, this condition could no longer continue. It was essential that there be some definite relation arranged between the Sultan and the large class of Greeks who had come to form so important a part of the empire. He realized that the whole position was changed; that he was no longer merely a general, but an emperor, and an emperor over a very heterogeneous empire." (Edwin Munsell Bliss, *Turkey and the Armenian Atrocities*, pp.165f)

<sup>36</sup> *A complete Harmony of Daniel and the Apocalypse*. (Published by Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, Philadelphia)

<sup>37</sup> Dirk Anderson says concerning this quote, "This commentary is more profound for what it does not say rather than what it says. Gone are the claims that the events of August 11, 1840, fulfilled the prophecy of Revelation 9:15." <http://www.ellenwhite.org/egw52.htm>

led him to ask permission of Amurath to ascend the throne. Such an act would almost seem a resignation of the throne to the Turks. In fact, very shortly the Ottomans had possession of the city of Constantinople and the Eastern empire of Rome. Thus they (politically) “killed” that empire which they had before “tormented.” They were to “slay” it for “an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year.”

Taking this as prophetic time, a day for a year, how long a time would it be? The problem is a simple one: a year, 360 days, or years; a month, 30 days, or years; and oneday, one year,-in all 391 days, or, literally, 391 years. An hour being the twenty-fourth part of a day, as a symbol would be half a month, or fifteen days. The whole time of Mohammedan independent rule of Eastern Roman territory would therefore be 391 years and 15 days. This added to July 27, 1449, brings us to August 11, 1840, for the termination of the period of **Turkish independence, as set forth under the sixth trumpet.**

#### Dr. Josiah Litch Predicts the Fall of the Ottoman Empire

In 1838 Dr. Josiah Litch, of Philadelphia, Pa., having embraced the truth set forth by William Miller, united in the work of giving greater publicity to the message. He prepared articles for the public print on the subject of the seven trumpets of the Revelation. He took the unqualified position that the sixth trumpet would cease to sound and the Ottoman power fall on the 11th day of August, 1840, and that that would demonstrate to the world that a day in symbolic prophecy represents a year of literal time. Some of the brethren, even those who believed with him on this point, trembled with fear for the result “if it should not come to pass” as he said. This did not, however, daunt him, but he went forward to do all in his power to give publicity to his views on the Turkish question. Public journals spread abroad the claim he had made on the subject. Infidel clubs discussed the question in their meetings, and said, “Here is a man that ventures something, and if this matter comes out as he says, it will establish his claim without a doubt that a day in prophecy symbolizes a year, and that twenty-three hundred days is so many years, and that they will terminate in 1844.” The publication of Dr. Litch’s lecture made a general stir, and many thousands were thus called to watch for the termination of the difficulties that had sprung up between Mehemet Ali, the pasha of Egypt, and the Turkish sultan. Hundreds said, “If this affair terminates as the doctor has asserted, it will establish the ‘year-day’ principle of interpreting symbolic time, and we will be Adventists.”

#### The Turkish Sultan at War with the Pasha of Egypt

For several years previous to 1840, the sultan had been embroiled in a war with Mehemet Ali, pasha of Egypt. In 1838 the trouble between the sultan and his Egyptian vassal was for the time being restrained by the influence of the foreign ambassadors. In 1839, however, hostilities were again begun, and were prosecuted until, in a general battle between the armies of the sultan and Mehemet, the sultan’s army was entirely cut up and destroyed, and his fleet taken by Mehemet and carried into Egypt. So completely had the sultan been reduced, that, when the war again began in August, he had only two first-rates and three frigates as the sad remains of the once powerful Turkish fleet. This fleet Mehemet positively refused to give up and return to the sultan, and declared that if the powers attempted to take it from him, he would burn it. In this posture affairs stood, when, in 1840, England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia interposed, and determined on a settlement of the difficulty; for it was evident that if let alone, Mehemet would soon become master of the sultan’s throne.

#### Intervention of the Allied Powers

“The sultan accepted this intervention of the allied powers, and thus made a voluntary surrender of the question into their hands. A conference of these powers was held in London, the sheik, Effendi Bey Likgis, being present as Ottoman plenipotentiary. An ultimatum was drawn up, to be presented to the pasha of Egypt, whereby the sultan was to offer him the hereditary government of Egypt, and all that part of Syria extending from the Gulf of Suez to the Lake of Tiberias, together with the province of Acre, for life; he, on his part, to evacuate all other parts of the sultan’s dominions then occupied by him and to return the Ottoman fleet. In case he refused

this offer from the sultan, the four powers were to take the matter into their own hands, and use such other means to bring him to terms as they should see fit.

“It was apparent that just as soon as this ultimatum should be put into the hands of Mehemet Ali, the matter would forever be beyond the control of the former [the sultan], and the disposal of his affairs would, from that moment, be in the hands of the foreign powers.

#### The Prophecy Fulfilled-End of Turkish Independence

“The sultan dispatched Rifat Bey on a government steamer to Alexandria, to communicate the ultimatum to the pasha. It was put into his hands, and by him taken in charge, on the eleventh day of August, 1840! On the same day a note was addressed by the sultan to the ambassadors of the four powers, inquiring what plan was to be adopted in case the pasha should refuse to comply with the terms of the ultimatum; to which they made answer that provision had been made, and there was no necessity of his alarming himself about any contingency that might arise. This day the period of three hundred ninety-one years and fifteen days allotted to the continuance of the Ottoman power ended; and where was the sultan’s independence?- Gone!” [Litch footnotes: “See Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation, pp., 497, 498.]

From that day to this the sultan has had to move under the dictation of the powers, and watch the dismemberment of his kingdom, as slice by slice it has been appropriated to their own use.

This striking fulfillment of the prophecy had a tremendous effect upon the public mind. It intensified the interest of the people to hear upon the subject of fulfilled and fulfilling prophecy. Dr. Litch said that within a few months after August 11, 1840, he had received letters from more than one thousand prominent infidels, some of them leaders of infidel clubs, in which they stated that they had given up the battle against the Bible, and had accepted it as God’s revelation to man. Some of these were fully converted to God, and a number of them became able speakers in the great second advent movement. Some expressed themselves to Dr. Litch on this wise: “We have said that expositors of prophecy quote from the musty pages of history to substantiate their claims of prophetic fulfillments; but in this case we have the living facts right before our eyes.” To illustrate how, just at the close of the sixth trumpet, the advent message began to go “with a loud voice,” I will note a case as related to me by one of the actors in this message.

In the year 1840, E. C. Williams, an extensive tent and sail maker, of Rochester, N.Y., accepted the message, and invited Elders Miller and Himes to come to Rochester and speak to the thousands of that city. They replied that they lacked the money necessary to secure a hall of sufficient size to accommodate the people. He replied, “I have a circular tent 120 feet in diameter. I will pitch it, seat it, and care for it, free. Come on and proclaim the message.” “They came,” he said to me, “and the tent did not half hold those who came to hear, so I put in a forty-foot splice, making a tent 160 x 120 feet in size. This tent was filled with people daily, and hundreds crowded near on the outside, all eager to hear the word.”

To meet the growing interest, large tents were used, and grove meetings were held in the summer season. Some of the largest church buildings and public halls were used in the winter, and all were packed to their utmost capacity with interested listeners. Instead of Elder Miller now standing, as he had previous to 1840, “almost alone” in declaring the message, about three hundred joined him in publicly proclaiming the termination of the twenty-three-hundred-day period, and in giving the cry, “There shall be time no longer,” and, “The hour of his judgment is come.” Thus we see how, when the Lord’s time came for the message to make its world-wide advancement, his word was fulfilled, and the millions were moved with a desire to hear the call.

What was true of the movement in America was true in other countries. From the year 1840, instead of a few individuals scattering their publications, scores sprang, as it were, to the front to proclaim the cry. In England there were seven hundred ministers of the Church of England alone proclaiming the message, to say nought of the scores of others engaged in the same work. In more than a score of the different leading nations

of the earth a message was going with that zeal which led the looker-on to say, "This people are terribly in earnest." (1905, pp.pp.128-133)

### **From Haskell:**

Haskell, writing some years after the 1840s was in constant expectation of the Turkish Empire disappearing, something predicted by Litch, but which did not occur when predicted in 1840:

This is a wonderful prophecy, the only one in the Bible where the time of the fulfillment is given to the very day. At the end of this period, Turkey would cease to be an independent power. Three hundred and ninety-one years and fifteen days from July 27, 1449, brings us to August 11, 1840. There are four great waymarks in the world's history connected with Constantinople. First, when it was founded in 330 A.D. second, its capture by the Turks, July 27, 1449; third, when the sultan of Turkey signed away his independence August 11, 1840. There is no date for the fourth great waymark; namely, when the capital of Turkey will be removed from Constantinople to Jerusalem "between the seas in the glorious holy mountain."

In 1838 Josiah Litch and William Miller, after a careful study of the prophecies, came to the conclusion that on this last date nations might expect to see the Turkish sultan surrender his power. This prophecy was published to the world, but there were events transpiring which also called the attention of nations to Constantinople. The sultan of Turkey and Mehemet Ali, pashi of Egypt, were at war, the pasha refusing an indemnity demanded by the ruler of Turkey. In 1839 the pasha was victorious in battle over the Turkish army, and he sent another force under command of his son into Syria and Asia Minor, and threatened to carry his victorious arms against Constantinople. At this juncture, England, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, combined in the demand that the pasha should confine himself to Syria and Egypt. A council of these four powers was held July 15, 1840. The ruler of Turkey agreed to abide by their decision and was only too glad to have his life saved by their intervention. He thereby voluntarily surrendered all rights into the hands of the combined forces of Western Europe. In the official document drawn up by representatives of the nations concerned, are these words:

"It having been felt that all the zealous labors of the conferences of London in the settlement of the pasha's pretensions were useless, and that the only public way was to have resources to coercive measures to reduce him to obedience in case he persisted in not listening to pacific overtures, the powers have, together with the Ottoman plenipotentiary, drawn up and signed a treaty whereby the sultan offers the pasha the hereditary government of Egypt, . . . the pasha, on his part, evacuating all other parts of the sultan's dominions now occupied by him, and returning the Ottoman fleet. . . If the pasha refuses to accede to them, it is evident that the evil consequences to fall upon him will be attributed solely to his own fault."

This treaty was signed, and the ultimatum was officially put in the power of Mehemet Ali on August 11, 1840. Since that time Turkey has been known everywhere as the "Sick Man of The East." Daniel prophesied concerning him saying, "He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." At any moment, when the jealous powers of Europe can decide, either peaceably, or in battle, which one of them shall occupy Constantinople, the "Sick Man" will speedily take his departure from Europe. That movement, for which nations are now on the alert, will be the sign of still more important changes in the heavenly court.

The importance of the prophecy, and the exactness with which it was fulfilled, to the very day, should lead to a careful investigation of that divine history, which circles about the year 1840 to 1844. Its study will lead men to look for changes in the heavens as well as upon the earth; for when the capital of Turkey is removed to Palestine, then Christ, finishing His work in the sanctuary, throws His censur on the earth as a signal for the final dissolution of all things. (1977, pp.177-179)

What is fascinating in Haskell's report on the topic is his (assumedly) verbatim account of the official document. In that report, we see the statement “, the powers have, *together with* the Ottoman plenipotentiary.” Far from portraying Turkey as a servant of the England, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, it portrays them as a group in alliance against the pasha of Egypt. The four powers are presented here as standing on equal status with Turkey. In modern diplomacy, the act of seeking the assistance of other powers to encourage a certain power to concede to certain terms is not, as Litch and Miller have us believe, as act of subservience. Just look at any number of diplomatic acts of recent times, for example, the United States President Bush getting the Chinese president to open talks with the Korean prime minister over the nuclear testing issue. Does that mean that the United States has indicated its subservience to the Chinese government? The purpose of diplomatic discussions and alliances is to find a good solution to a situation by any and all means possible. If that means standing by the side of a power you are at odds with in other issues, then so be it. This act does not indicate subservience to that power. It just indicates expedience for a common cause. In the case of the alliance of the five powers, the same principle is involved. They did not want the pasha as ruler of Turkey and so they supported the requests of Mehemet Ali.

The fact that this is the official statement of the relationship between the five power involved in the incident, and assuming that Haskell's report is accurate, then the document overthrows what SDA historicists assert concerning it. Therefore rather than being a date for the fulfillment for the end of the 391 years, it was a non-event, both in prophetic fulfillment and in Turkish history. It is not a date of significance in Turkish history.

Haskell comments further on this in his book on Daniel the prophet:

At the time of the end (1798) the kings of the north and the south again contended. From the founding of Constantinople by Constantine in 330, the power which held that city had maintained control of the Mediterranean, for Constantinople is recognized by all nations as the key to both Asia and Europe. In the time of the end, history will again center about this city.

As in times past, so again we are obliged to trace far back to find the source of event which now appear in full view. About the time that the papacy was growing into a fully-fledged monarchy, recognized among nations of the earth, another power had birth. This new work of Satan came in the form of Mohammedism, which to-day holds about one sixth of the world's population in its grasp. The new doctrine originated in Arabia, from whence it spread as a smoke from the bottomless pit. Syria fell under its power, but Egypt became the center of its influences. Egypt has felt every evil influence, and the banks of the Nile have fed every form of idolatry.

Mohammedism is but another form of Egyptian darkness. By the power of the sword the followers of Mohammed strove to enter Europe. The western horn of the Crescent, the Moslem symbol, was extended into Spain in the early part of the eighth century, and for a time all Europe was threatened, but the battle of Tours (732) stopped the progress of the conquerors. In 1453, however, Constantinople was captured, and has since remained in the hand of the Turks, the boldest advocates of the doctrine of Mohammed. As the *founding* of Constantinople is a guidepost in history, so the capture of that city in 1453 is another landmark. One of the greatest checks received by the papacy was due to the influx into Italy of Greek scholars, driven from Constantinople by the incoming Mohammedans. The discovery of America was due to the closing of the eastern passage to the rich islands of the Indian Ocean by the Mohammedans in Constantinople and Asia Minor, and so in more ways than is usually thought, God worked to advance truth through those who were ignorant of his truth.

Not only Egypt, but Syria and Turkey in Europe, belonged to the Mohammedans, and he has entered “the glorious land,” and a Moslem mosque occupies the site where once stood the temple of Solomon. Edom, Moab, and Ammon, however, escaped the

hand of this conquering power, and these countries receive an annual tribute from the Turks who pass in caravans on their way to Mecca.

The ambition of Napoleon to establish the authority of Europe in Egypt might have been the beginning of the last struggle between the north and the south. Even in this day Russia and France made friends, but the time had not yet come for the Turk to take his departure from Europe, and England took the part of Egypt against the arms of Napoleon. Napoleon recognized the strength of Constantinople, so also did Russia, and there has been a constant jealousy among the nations of Europe lest one should outwit the others, and become the possessor of that stronghold.

Every eye is centered on that one spot, and has been for years. Turkey is known universally as the "Sick Man of the East," and the only reason he does not die is because intoxicants are administered, figuratively speaking, by first one nation then another. The time will come when he will remove from Constantinople, and take up his abode in Palestine; that is, plant his tabernacle between the Mediterranean and Red Seas. Time and again the world has been brought to realize that the end of all things is near at hand, for all know that when the Turk steps out of Constantinople, there will be a general breaking up of Europe. They may not name this impending conflict the battle of Armageddon but God has so named it. ...No man knows when Turkey will take its departure from Europe, but when that move is made, earth's history will be short. Then it will be said, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still, ...and he that is righteous let him be righteous still." ...While the world watches Turkey, let the servant of God watch the movements of his great High priest, whose ministry is nearly over. (1904, pp.246-249)

Here we see Haskell, in 1904, still waiting for the event that should have happened not long after 1840.

#### From Smith:

Concerning the five month period, Smith says:

**[Rev.9] Verse 10** *And they had tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails: and their power was to hurt men five months. 11* *And they had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon.*

"*To Hurt Men Five Months.*"--The question arises, What men were they to hurt five months?--Undoubtedly the same they were afterward to slay (see verse 15), "the third part of men," or third of the Roman Empire--the Greek division of it.

When were they to begin their work of torment? The eleventh verse answers the question.

"They had a king over them." From the death of Mohammed until near the close of the thirteenth century, the Mohammedans were divided into various factions under several leaders, with no *general* civil government extending over them all. Near the close of the thirteenth century, Othman founded a government which has since been known as the Ottoman government, or empire, which grew until it extended over all the principal Mohammedan tribes, consolidating them into one grand monarchy.

Their king is called "the angel of the bottomless pit." An angel signifies a messenger, a minister, either good or bad, and not always a spiritual being. "The angel of the bottomless pit" would be the chief minister of the religion which came from thence when it was opened. That religion is Mohammedanism, and the sultan was its chief minister. His name in the Hebrew tongue is "Abaddon," the destroyer; in Greek, "Apollyon," one that exterminates, or destroys. Having two different names in two languages, it is evident that the character rather than the name of the power is intended to be represented. If so, as expressed in both languages, he is a destroyer. Such has always been the character of the Ottoman government.

But *when* did Othman make his first assault on the Greek empire?-- According to Gibbon "it was on the twenty-seventh of July, in the year twelve hundred and ninety-nine of the Christian Era, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomaedia; and the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose some foresight of the rapid and

destructive growth of the monster." [Smith footnotes: "Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. VI, chap. 64, p. 226."]

Von Hammer, the German historian of Turkey, and other authorities have placed this event in 1301. But to what date do the historic sources of this period testify? Pachymeres was a church and state historian, born at Nicaea, which was 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, in 1669, worked out a complete chronology of Pachymeres' history, giving the dates for the eclipses of the moon and the sun, as well as other events, recorded by Pachymeres in his work. Concerning the date 1299 Possinus 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 thoroughgoing 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 Othman] 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 if 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 of our Lord 1299." [Smith footnotes: "Possinus, *Observationum Pachymerianarum*, Book III (Chronology), chap. 8, sec. 5, 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 strap of the Persians, called also Ottomanes, the founder of the still reigning dynasty of the Turcs, grew strong by joining to himself a great number of fierce bandits from Paphlagonia." [Smith footnotes: "*Ibid.*, bk. 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.

Gregoras, also a contemporary of Othman, supports Gibbon and Pachymeres in establishing the date 1299 in his account of the division of Anatolia. This division among ten Turkish emirs took place in 1300, as supported by reliable historians. Gregoras states that in the division of Bithynia, indicating that Othman had already fought the battle of Bapheum, and had conquered certain parts of this eastern Roman-Greek territory.

"The calculations of some writers have gone upon the supposition that the period should begin with the foundation of the Ottoman Empire; but this is evidently an error; for they not only were to have a king over them, but were to torment men five months. But the period of torment could not begin before the first attack of the tormentors, which was, as above [stated], July 27, 1299." [Smith footnotes: "Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, Vol. II, p. 180."]

The calculation which follows, founded on this starting point, was made and first published in a work entitled, *Christ's Second Coming*, by Josiah Litch, in 1838.

" 'And their power was to hurt men five months.' Thus far their commission extended, to torment by constant depredations, but not politically to kill them. 'Five months' [thirty days to a month, one hundred and fifty days], that is, one hundred and fifty years. Commencing July 27, 1299, the one hundred and fifty years reach to 1449. During that whole period the Turks were engaged in an almost perpetual war with the Greek Empire, but yet *without conquering it*. They seized upon and held several of the Greek provinces, but still Greek independence was maintained in Constantinople. But in 1449, the termination of the one hundred and fifty years, a change came," [Smith

footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 181.]" the history of which will be found under the succeeding trumpet. (1944, pp. 502-505)

Concerning the meaning and application of the "hour, and a day, and a month and a year" period, Smith says:

*The Sixth Trumpet.*--"The first woe was to continue from the rise of Mahometanism until the end of the five months. Then the first woe was to end, and the second begin. And when the sixth angel sounded, it was commanded to take off the restraints which had been imposed on the nation, by which they were restricted to the work of *tormenting* men, and their commission extended to slay the third part of men. This command came from the four horns of the golden altar." [Smith footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 182."]

*The Four Angels.*--These are the four principal sultanies of which the Ottoman Empire was composed, located in the country watered by the Euphrates. These sultanies were situated at Aleppo, Iconium, Damacus, and Bagdad. Previously they had been restrained; but God commanded, and they were loosed.

Late in the year 1448, as the close of the 150-year period approached, John Palaeologus died without leaving a son to follow him on the throne of the Eastern Empire. His brother Constantine, the lawful successor, would not venture to ascend the throne without the consent of the Turkish sultan. Ambassadors therefore went to Adrianople, received the approbation of the sultan, and returned with gifts for the new sovereign. Early in the year 1449, under these ominous circumstances, Constantine, the last of the Greek emperors, was crowned.

The historian Gibbon tells the story:

"On the decease of John Palaeologus, . . . the royal family, by the death of Andronicus and the monastic profession of Isidore, was reduced to three princes, Constantine, Demetrius, and Thomas, the surviving sons of the emperor Manuel. Of these the first and the last were far distant in the Morea. . . . The empress-mother, the senate and soldiers, the clergy and people, were unanimous in the cause of the lawful successor: and the despot Thomas, who ignorant of the change, accidentally returned to the capital, asserted with becoming zeal the interest of his absent brother. An ambassador, the historian Phranza, was immediately dispatched to the court of Adrianople. Amurath received him with honor and dismissed him with gifts; but the gracious approbation of the Turkish sultan announced his supremacy, and the approaching downfall of the Eastern empire. By the hands of two illustrious deputies, the Imperial crown was placed at Sparta on the head of Constantine. [Smith footnotes: "Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. VI, chap. 67, p. 365."]

"Let this historical fact be carefully examined in connection with the prediction [given] above. This was not a violent assault made on the Greeks, by which their empire was overthrown and their independence taken away, but simply a voluntary surrender of that independence into the hands of the Turks, by saying, 'I cannot reign unless you permit.' " [Smith footnotes: "Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, Vol. II, pp. 182, 183."]

The four angels were loosed for an hour, a day, a month, and a year, to slay the third part of men. This period, during which Ottoman supremacy was to exist, amounts to three hundred ninety-one years and fifteen days. Thus: A prophetic year is three hundred and sixty prophetic days, or three hundred and sixty literal years; a prophetic month, thirty prophetic days, is thirty literal years; one prophetic day is one literal year; and an hour, or the twenty-fourth part of a literal year year, or fifteen days; the whole amounting to three hundred and ninety-one years and fifteen days.

"But although the four angels were thus loosed by the voluntary submission of the Greeks, yet another doom awaited the seat of empire. Amurath, the sultan to whom the submission of Deacozes was made, and by whose permission he reigned in Constantinople, soon after died, and was succeeded in the empire, in 1451, by Mahomet II, who set his heart on Constantinople, and determined to make it a prey.

"He accordingly made preparations for besieging and taking the city. The siege commenced on the 6th of April, 1453, and ended in the taking of the city, and death of the last of the Constantines, on the 16th day of May following. And the eastern city of the Caesars became the seat of the Ottoman Empire." [Smith footnotes: "*Ibid.*, p. 183."]

The arms and mode of warfare which were used in the siege in which Constantinople was to be overthrown and held in subjection were, as we shall see, distinctly noticed by the prophet.

**Verse 16** *And the number of the army of the horsemen were two hundred thousand thousand: and I heard the number of them.*

"Innumerable hordes of horses, and them that sat on them! Gibbon describes the first invasion of the Roman territories by the Turks thus: 'The myriads of Turkish horse overspread a frontier of six hundred miles, from Tauris to Azeroum, and the blood of 130,000 Christian was a grateful sacrifice to the Arabian prophet.' Whether the number is designed to convey the idea of any definite number, the reader must judge. Some suppose 200,000 twice told is meant, and then, following some historians, find that the number of Turkish warriors in the siege of Constantinople. Some think 200,000,000 to mean all the Turkish warriors during the 391 years fifteen days of their triumph over the Greeks." [Smith footnotes: "*Ibid.*, pp. 183, 184."] Nothing can be affirmed on the point. And it is not at all essential.

**Verse 17** *And thus I saw the horses in the vision, and them that sat on them, having breastplates of fire, and of jacinth, and brimstone: and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions; and out of their mouths issued fire and smoke and brimstone.*

The first part of this description may have reference to the appearance of these horsemen. Fire, representing a color, stands for red, "as red as fire" being a frequent term of expression; jacinth, or hyacinth, for blue; and brimstone, for yellow. These colors greatly predominated in the dress of these warriors; so that the description, according to this view, would be accurately met in the Turkish uniform, which was composed largely of red, or scarlet, blue, and yellow. The heads of the horses were in appearance as the heads of lions, to denote their strength, courage, and fierceness; while the last part of the verse undoubtedly has reference to the use of gunpowder and firearms for purposes of war, which were then but recently introduced. As the Turks discharged their firearms on horseback, it would appear to the distant beholder that the fire, smoke, and brimstone issued out of the horses' mouths.

Quite an agreement exists among commentators in applying the prophecy concerning the fire, smoke, and brimstone to the use of gunpowder by the Turks in their warfare against the Eastern Empire. [Smith footnotes: "See notes on Revelation 9: 17 in Adam Clarke, *Commentary on the New Testament*, Vol. II, p. 1003; Albert Barnes, *Notes on Revelation*, p. 264; *The Cottage Bible*, Vol. II, p. 1399."] But they generally allude simply to the heavy ordnance, the large cannon, employed by that power; whereas the prophecy mentions especially the "horses," and the fire "issuing from their mouths," as though smaller arms were used, and used on horseback. Barnes thinks this was the case; and a statement from Gibbon confirms this view. he says: "The incessant volleys of lances and arrows were accompanied with the smoke, the sound, and the fire of their musketry and cannon." [Smith footnotes: "Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Vol. VI, chap. 68, p. 388."] Here is good historical evidence that muskets were used by the Turks; and secondly, it is undisputed that their general warfare they fought principally on horseback. The inference is therefore well supported that they used firearms on horseback, accurately fulfilling the prophecy, according to the illustration above referred to.

Respecting the use of firearms by the Turks in their campaign against Constantinople, Elliott thus speaks:

"It was to 'the fire and the smoke and the sulphur,' to the artillery and firearms of Mahomet, that the killing of the third part of men, *i.e.*, the capture of Constantinople,

and by consequence the destruction of the Greek Empire, was owing. Eleven hundred years and more had now elapsed since her foundation by Constantine. In the course of them, Goths, Huns, Avars, Persians, Bulgarians, Saracens, Russians, and indeed the Ottoman Turks themselves, had made their hostile assaults, or laid siege against it. But the fortifications were impregnable by them. Constantinople survived, *and with it the Greek Empire*. Hence the anxiety of the sultan Mahomet to find that which would remove the obstacle. 'Canst thou cast a cannon,' was his question to the founder of cannon that deserted to him, 'of size sufficient to batter down the wall of

Constantinople?' Then the foundry was established at Adrianople, the cannon cast, the artillery prepared, and the siege began.

"It well deserves remark, how Gibbon, always the unconscious commentator on the Apocalyptic prophecy, puts this new instrumentality of war into the foreground of his picture, in his eloquent and striking narrative of the final catastrophe of the Greek Empire. In preparation for it, he gives the history of the recent invention of gunpowder, 'that mixture of saltpeter, sulphur, and charcoal;' tells, as before said, of the foundry of the cannon at Adrianople; then, in the progress of the siege itself, describes how 'the volleys of lances and arrows were accompanied with smoke, the sound, and the fire of the musketry and cannon;' how 'the long order of Turkish artillery was pointed against the walls, fourteen batteries thundering at once on the most accessible places;' how 'the fortifications which had stood for ages against hostile violence were dismantled on all sides by the Ottoman cannon, many breaches opened, and near the gate of St. Romanus, four towers leveled with the ground:' how, 'as from the lines, the galleys and the bridge, the Ottoman artillery thundered on all sides, the camp and city, the Greeks and the Turks, were involved in a cloud of smoke, which could only be dispelled by the final deliverance or destruction of the Roman empire:' and how the besiegers at length 'rushing through the breaches,' 'Constantinople was irretrievably subdued, her empire subverted, and her religion trampled in the dust by the Moslem conquerors.' I say it well deserves observation how markedly and strikingly Gibbon attributes the capture of the city, and so the destruction of the empire, to the Ottoman artillery. For what is it but a comment on the words of the prophecy? 'By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the sulphur, which issued out their mouths.' " [Smith footnotes: "Edward B. Elliott, *Horae Apocalypticæ*, pp. 478, 479."]

**Verse 18** *By these three was the third part of men killed, by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths. 19 For their power is in their mouth, and in their tails: for their tails were like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt.*

These verses express the deadly effect of the new mode of warfare introduced. It was by means of these agents--gunpowder, firearms, and cannon--that Constantinople was finally overcome, and given into the hands of the Turks.

In addition to the fire, smoke, and brimstone, which apparently issued out of their mouths, it is said that their power was also in their tails. The meaning of the expression appears to be that horses' tails were the symbol, or emblem, of their authority. It is a remarkable fact that the horse's tail is a well-known Turkish standard, a symbol of office and authority. The image before the mind of John would seem to have been that he saw the horses belching out fire and smoke, and, what was equally strange, he saw that their power of spreading desolation was connected with the tails of the horses. Anyone looking on a body of cavalry with such banners, or ensigns, would be struck with this unusual or remarkable appearance, and would speak of their banners as concentrating and directing their power.

This supremacy of the Mohammedans over the Greeks was to continue, as already noticed, three hundred and ninety-one years and fifteen days. "Commencing when the one hundred and fifty years ended in 1449, the period would end August 11, 1840. Judging from the manner of the commencement of the Ottoman supremacy, that it was by a voluntary acknowledgment on the part of the Greek emperor that he only reigned by permission of the Turkish sultan, we should naturally conclude that the fall or departure of the Ottoman independence would be brought about the same way; that at the end of the specified period [that is, on the 11th of August, 1840] the sultan would

voluntarily surrender his independence into the hands of the Christian powers," [Smith footnotes: "Josiah Litch, *Prophetic Expositions*, Vol. II, p. 189."] just as he had, three hundred ninety-one years and fifteen days before, received it from the hands of the Christian emperor, Constantine XIII. (1944, pp.505-513)

Concerning the events between the Viceroy of Egypt and the sultan of the Ottoman Empire, around the ending of the 391-year period, Smith says:

So completely had the sultan's fleet been reduced, that, when hostilities commenced in August, he had only two first-rates and three frigates as the sad remains of the once powerful Turkish fleet. This fleet Mehemet positively refused to give up and return to the sultan, and declared if the powers attempted to take it from him, he would burn it. In this posture affairs stood, when, in 1840, England, Russia, Austria and Prussia interposed, and determined on a settlement of the difficulty; for it was evident, if let alone, Mehemet would soon become master of the sultan's throne.<sup>38</sup>

The sultan accepted this intervention of the great powers, and thus made a voluntary surrender of the question into their hands. A conference of those powers was made in London, the Sheik Effendi Bey Likgis being present as Ottoman plenipotentiary. An agreement was drawn up to be presented to the pasha of Egypt, whereby the sultan was to offer him the hereditary government of Egypt, and all that part of Syria extending from the Gulf of Suez to the Lake of Tiberias, together with the province of Acre, for life; he on his part to evacuate all other parts of the sultan's dominions then occupied by him, and to return the Ottoman fleet. In case he refused this offer from the sultan, the four powers were to take the matter into their own hands, and use such other means to bring him to terms as they should see fit.

It should be obvious that as soon as this ultimatum should be placed under the jurisdiction of Mehemet Ali, pasha of Egypt, the matter would be forever beyond the control of the sultan, and the disposal of his affairs would, from that moment be in the hands of foreign powers. The sultan dispatched Rifat Bey on a government steamer to Alexandria, to communicate the ultimatum to Mehemet Ali. The ultimatum was placed at his disposal *on the eleventh day of August, 1840*.<sup>39</sup> On the same day, in Constantinople, a note was addressed by the sultan to the ambassadors of the four powers, inquiring what plan was to be adopted in case the pasha should refuse to comply with the terms of the ultimatum, to which they made answer that provision had been made, and *there was no necessity of his alarming himself about any contingency that might arise*.

The facts are substantiated by the following quotations:

"By the French steamer of the 24th, we have advices from Egypt to the 16th. They show no alteration in the resolution of the Pacha. Confiding in the valor of his Arab army, and in the strength of the fortifications which defend his capital, he seems determined to abide by the last alternative; and as recourse to this, therefore, is now inevitable, all hope may be considered as at an end of a termination of the affair without bloodshed. Immediately on the arrival of the Cyclops steamer with the news of the convention of the *four powers*, Mehemet Ali, it is stated, had quitted Alexandria, to make a short tour through Lower Egypt. The object of his absenting himself at such a moment being partly to avoid conferences with the European consuls, but principally to endeavor, by his own presence, to arouse the fanaticism of the Bedouin tribes, and facilitate the raising of his new levies. During the interval of this absence, the *Turkish government steamer, which had reached Alexandria on the 11th, with the envoy Rifat Bey on board*, had been by his orders placed in quarantine, and she was not released

<sup>38</sup> Smith footnotes: "Josiah Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About A.D. 1843*, p. 157."

<sup>39</sup> When do you date this so-called surrender of supremacy from? When he agreed at the London conference to allow the four powers to do this and signed it on 15<sup>th</sup> July? From the issue of the agreement to the pasha (11 August)? Or from the time that the pasha actually agrees to the agreement and begins to withdraw (27 November)?

from it till the 16th. Previous, however, to the poet's <sup>40</sup> [boat's] leaving, and on the very day on which he [she] had been admitted to pratique, the above-named functionary had an audience of the Pacha, and had communicated to him the command of the Sultan, with respect to the evacuation of the Syrian provinces, appointing another audience for the next day, when, in the presence of the consuls of the European powers, he would receive from him his definite answer, and inform him of the alternative of his refusing to obey; giving him ten days which have been allotted him by the convention to decide the course he should think fit to adopt." <sup>41</sup>

The correspondent of the London *Morning Chronicle*, in a communication dated "Constantinople, August 12, 1840," says:

"I can add but little to my last letter on the subject of the plans of the Four Powers; and I believe that the details I then gave you compose everything that is yet decided on. The portion of the Pacha, as I then stated, is not to extend beyond the line of Acre, and does not include either Arabia or Candia. Egypt alone is to be hereditary in his family, and the province of Acre to be considered as a pachalik, to be governed by his son during his lifetime, but afterwards to depend on the will of the Porte; and even this latter is only to be granted to him on the condition of his accepting these terms and delivering up the Ottoman fleet within the period of ten days. In the event of his not doing so, this pachalik is to be cut off. Egypt alone is then to be offered, with another ten days for him to deliberate on it before actual force be employed against him. The manner, however, of applying the force, should he refuse to comply with these terms--whether a simple blockade is to be established on the coast, or whether his capital is to be bombarded and his armies attacked in the Syrian provinces--is the point which still remains to be learned; *nor does a note delivered yesterday by the four ambassadors, in answer to a question put to them by the Porte, as to the plan to be adopted in such an event, throw the least light on this subject. It simply states that provision had been made, and there was no necessity for the Divan alarming itself about any contingency that might afterward arise.*" <sup>42</sup>

Let us analyze the foregoing quotations:

*First.*--The ultimatum reached Alexandria on August 11, 1840.

*Second.*--The letter of the correspondent of the *London Morning Chronicle* is dated August 12, 1840.

*Third.*--The correspondent states that the question of the Sublime Porte was put to the representatives of the four great powers, and the answer received "*yesterday*." So in his own capital, "*yesterday*" the Sublime Porte applied to the ambassadors of the four Christian powers of Europe as to what measures had been taken in reference to a circumstance vitally affecting his empire; and was told that "*provision had been made*," but he could not know what it was; and that he need not give himself any alarm "about any contingency which might arise"! From that day, "*yesterday*," *which was August 11, 1840*--they, the four Christian powers of Europe, and not he, would manage that.

On August 11, 1840, the period of three hundred ninety-one years and fifteen days, allotted to the continuance of the Ottoman power, ended; and *where was the sultan's independence?*--GONE! Who had the supremacy of the Ottoman empire in their hands?--The *four great powers*; and that empire has existed ever since only by the *sufferance* of these Christian powers. Thus was the prophecy fulfilled to the very letter.

From the first publication of the calculation of this matter in 1838, before referred to, the time set for the fulfillment of the prophecy was watched by thousands with intense interest. The exact accomplishment of the event predicted, showing, as it did,

<sup>40</sup> Smith footnotes: "The word "poet's" in this newspaper account is apparently a printer's error. The substitution of the word "boat's" with a change of pronouns obviously gives the correct meaning of the story."--*Editors*.

<sup>41</sup> Smith footnotes: "London *Morning Chronicle*, September 18, 1840, extract from a correspondent's letter dated 'Constantinople, August 27, 1840.'"

<sup>42</sup> Smith footnotes: "*Ibid.*, September 3, 1840."

the right application of the prophecy, gave a mighty impetus to the great advent movement then beginning to attract the attention of the world. (1944, pp.513-517)

Smith uses the wording of journalists' reports to prove his point, rather than looking at the wording of the actual agreement produced by the London Conference. The actual agreement places the sultan with equal standing with the other four powers, regardless as to how the powers executed the agreement. The Sultan was an *equal* signatory to the agreement.

**From Prescott:<sup>43</sup>**

Prescott says that he checked the original Greek from the Library of Congress and found that Gibbons' date is wrong by a number of years and its correctness cannot be substantiated. In the 1919 Bible Conference minutes, we read this:

C. S. LONGACRE: I would like to ask a question on the great river Euphrates: Does it represent Turkey or Babylon the Great?

A. O. TAIT: Our brethren have taught that it represents Turkey.

M .C. WILCOX: Maybe we can tell better when we get over there when the sixth plague is poured out.

A. O. TAIT: The Turkish power has not been a *king* for 300 years. The Turkish power has not been a power in any sense of the word. It has been a puppet that has been holding territory that none of the rest of the powers in Europe was willing to let the others have. The Turkish power cannot answer to that prophecy.

A. G. DANIELLS: Didn't the Lord recognize that decaying process in the book of Revelation of that very power, the Turkish power – its drying up?

A. O. TAIT: Then I will throw in another question: We teach that he dried up or lost its dominion on Aug.11. 1840.

A. G. DANIELLS: Lost his *dominion*?

A. O. TAIT: He lost his independence Aug.11. 1840. We talk that, and then we just whirl right around and set him up there and say that "he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to take away many." And we put that back in 1798. But, brethren, I cannot see it that way. I do not think that Napoleon Bonaparte meets these specifications at all. I think I am prepared to show very clearly from history that he does not. Napoleon met the Turkish armies twice and destroyed them. They never gathered themselves after that. I do not see how you can have him lose his dominion in 1840 and be the king of the north in 1919.

W. W. PRESCOTT: No, the day July 27, 1299 is absolutely discredited. I had the original Greek history out of the Congressional Library for quite a while a long time, and went over the whole matter. It is a history in Greek with a parallel column translated into Latin, and accompanied by a chronological table, and the author put that event that Gibbon refers to as occurring in 1302. Von Hammer puts it in 1301. Someone else in 1300, I believe. From my standpoint it doesn't make any difference which it is, and there is no occasion to attempt to prove which it is, because just so long as we interpret the symbols as applying to the Saracens, we certainly must give the time to the Saracens and not to the Ottoman empire, and what was presented this morning was simply to show in a general way the beginning of the Ottoman power here at the end of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. But the same authority said that from these small beginnings rose a power that was established in 1453. Now we don't date our interpretation of the prophecy of the Roman power from 754 BC, and yet Rome had its beginnings in 754. Now all I ask for is that he shall be consistent with ourselves so that when we stand up before an audience or appear in print we don't expose ourselves any longer to that shocking inconsistency of applying the symbols to two powers, and then

<sup>43</sup> Credit must go to Dirk Anderson's page <http://www.ellenwhite.org/egw52.htm> for bringing these things in Ford's manuscript back to my memory. I knew I had read them, but could not think where.

turn right around and give the time that belongs right in that prophecy and date it five centuries at least after the power had ceased to be aggressive as a tormentory.

Before 1844 in William Miller's lectures, he gives both symbols to the Ottoman power. He adds the periods together, makes 514 years and 15 days date from July 27, 1299, and follow it straight through. Now when you go further you say we will start from July 27, 1299, and we come to 1499 [sic]. What happened then? We must have something on a day. What happened July 27, 1449, that both marked the ending of one period and the beginning of another, because you must not begin the next day. That is, when we are trying to arrive at Aug. 11, 1840 you can't say this period ends July 27, 1449, and the next began July 28. You have got to make them lap one day or else you are thrown out when you get to the end. That question must be answered. What marked the close of the 150 years on July 27, 1449? What event on that day marked the beginning of the next period? What marked the close of the next period? Until that is out of the way I don't see that we shall be helped very much by any papers to establish a date for something relating to the Ottoman Empire.

W. G. WIRTH: What dates do you give for the 150-year period?

W. W. PRESCOTT: According to the best light I can get, and I am not alone – I suppose it is more or less known here that this whole matter came up several years ago, and the Review and Herald Board appointed a committee to study the question. This committee was composed of F.M. Wilcox, Chairman, W.A. Spicer, M.E. Kern, C.S. Longacre, C.L. Benson, S.M. Butler, and myself. We took up this question, went into it quite thoroughly, and that committee, came to the conclusion that we could not apply this 150 years beginning July 27, 1299, for the double reason, first, it didn't belong to that power, and second, the date itself could not be established. Then there were further things brought in, so that all the evidence to establish the date Aug. 11, 1840. Therefore it was recommended that since it was too large a question for us, it be presented to the General Conference Committee in Council.

The board adopted the recommendation presented. Brother Spicer was to present one phase, Brother Benson another, and I was to present a third phase. We prepared our matter and presented it at the Spring Council, and our papers, working together, set forth these suggestions, not as established orthodoxy, but as suggestions from the Committee for consideration.<sup>44</sup>

And again at another time Prescott wrote:

I notice that in the issue of the *Signs* for Nov. 21 [year?], you have let loose the Turk--and some other things besides. I had known for some time that the date, August 11, 1840, would not stand examination. Two years ago we presented full information on this at the Fall Council, but nothing has been done and in the meantime our books and publications are repeating the old unwarranted statements ...<sup>45</sup>

If the Emperor John, who died in 1448, "never forgot that he was a vassal of the Ottoman Empire," how can we assert that the Byzantine Empire did not become subject to Turkey until 1449?

Yours faithfully,

W. W. Prescott

(Ford, 1980, loc. cit)

### From W.A. Spicer

Here is W. A Spicer's comment:

Letter from W. A. Spicer to L. R. Conradi, Nov. 30, 1914, GC Archives.

<sup>44</sup> 1919 Bible Conference Records, 7/3/19, 55, 56, 57, 97, 101; 7/6/19, 82; 7/8/19, 72; 7/17/19, 49-51. GC Archives. Quoted in Ford, *Daniel 8:14: The Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment*, Casselbury, FL: Euangelion Press, 1980, pp.211-213.9

<sup>45</sup> This seems to indicate the 1917 GC Autumn Council.

Brother Conradi,

....I will also enclose some material on the dates of the prophetic periods of Rev. 9. Some time ago, Professor Prescott and I went to the Library of Congress. He looked up the history of Pachymeris, translated into Latin by Possinus. It is from this book that Gibbon got his date, July 27, 1299. I looked up Von Hammer, who is the heaviest German author on Ottoman history, and *it is very clear that Gibbon made a distinct error*, which Von Hammer and others have corrected all these years. Gibbon's mistake is easily seen by looking at the book. He saw July 27 at the opening of chapter 25, and then over in the chronological tables given by Possinus he saw the date 1299 for the beginning of the events dealt with in this chapter. But he failed to note that the chapter *began* with July 27, it later went back and dealt with earlier events. These earlier events were the events of 1299. and it was not until 1301 or 1302, as various authorities compute the Mohammedan era, that the battle of July 27 took place.

Well then, about this time Professor Benson, who is not with us here, formerly of Union College, came on with Blue Books that he had received from London, showing conclusively that *the ultimatum of the Powers was not delivered to the Pasha of Egypt on Aug. 11, 1840*. Then we began to look the thing up a bit, and presented some of these features to the recent council. You may well understand that the brethren had to sit up and take notice. The shadow of the "Daily" controversy is still with us *It is remarkable how loath people are to look at facts, or to correct anything*. But they had to agree that we must study this thing....Our folks have taught right along that John Palaeologus died, one would infer, July 27, 1449; but he didn't, he died in the previous year.

(Signed) W A. Spicer.

(Nov. 30, 1914) in (Ford, 1980, pp.A-204, 205)<sup>46</sup>

#### **From Damsteegt:**

Damsteegt presents much the same information as Arasola with the exception of these comments. He shows how even though Miller was not the first regarding the application of the time periods in Revelation 9 to the Mahomedans, he was the first to add them together:

The events that occurred in August 11, 1841 [sic] were an important boost to the missionary enthusiasm of the Millerite movement. The significance of this date was based on the historicist view of the seven trumpets of Rev.9 and 9...

Many of Litch's contemporaries applied the fifth and sixth trumpet to Muhammadanism, or Islam, and the Ottoman empire arising out of that religious system. In Rev. 9:3, 5, 10 the Turkish empire was symbolized as locusts commissioned to torment men for five months or 150 prophetic days, representing 150 actual years according to the year-day principle. Litch accepted the idea that the Ottoman empire was to torment the "Greek empire." The crucial question was the precise time when the tormenting began. Litch's authority for his answer was Edward Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, according to which the Ottoman Turks first entered the territory of Nicomedia and attacked the Greeks on July 27, 1299. From this Litch inferred that the 150 years would finish in 1449 when the fifth trumpet would end and the sixth trumpet begin to sound (9:13), and indicated that from 1299 to 1449 the Turks were continually tormenting the Greeks by wars without conquering them. The events related to the succession of the Greek throne in Constantinople in 1449 were interpreted as the fulfillment of the 150 years. In that year the Greek emperor died and left the throne to his brother, Deacozes. But before Deacozes dared ascend the throne, he sent ambassadors to Anereth, the Turkish sultan, to request his permission. Thus, according to Litch, his independence was gone before

<sup>46</sup> A copy of this text was also found in a net search in the Netherlands in a Benedictine monastery, called "Sint Willibrords Abij. The Bibliographical details are: (CBH XXVIII, 1.) GEORGII PACHYMERIS, *Historia Rerum a Michaele Palaeologo*. Ed. P. Possinus. Romae, 1666, and was found at <http://www.willibrords-abbey.nl/library/history.htm> It is priced at 52 Euro. Presumably that is for a photocopy of the microfiche.

the fall of the city in 1453 and the “Turkish nations were therefore loosed by the divine command.”

The sixth trumpet of Rev.9 depicted the conquest and killing done by the Ottoman empire. The duration of the supremacy of this power was “an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year” (9:15). The actual time was again found by using the year-day principle...Thus, to Litch the completion of the sixth trumpet or the end of the Ottoman supremacy, should occur...precisely on August 11, 1840. To this conclusion he arrived about two weeks before the expected event....This interpretation of Rev. 9 contributed considerably to the awareness of the time of the end because they thought that one of the last signs of the times had taken place. An editorial comment on Litch’s findings stated that if the Ottoman supremacy had departed, then the end of the world was imminent. Litch’s prediction was a great stimulus to the missionary zeal of the Millerite movement. Years later, a participant commented that it was to “the advent movement what the power of steam is on the machinery of the railroad locomotive. So, from the 11<sup>th</sup> day of August, 1840, the advent cause and message, or angel, careered on its way with *greater power than ever before.*” (1977, pp.26-29)

### From Maxwell:

In regard to the time period itself for the sixth trumpet, Maxwell is prepared, at least, to acknowledge there is another interpretation of the time periods in Revelation 9, but then explains why he thinks the historicist’s interpretation is better. He, like Ford, is not prepared to recite the traditional interpretation on the sixth trumpet. He changes not only the *length* of the time period under consideration by 15 days, he also changes *when it begins* (from 1449 A.D to 1453 A.D.) and *ends* (from 1840 A.D. to 1844 A.D.). All this is proposed in direct contradiction to Ellen White, who said of Litch’s prediction for August 11, 1840: “At the very time specified...the event exactly fulfilled the prediction.” (loc. cit)

One of the more challenging symbols in the sixth trumpet is its reference (in the King James Version) to “an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year.” The ancient King James Version expects us to add the periods of time together. From our study of Daniel we are well aware that a symbolic day in long-time Bible prophecy represents an actual year. In Revelation 11:2,3 a month stands for 30 days. On this basis, a year of twelve thirty-day months represents 360 years. When we add 1 year plus 30 years plus 360 years, we get 391 years. The Revised Standard Version, however, and quite a few other modern versions as well, translate the passage, “**the hour, the day, the month, and the year,**” making it refer to a specific point of time rather than to an extended period of time. But there are good reasons to prefer the King James Version translation. [Maxwell endnotes here (see **Note 1** below)]

Assuming then that the expression refers to 391 years, we ask, What particular beginning and ending dates did God have in mind?

We mentioned above that the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, which allowed the Turks to leave the Euphrates Valley and overrun the heartland of the Christian Byzantine Empire, was a major event. From that event until the Turks finally “killed” the Byzantine Empire in 1453 was a period of 382 years. This may be close enough to 391 years to satisfy some minds, but not close enough to satisfy others. More striking is the fact from 1453, the death of the Byzantine Empire, until 1844, the close of the most significant long-time prophecy in the Bible, was precisely 391 years.

In 1453 the Ottoman Empire was a powerful and dangerous threat to Christian Europe. By 1844, however, the once invincible empire had fallen so low that it would not have survived unless Christian nations had come to its aid. Actually, a series of significant events clusters both 1453 and 1844. [Maxwell endnotes here (see **Note 2** below)] (1985, pp.255-256)

[**Note 1:** Maxwell endnotes]: “...Is the King James Version correct? and, How shall we understand the “**hour**”?”

Let us look at the “hour” first. Because an hour is the twenty-fourth part of a day, some readers have suggested that the hour here represents a twenty-fourth part of a year, or 15 days, leading to a total of 391 years and 15 days. There is, however, another attractive interpretation. In Revelation 14:6,7 an angel uses the term “hour” in the phrase “the hour of his judgment,” referring to the final judgment. So – because the 391 years are related to one of the trumpet judgments – some commentators suggest that the hour in our passage represents another “hour of judgment,” this one lasting 391 years.

As for which translation is correct, the Revised Standard Version renders the passage, “**for the hour, the day, the month and the year,**” a rendition that seems intended to make the phrase refer to a specific point in time rather than to an extended period of judgment. A number of other recent translations do something similar. Today’s English Version goes so far as to say, “for this very hour of this very day of this very month and year.”

What about the underlying Greek? The Greek for this passage has only the plain and simple statement, “for the hour, and day, and month, and year,” in which only *hour* is preceded by *the*. Thus, in the underlying Greek there is no hint of “*this very hour*” or “*this very day,*” or “*this very month.*” The earliest translations were more faithful to John’s original statement than the modern ones are.<sup>47</sup> In 1525 Tyndale had, “for an houre, for a daye, for a moneth, and for a yeare.” And the King James of 1611 was closest of all with “for an houre, and a day, and a moneth, and a yeere.”

Commentators<sup>48</sup> who prefer to think of an “hour” of judgment extending to 391 years call attention (1) to this use of the article *the* (in the Greek) only with “hour,” setting the “hour” apart from all other terms. Thus they say, the “hour” can indeed mean an “hour of judgment,” even though the day, month, and year retain their more ordinary meanings.<sup>49</sup> These commentators also remind us (2) that in New Testament times it was a common practice in Greek to use *and* in an explanatory or epexegetical manner. [Maxwell footnotes here: “See, eg., F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago, Press, 1961), section 442(9). See, for example, 1 Corinthians 15:38, “God gives it a body as he has chosen, *and* [or rather, *that is to say*] to each kind of seed its own body.”

In the light of these considerations, we can helpfully translate the phrase this way, “for the hour” *and* [or rather, *that is to say*] for a day, and a month, and a year.” So now, interpreting the “hour” as an hour of judgment, we get this: “For the hour of judgment; that is to say, for a period of judgment extending over a day and a month and a year symbolic of 391 years.” (1985, pp.262f)<sup>50</sup>

[Note 2: Maxwell endnotes:] “What happened to mark the 391 years? Assuming then that the expression refers to 391 years, what particular beginning and ending dates did God have in mind when he gave John the vision of the sixth trumpet?”

We pointed out on page 256 that from 1453, the death of the Byzantine Empire, until 1844, the close of the most significant long-time prophecy in the Bible, was precisely 391 years. We also noted that a series of salient events clustered around 1453 and 1844 – and that whereas around 1453 the Ottoman Turks were a powerful threat to Christian nations, by the mid-1840s the once mighty Ottoman Empire had become so weak it could not have survived without Christian assistance. [Maxwell footnotes here: “This answer is based on various sources including Robert Darnell, letter to the author, March 22, 1982; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chs. 67, 68; Heyd, “The

<sup>47</sup> This is biased commentary. Look at other versions beside the TEV. The earlier translation by Tyndale is no worse than some of the modern translations.

<sup>48</sup> Who are these commentators? None are referenced. He depends on their testimony a number of times. Is this just literary device to refer to himself – “I, me and myself” – all in good company with each other? Are there any commentators who recommend this idea?

<sup>49</sup> This is awful exegesis. The time periods must be considered together. They flow naturally from the smallest time unit – hour, to the largest time unit – year.

<sup>50</sup> A comment by Ford would apply here: “All twistings and turnings done here.”

Latter Ottoman Empire,” pp. 354-369; James Westfall Thompson and Edgar Nathaniel Johnson, *An Introduction to Medieval Europe, 300-1500* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1937), pp. 942–948; Previt -Orton, *Shorter Medieval History*, 2:1010, 1011; and news reports and comments in *Signs of the Times*, August 1, 1840 to February 1, 1841.]

In 1451 (near the beginning of the 391 years) a sultan named Mohammed II the Conqueror began a reign, based on the armed power of the Janissaries. (The Janissaries were a body of several thousand, many of whom, as boys, had been handed over like a tax to the Ottomans by their Christian parents. The Ottomans brought up the Janissaries strictly in the Islamic religion, trained them expertly as soldiers and government officials, and forbade them to marry. [Maxwell inserts footnote: “Thompson and Johnson, *Medieval Europe*, pp.943, 944.”] For a long time the expertise, loyalty and military prowess of the Janissaries made them the core of each sultan authority.)

In 1451 Mohammed II launched a hundred-year process of creating a new Islamic law code called the *kanun names*. In 1826 (near the other end of the 391 years) another sultan named Mahmud II massacred the Janissaries; and in November 1839 (391 years after the Janissaries came to powers his successor, Abdulmecid I, under pressure from the Christian powers, issued the Noble Edict of the Rose Chamber, announcing the creation of a new series of Moslem laws called the *tanzimat* to take the place of the old law code, *kanun names*. Among its other provisions, the *tanzimat* “guaranteed certain fundamental rights to all Ottoman subjects without distinction of religion.” These provisions guaranteed to Christians not only the right to practice their religion, which the Moslems had nominally permitted all along, but also an equalization of political opportunity and taxation, which the Moslems had long vigorously denied. Codes of laws define a society. Basic changes in a society’s laws flag basic changes in the society’s fabric. So here was a epochal victory for the Christian nations and a bitter pill for the Moslems, for “the changes that the [Christian] powers most insistently urged upon the Ottoman government concerned the status of its [the Empire’s] Christian subjects. NOTE THIS IS A CONTRADICTION ACCORDING TO MAXWELL’S EXPLANATION OF THE “GRASS’ AS GOD’S PEOPLE AND THOSE WHO HAAVE THE SEAL OF GOD, WOULD NOT BE TOUCHED DURING THIS TIME. THEY WERE.

In January 1449 (to turn now to the other events marking the beginning and ending of the 391 years) Constantine XI was crowned Byzantine Emperor only after he first asked for and received the approval of the Ottoman sultan. When a king has to get the approval of an enemy king before he can sit on his own throne, it is quite obvious who is ahead. As famed historian Edward Gibbon observed, “The gracious approbation of the Turkish sultan announced his [own] supremacy, and the approaching downfall of the Eastern empire.” [Maxwell footnotes: “Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch.67”] In 1449 the Turks were on top.

By contrast, the Ottoman sultan 391 years later found himself by no means on top. Rather, he was defeated by Mohammed Ali (Mehemet Ali), the pasha or governor of Egypt, who had captured the sultan’s fleet and conquered Syria; long a part of the Ottoman Empire. In fact, the sultan was quite helpless – until for political reasons (not for love!) Christian nations came to his rescue. On July 15, 1840, representatives of Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia (all Christian nations in those days) signed the Treaty of London, ordering Mehemet Ali of Egypt to return the sultan’s fleet and get out of Syria. When Mehemet Ali swore by Allah that he would do nothing of the sort, British gunboats in September pounded Beirut (then a Syrian city) to rubble, literally, in a few hours. Egypt responded by getting out of Syria and giving the sultan back his boats. Meanwhile, the *London Morning Herald* observed that “the sultan has been reduced to the rank of a puppet.” [Maxwell footnotes: ‘Quoted in *Signs of the Times*, January 1, 1841, p.152 [sic?]]

The Ottoman Empire limped along as the “sick man of Europe” until the end of the first world war. Neither its existence nor its atrocities terminated in very sense of the word in the 1840s, any more than they had begun their existence in every sense of the word in the 1450s. But its period of dominance over specified Christian affairs, its

power to “kill” a particular “**third of mankind**” can be significantly identified with the 391 years we have spoken of here. (Maxwell, 1985, pp.263-265)

### **From Woolsey:**

An interesting confirmation, both of the concept of the trumpets [in the book of Revelation] as a whole and of the principle of prophetic interpretation whereby a day in prophecy represents a year of literal time, was accomplished in the nineteenth century. According to that principle, the time periods of Revelation 9:5 and 9:15 represent 541 years and 15 days. A Bible student named Josiah Litch believed, as others had before him as far back as Martin Luther, that the Ottoman Empire was the power referred to under the sixth trumpet. Based on the date that the Ottomans got the upper hand over the Byzantine Empire in A.D. 1299, Litch concluded that the Ottomans would come to the end of their power in August, 1840. Later he settled on August 11, as the exact date. As events transpired, that was the very date that the Ottoman sultan acquiesced to an arrangement whereby the powers of Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia decided affairs of state for him. (2001, p.74f)

### **From the Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary:**

One of the first Biblical expositors on record identify the Turks as the power portrayed under the sixth trumpet was the Swiss Reformer Heinrich Bullinger (d. A.D.1575), although Martin Luther had already set forth this trumpet as symbolic of Moslems. However, on the dating of this trumpet, as of the fifth, commentators have shown wide divergence, although the decided majority of expositors have assigned dates for the fifth trumpet during the period in which the Saracens were in the ascendancy, and for the sixth trumpet, during the heyday of either the Seljuk or the Ottoman Turks.

In 1832 William Miller made a new approach to the dating of these trumpets by connecting them chronologically (in the fifth of a series of articles in the *Vermont Telegraph*). On the basis of the year-day principle..., Miller calculated the five months of the fifth trumpet (Rev.9:5) to be 150 years, and the hour, day, month, and year of the sixth to be 391 years and 15 days. Many expositors before Miller had adopted these same calculations, but they had not connected the two periods chronologically. Miller set forth the view that the time period of the sixth trumpet followed immediately upon that of the fifth, so as to, make the entire period one of 541 years and 15 days. This period he dated from A.D. 1298, when he considered the first attack by the Ottoman Turks on the Byzantine Empire to have occurred, to 1839.<sup>51</sup> Thus, according to his view, both trumpets represented the Ottoman Turks, the fifth, their rise and the sixth, their period of domination.

In 1838 Josiah Litch, one of Miller's associates in the second advent movement in America, revised Miller's dates to A.D. 1299 to 1449 for the fifth trumpet, and 1449 to 1840 for the sixth. Litch accepted the date July 27, 1299, for the battle of Bapheum, near Nicomedia, which he took as the first attack by the Ottoman Turks on the Byzantine Empire. He saw the date 1449 as significant of the collapse of Byzantine power, for toward the end of 1448 a new Byzantine emperor, Constantine Palaeologus, had requested permission of the Turkish sultan Murad II before daring to ascend his throne, and he did not, in fact, receive the crown until January 6, 1449, after such permission had been granted.<sup>52</sup> Litch believed that this 150-year period constituted the time during which the Ottoman Turks “tormented” (see v.5) the Byzantine Empire.

<sup>51</sup> But according to the interpretation of the text, one of the first things the locusts were to do was to torment a third of the people. The Seljuk Turks did that long before they got to Turkey. They moved through Russia and then later invaded Iran. They converted to Islam there. But they had tormented long before they reached Iran. To be correct, it would be wise to date their tormenting from their movement through Russia, when the “tormenting” first begun. (See Maxwell, 1985, pp.251f)

<sup>52</sup> Is this the first time that the emperor had to get approval from the sultan?

As already stated, Litch set 1299 as the beginning of the fifth trumpet, to be more exact, July 27, 1299, his date for the battle of Bapheum. He gave to this fifth trumpet a period of 150 years. This brought him to July 27, 1449, for the beginning of the sixth trumpet.<sup>53</sup> Adding on 391 years brought him to July 27, 1840. The 15 days carried him over into the month of August of that year. He predicted that in that month the power of the Turkish Empire would be overthrown.<sup>54</sup> However, at the outset he did not fix on a precise day in August. A short time before the expiration of this period he declared that the Turkish Empire would be broken August 11, which is exactly 15 days beyond July 27, 1840.

At that time world attention was directed to events taking place in the Turkish Empire. In June, 1839, Mohammed Ali, pasha of Egypt, and nominally a vassal of the sultan, had rebelled against his overlord. He defeated the Turks and captured their navy. At this juncture, Mahmud II, the sultan, died, and the ministers of his successor, Abdul Mejid, proposed a settlement to Mohammed Ali by which he would receive the hereditary pashalik of Egypt, and his son Ibrahim, the rulership of Syria. However, Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, who all had interests in the Near East, intervened at this point and insisted that no agreement between the Turks and Mohammed Ali be made without their consultation. Negotiations were protracted until the summer of 1840, when, on July 15, Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia signed the Treaty of London, proposing to back with force the terms suggested the previous year by the Turks. It was about this time that Litch announced that he anticipated the Turkish power to come to an end on August 11. On that day the Turkish emissary, Rifat Bey, arrived at Alexandria, with the terms of the London Convention. On that day also the ambassadors of the four powers received a communication from the sultan inquiring as to what measures were to be taken in reference to a circumstance vitally affecting his empire. He was told that "provision had been made," but he could not know what it was. Litch interpreted these events as a recognition by the Turkish government that its independent power was gone.

These events, coming at the specified time of Litch's prediction, exercised a wide influence upon the thinking of those in America who were interested in the Millerite movement. Indeed, this prediction by Litch went far to give credence to other, as yet unfulfilled, time prophecies – particularly that of the 2300 days – which were being preached by the Millerites. Thus this occurrence in 1840 was a significant factor in building up the expectation of the second advent three years later (see GC 334, 335).

It should be made clear, however, that commentators and theologians in general have been greatly divided over the meaning of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> trumpets. This has been due principally to problems in three areas: (1) the meaning of the symbolism itself; (2) the meaning of the Greek; (3) the historical events and dates involved. But to canvass adequately these problems would carry us beyond the space limits permissible in this commentary.

Generally speaking, the Seventh-day Adventist interpretation of the fifth and sixth trumpets, particularly as touching the time period involved, is essentially that of Josiah Litch. (Nicole, 1957, pp.794-796)

### **From J. Robert Spangler:**

J. Robert Spangler was the editor, and presumably the major (if not only) contributor to the section in the special edition of the *Ministry* magazine entitled

---

Notice the similarity here between what SDA historicists say of the relation between the emperor and the sultan, and what they say of the pope and the emperor before the eighth century, when the pope had to get confirmation from Constantinople before he was installed as pope. If they admit the emperor is inferior to the sultan, then by that admission they also admit that the pope was, by the same action, inferior to the emperor, and was in fact, not free to develop his own power in Rome.

<sup>53</sup> And what happened on that day? Prophecy must be exact here, since it finishes 'on the very day.'

<sup>54</sup> But the interpretation of the prophecy was that of the Moslems in general and the Turks in particular. There were more Turks than those at Constantinople. It was when they stopped tormenting the inhabitants of the earth that we see the end of the period.

“Questions and Answers on Doctrinal issues,” “prepared to give us a synopsis on the positions on the sanctuary, the investigative judgment, and related issues that were taken by Dr. Ford and examined by the Sanctuary Review Committee.” In those questions and answers there is a comment on the time prophecy related to the sixth trumpet.<sup>55</sup> This comment completely ignores the interpretation developed by Miller and Litch and proclaimed by the pioneers of the church, even into the twentieth century, and the statement of Ellen White as to the divine support given to the interpretation of international events relating to Turkey by Josiah Litch

The significance of the year 1844 as the beginning of the eschatological pre-Advent judgment is not derived solely from the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14....The book of Revelation has one prophecy that finds its fulfillment at 1844, and that is the sixth trumpet. Although we have usually interpreted the sixth trumpet as ending in 1840, it may be possible to build a stronger case for its fulfillment in 1844. The sixth trumpet is said to cover a period of exactly 391 years (Rev. 9:15), and if the starting point for this prophecy is the capture of Constantinople, the capital of Turkey, by the Moslems in 1453, then the end point would be 1844. And if the use of trumpets signifies the announcement of judgments to follow (Lev. 23:23-28; Joel 2:21), then we would expect the judgment to begin at the blowing of the seventh trumpet. The seventh trumpet has as its theme the “time of the dead, that they should be judged,” and indicates that this pre-Advent judgment involves the wicked (“and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth”) as well as the righteous (“that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints”), according to Revelation 11:18 (K.J.V). This is followed by the close of the judgment in the heavenly temple as indicated by the exposure of the Most Holy Place to the gaze of onlookers (verse 19). (Spangler, 1980, pp.41-42)

I do not recall seeing this idea in Adventist publications before 1980 as being the current belief of Adventists in regard to this time period. Perhaps this was the first public mooted of the revamped interpretation of the time period of the sixth trumpet.<sup>56</sup> The fact that it does not fit, as Maxwell ably comments does not seem to be a problem for Spalding either. It is, in Spalding’s term, “*the one prophecy*” in “the book of Revelation,” “*that finds its fulfillment in 1844.*” And that will be enough to make it become a venerable tradition, regardless of its unsuitability to fit the historical detail or the parameters of the prophecy.<sup>57</sup> What is the significance of the end of the sixth

<sup>55</sup> It should be noticed that is comment is not a synopsis of the opinion of either Dr. Ford, or the Sanctuary Review Committee. No document produced by either party states what is explicated here. We can only judge it then to be the personal opinion of the editor, surreptitiously inserted.

<sup>56</sup> Reminds me of the story of the King’s New Clothes. Spalding is proclaiming a new “dressed-up-in-drag” version of the sixth trumpet that is stunning at first glance until one looks a little closer, and sees how the outer garment (the interpretation) does not fit the body (the text of the sixth trumpet). But everybody cheers because the interpretation is what they want to hear (we have a vision in the book of Revelation that points to 1844 too!! How naïve they must think we are!!). And so this version will be proclaimed as the brand new “advancement in the truth – truth for *this very time.*”

<sup>57</sup> It should be noted that in 1954, when Froom published his fourth volume of *Prophetic Faith of our Fathers*, he said “in 1795 E. W. Whittaker first placed the 391 years from 1453 to 1844, with about sixteen others following his lead in subsequent decades. But not until Josiah Litch, in 1838, was the principle employed of linking the 150 years and the 391 years in sequence.” (p.1123) It is this interpretation, ending the period in 1844, that Spangler has reverted back to. Names that Froom lists that advocated this view include Charles Buck (1808, Amer. Ind.), John A. Brown (1823, Brit. ?), Ethan Smith (1811, Amer. Cong.), William C. Davis (1811, Amer. Presby.), Th. R. Robertson (1826, Amer. Presby.), John Fry (1822, Brit. Ang.), Thomas White (1828, Brit. Angl.), Ph. Homan (1829, Brit.), John R. Park M.D. (1825, Brit. Angl.), Alexander Keith (1828, Brit.), Matthew Habeshon (1834, Brit. Angl.), PROT. VINDICATOR (1836, Amer. Dutch R.), R. C. Shimeal (, Amer. Epis.), James Scott (Brit.), John Cox (Brit.), “J. G. O.” (Jew. Exp., Brit. Angl.), “C. E. S.” (Chr. Obsvr, 1826, Brit.)

trumpet? The ending of the Turkish power? The ending of the independence of the Turkish power? No! No!! No!!! Turkey does not even fit into the picture anymore. It is the opening of the investigative judgment. The end of the 391 years is the beginning of the investigative judgment. The end of the 391 years is the blowing of the seventh trumpet. And what is the blowing of the seventh trumpet? Nothing but the announcement of the investigative judgment. So one must ask the question, If Turkey is not symbolised by the locusts, then who is represented by this insect? Those who preach about the coming investigative judgment in centuries past, as they tormented people with hell and brimstone messages? One wonders what would have been the complete explanation of the fifth and sixth trumpet symbolism by Spangler.

Let us consider some of the details he has to harmonise with this view:

- What does the ---- mean, if it does not refer to the Turks?
- List here all the items of the prophecy that Smith, Maxwell and Haskell comment on; and ask how Spalding would interpret them. Note: maxwell's book came out a year after the Review. Was it in publication process before Glacier view? Did Spalding get his ideas from Maxwell?
- What does Spalding do with all the arguments of Smith and other pioneers?
- What does Spalding do with the statement of Ellen White stating that the fulfillment of the prediction is a divine event? Just ignore the authority of her statement?

#### **From Robert Olson:**

Robert Olson wrote a polemic against Ford's material after Glacier View in March, 1981, and it appeared as a supplement in the Australasian Record, June 8, 1981. There were 101 points he focuses on in the 112-page pamphlet. One of them was the issue of Ellen White's endorsement in The Great Controversy of Dr. Josiah Litch's interpretation of the time periods associated with the fifth and sixth trumpet in the book of Revelation. Olson attempted to deflect criticism away from Ellen White's comments in two ways: (1) by indicating she never commented on the topic again; (2) She was not writing in an exegetical context, but was just reporting events and opinions of "the Millerite movement." (3) Then he adds a smokescreen to the discussion, indicating that Ellen White could be either commenting about the interpretation of the time period of the sixth trumpet, or she could be commenting on Litch's interpretation of the time period. The subjunctive "if," used by Olson, leaves the matter undecided.

#### 55. Revelation 9 and Josiah Litch

Ford states, "Litch's application of Revelation 9:15 to August 11, 1840, was quite wrong, as he himself admitted in later years." "Ellen White accepted the prophetic conclusions of Josiah Litch regarding August 11, 1840" (Ford, pages 659-660, 584).

Did Mrs. White say much about the seven trumpets?

No. This is the only known reference to Revelation 9 in all of Ellen White's writings and it appears, not in connection with an exegetical study of the Bible, but as part of her description of the Millerite movement.<sup>58</sup> On the basis of his interpretation of

---

<sup>58</sup> Olson's point raises the question, are we only to take as correct and authoritative, those statements in Ellen White's writings where she is writing exegetically? In those cases where she does not write exegetically, we are not to take her comments as correct? This then would mean that we would have to decide on levels of correctness in the writings, and levels of authority, and perhaps levels of inspiration?

Revelation 9:15 Josiah Litch predicted in 1838 that the Ottoman power would be broken in 1840. On August 1, 1840, he predicted that it would occur on August 11. What took place on that date confirmed the faith of multitudes in the Millerite interpretation of Scripture and gave the advent movement great impetus.

If Ellen White, in *The Great Controversy*, pages 334-335, means that John the Revelator's prophecy was fulfilled on August 11, 1840, she would be giving support to Litch's interpretation of Revelation 9:15. If she simply means that Josiah Litch's prediction was fulfilled, then she is not necessarily supporting Litch's interpretation of the text.<sup>59</sup>

The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary states, "Generally speaking, the Seventh-day Adventist interpretation of the fifth and sixth trumpets, particularly as touching the time period involved, is essentially that of Josiah Litch." (Volume 7, Page 796) Ministry magazine has suggested the dates 1453 to 1844 for the sixth trumpet instead of the period 1449 to 1840 assigned by Litch (Ministry, October, 1980, Page 41.). (Olson, 1980, p.50)

Olson wants to let Ellen White off the hook on the basis that her comment here is not in an exegetical context. But she is giving an unambiguous endorsement to the application of Litch's exegesis of the prophecy to historical events. She supports Litch's exegesis by endorsing his application of his exegesis. Olson seems to overlook in this quote the very obvious opinion of Ellen White stated in the beginning of her recital of the events. She says, "In the year 1840 another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest." This is her opinion. She is not reciting the opinion of either Litch or Miller here. She is stating what to her were the facts. That Litch and Miller were wrong in regard to the application to Turkey, means that she was also incorrect, in that there was *not* a remarkable fulfillment of prophecy in 1840, as evidenced by Litch's change of opinion on the interpretation of the sixth trumpet and also by the sudden shift of contemporary SDA historicists to apply this time period to 1453-1844 rather than the period 1449-1840, as proclaimed and published by their predecessors.

If Olson wants the word "prophecy" to refer to Litch's prophecy, then is Olson saying that Litch was a prophet, and he gave a "prophecy?" Was not Litch and Miller explaining *what they thought Bible prophecy taught?* Olson may remember that the result of these events that Ellen White describes, were, *not that multitudes followed and proclaimed Litch as a prophet*, but that "when it became known, multitudes were convinced of **the correctness of the principles of prophetic interpretation adopted by Miller and his associates**, and a wonderful impetus was given to the advent movement. Men of learning and position united with Miller, both in preaching and in publishing his views, and from 1840 to 1844 the work rapidly extended." (White, 1950, p.335) It was the correctness of their *interpretation* of the prophecies that was the message of this event, not that Litch has made a prophecy.

Even Loughborough, in reporting the effects of the prophecy on the Ottoman empire quoted infidels who contacted him, not with their announcement that they considered Litch a true prophet, but that they believed the principles of prophetic interpretation used by Litch and Miller to be correct:

---

And what about the statements made by her that this book contains only truth? Is Olson making excuses for White here?

<sup>59</sup> Note that Ellen White does not say, "In the year 1840 Miller and Litch said another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest." She is stating *her* assessment of the events here. It is the opinion of Ellen White that "In the year 1840 another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest." That is *her opinion*; not her reporting of *someone else's opinion*. Therefore Olson is incorrect here. Ellen White felt that the events of 1840 fulfilled the prophecy. This then leads us to believe that she felt the prophecy expired in 1840.

This striking fulfillment of the prophecy had a tremendous effect upon the public mind. It intensified the interest of the people to hear upon the subject of fulfilled and fulfilling prophecy. Dr. Litch said that within a few months after August 11, 1840, he had received letters from more than one thousand prominent infidels, some of them leaders of infidel clubs, in which they stated that they had given up the battle against the Bible, and had accepted it as God's revelation to man. Some of these were fully converted to God, and a number of them became able speakers in the great second advent movement. Some expressed themselves to Dr. Litch on this wise: "We have said that expositors of prophecy quote from the musty pages of history to substantiate their claims of prophetic fulfillments; but in this case we have the living facts right before our eyes." (1905, p.133)

The reader will notice here that Litch is grouped among those who are called "expositors of prophecy," and was not viewed by the public as a prophet. Therefore, we may conclude that Ellen White was referring to Litch's *interpretation* of the sixth trumpet, and she was endorsing his interpretation as correct, as does also the *SDA Bible Commentary*. This flies in the face of Olson's desperate attempt to deflect criticism from the assertion of Ellen White at the beginning of the chapter in *Great Controversy* on the topic. We must accept the fact: Ellen White was wrong on the fulfillment of Litch's interpretation of prophecy. The position of Spalding and Maxwell augur for the same conclusion as well.

#### **From Arasola:**

One of the most colorful interludes within the short history of Millerism is the summer and autumn of 1840 when Miller expected the first serious omens of the end. He based these ideas on Revelation 9:5, 15. Usually the whole episode is credited to Josiah Litch, but certainly also Miller is involved as well as the editorial staff of the *Signs*....The lack of dramatic events at the expected time prevented Miller's and Litch's ideas from growing into a spectacular advertisement for Millerite exegesis, neither can the slightly hesitant enthusiasm, with which the "fulfillment" was pronounced, be designated a disappointment. The Millerites did not realize that the events failed to come up to measure with their assumptions. Miller initiated an interpretation of the two verses of Revelation 9 as a time prophecy which would lead either to 1839 or 1840. His associates, in particular Litch, did further research into the history of Islam and at first he defined the time to the month of August, and later exactly to the day. The prophecy includes two pieces of chronological information. One of these is five months, which in regular year for a day reckoning stood for 150 years. The other is "an hour, a day, a month, and a year," which was believed to lead on for a further 391 years and 15 days to the fall of the Turkish empire. The beginning of the first of the time periods was discovered in Gibbon's history, which told that on July 27, 1299, Osman bought the Ottoman empire into European consciousness by attacking Greece. The first 150 years of the prophecy were concluded on July 27, 1449 and the second period was to finish on August 11, 1840. The time required a strictly literalistic application of the year-day theory. An hour was one 24<sup>th</sup> of day symbolizing one 24<sup>th</sup> part of a year or 15 days. The rest was simple arithmetic, a day was taken for a year, a month for 30 years and a year for 360 years adding up to a total of 391 years plus 15 days...

When August 11 passed there was an abrupt pause in Millerite periodicals on the subject. The Millerites waited for news from Turkey with keen interest and expectancy of an Armageddon. For a time there appears to have been a moment of disquiet. No world war broke out. Nothing spectacular happened. The editors [of the *Signs of the Times*] promised that Miller would later comment on charges that he had falsely expected the close of probation. For a few weeks there was no "*THE NATIONS*" column in the *Signs of the Times*. Then steamers from the Old Continent brought detailed information of events in August and "*THE NATIONS*" reappeared in the *Signs*. Litch together with the other editors was able to publish news of prophetic fulfillment around August 11.

At first the reports were given with caution, and only after several months do they ring with a note of triumph. In October Litch entitles his article "The Battle Begun" and but [sic] he is not yet able to date the fulfillment to the day. Yet the fighting appeared to seal the prophecy. In January it is asserted that on the very day, August 11, Turkey had brought itself to the brink of war by imprisoning the special envoy of the allied Western nations in Alexandria. Mehemet Ali had proven unable to accept the conditions placed on him, instead he had answered: "Wallah, hillah, tillah" (an oath by God) I will not yield a span of the land I possess, and if war, is made against me, I will turn the empire upside down and be buried in its ruins." Mehemet Ali

The words "Wallah, hillah, tillah" must have appeared exciting to the Millerites as they were repeated numerous times in various articles over the issue. This was the decisive stroke. Litch concluded that he was now "entirely satisfied that on the 11<sup>th</sup> August – Ottoman supremacy departed." In spite of the fact that later judgment had failed to single out the Millerite dates as outstanding for the history of Turkey or of Islam, the Millerites experienced this "fulfillment" as a boost for their morale and it certainly proved an effective means of creating interest in prophetic timekeeping. For more than a year the *Signs* frequently included news on the Eastern question in "THE NATIONS" column.

Judgment on the impact of this interpretation must be guarded. It would be a mistake to regard this interpretation as one which converted thousands to Millerism. This idea would not explain Litch's dismay over people's reluctance to accept the events of August 11 as a "convincing" "sign from heaven." Likewise it is an error to call it a bitter disappointment. No one was to know that in spite of Turkey's troubles and occasional military skirmishes she was to continue as an independent state and that August 11, 1840 would not later be one of the important days in Turkish history. Subsequently after initial uncertainty the interpretation was promoted with reasonable enthusiasm. The fact that there was no strong challenge to Miller's and Litch's theory indicates that the hesitation and disappointment was not all that serious. In spite of the fact that Litch later renounced his Turkish interpretation it did add credibility to the whole of the year-day method: "That God had used days as figures of years, none will or can deny." The system of dates and periods was considered sealed and confirmed.

However one must agree with Anderson that Litch never allowed events to test his theory. It appears that if Mehemet Ali overthrew the Sultan, "or if the Sultan maintained his throne with outside help, the prophecy was still 'fulfilled.' If a general war broke out, or if it did not, the prophecy was still 'fulfilled.' Whether probation closed on August 11, 1840, or appeared to continue – the fall of Turkey was still a sign that the door of mercy would close – the hypothesis was not falsifiable."

(1989, pp.138, 139, 140-44)

### **From Ford:**

In the Glacier View document, *Daniel 8:14: the Day of Atonement and the Investigative Judgment*, Dr Ford makes these comments concerning the fifth and sixth trumpets:

As for Aug. 11, 1840, it has nothing whatever in its favor. As one studies the material sin our own GC Archives, one finds abundant evidence of the protracted discussions over this date through the years. But key scholars amongst us had settled the matter negatively by about the turn of the century. Litch was wrong chronologically, and exegetically, and historically. Nothing happened of significance on Aug.11, 1840. The power which supposedly lost its independence waged war against Western powers more than once since that date. Even in the twentieth century a large number of Adventists have anticipated the event as future which Litch affirmed was past. This our similarly inaccurate interpretations of Dan.11:45 and Rev.16:12.

Litch's starting date was as wrong as his terminus. Scholars no longer accept Gibbon's error regarding 1299. But this was only one or a chain of errors including Litch's forgetting about the calendar change which affected the reckoning of ten days.

Litch himself repudiated the former prophecy and mode of interpretation, as his later writings make clear. [Ford footnotes: "J. Litch, *Daniel and the Apocalypse*, (Philadelphia, 1873), p.170"]

Of much greater importance than the historical issues here is the fact that the Greek of Rev.9:15 is talking about a point of time, not a period. See all modern translations. (1980, p.199)

Again, the interpretation of the trumpets was looked at afresh, and Litch's position on Aug. 11. 1840, was rejected as false... (ibid, p.375)

In his commentary on the Book of Revelation, *Crisis*, Ford avoids the application to the Ottoman Empire:

This trumpet marks the crisis hour which is common with the sixth in each series in Revelation. Compare the reference to the hour of trial to test the whole world in the letter to the sixth church, the dissolution of the heavens in the great day of His wrath in seal six, and the gathering for Armageddon described by the sixth bowl. Verse 15 refers to "the hour, the day, the month, and the year" until which the demonic horsemen have been restrained in the tehom of the Euphrates." (1982, p.454)

In his recent commentary *Daniel and the Coming King*, Ford quotes a review by a John Rosier of Arasola's published dissertation.<sup>60</sup> Rosier says concerning Arasola's examination of the Ottoman Empire prediction in the Advent movement:

As regards the famous Turkey predictions of 1839, Arasola gives us a view not generally realized by those going through the Daniel and Revelation course. In a letter written by Josiah Litch at the time, he comments on how little attention had been paid to his prophecy, which he dated from 1449 and expected to end on August 11, 1840 with the collapse of Turkey and the great battle of Armageddon, heralding the beginning of the end and the Second Coming. The Turkey prediction proved to be unsound. There was no collapse of Turkey despite the war of 1839 between Turkey and Egypt, leading to the defeat of Turkey, and the predicted Armageddon did not occur. The Turkish empire, as we know, continued, even if in decline, until 1918. Litch later repudiated his Turkey prophecy; an act of some significance when one considers that initially this prophecy was considered as ocular proof of the validity of the day/year principle! Arasola also comments that the predicted date of August 11, 1840, is not a date of any significance in Turkish history. (Ford, 1996, p.295)

Before preparing the new edition of *Great Controversy* Prescott wrote a lengthy list of errors he felt needed correcting. Among these were the historical positions taken by it on the French Revolution and the sixth trumpet. Prescott pointed out that there was no evidence the Bible had been banned in France for three and a half years, and that Litch's prediction regarding August 11 had not only been given AFTER the fact (contrary to a statement in *Great Controversy*, which said it was given BEFORE), it was also quite invalid.

When *Daniel and Revelation* (Mrs. White's source) came in for revision in the 1940s, Prescott's criticisms were revived and confirmed. The fruitless scouring of libraries in Europe and America that took place before the 1911 edition of *Great Controversy* now witnessed a replay. We quote the official statement of the revising committee on the matter of the trumpets.

It is interesting to note that when James White and later Uriah Smith came to the seven trumpets they did not attempt an original interpretation but frankly appropriated an interpretation by Josiah Litch--one that Litch himself had already repudiated. Like them your committee has found nothing better to recommend. We therefore--

**Recommend**, That the interpretation of the Seven Trumpets remain as it is.

<sup>60</sup> No source is quoted by Ford for the source of Rosier's review.

During the work of the committee we find such comments as the following exchanged in letters:

I am still struggling with the problem of atheism and the French Revolution, and do not know yet just how we will come out.

I especially looked up Item Number 7 to find *some* quotations to take the place of these old ones, but I cannot find any good material

The date Aug. 26, 1792, should not be used. I can find nothing in any history of the French Revolution to show cause why this should be an outstanding day against Christianity.

**From David Lin:**<sup>61</sup>

David Lin takes issue with Ford's position on the traditional SDA historicists' explanation of the fifth trumpet.

A third instance of Ford's dishonest theology is found in his treatment of Josiah Litch's interpretation of Revelation 9:15. He says: "But, my friends, Josiah Litch was wrong. The day he chose to begin the prophecy was years out; he forgot about the dropping out of days in the calendar change. He didn't understand what the text was saying anyway. The text in Revelation spoke about the hour, day, month and year. It's not a period at all; it's a point and every Greek scholar in the world knows it. And The Seventh-day Adventist Commentary knows it too, so they put a special note in the Commentary saying, "Because of difficulties in the Greek, and our smallness of space, we will not enlarge upon the problem" (laughter). Now I've caricatured it a little and hope you'll read it for yourselves. Ellen White's endorsement of Litch was not correct. Litch was wrong, absolutely wrong."

Here we have an outstanding example of falsification, bluffing, and arbitrary denunciation, employed to enhance Ford's image as an authority on theology and to downgrade Ellen White's role as a messenger of God. Deliberate falsification is evident in Ford's attempt to create the impression that The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary knows that Litch was wrong and is so embarrassed as to refrain from elaborating on it on the pretext of lack of space. Is that true? No, that is not true.

The Commentary devotes more than a full page of special comment on Revelation 9:15, totalling some 1000 words, presenting the details of Litch's interpretation, and closing with the words, "Generally speaking, the Seventh-day Adventist interpretation of the fifth and sixth trumpets, particularly as touching the time period involved, is essentially that of Josiah Litch." It does not even mention the view advocated by Ford, but admits the existence of divergent interpretations in these words:

'It should be made clear, however, that commentators and theologians in general have been greatly divided over the meaning of the fifth and sixth trumpets. This has been due principally to problems in three areas: (1) the meaning of the symbolism itself; (2) the meaning of the Greek; (3) the historical events and dates involved. But to

---

<sup>61</sup> His paper can be found at <http://www.temcat.com/China-Letters/China-Letters-8.htm> The site gives a short biography of David Lin: "is a Chinese Christian who believes he is commissioned of God to carry the message of the soon-coming Savior to his countrymen. He was born in Manila. In infancy, he was dedicated by his mother to be a preacher of the Gospel. He received his first three years of schooling in Canada. Then he studied in Java, Shanghai and Beijing. He graduated from Pacific Union College and completed his religious training in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Takoma Park, Washington, D. C. In 1946 he returned to China, where he spent 45 years in his calling. During those years he was for some time isolated from the church in America, but remained interested in its welfare. Soon thereafter he resumed contact with friends in America and started writing letters and articles to share his concerns.

"David Lin's letters and articles appeared in various Adventist periodicals at a time when Desmond Ford's teachings were the center of attention in the Adventist church. Due to a revival of interest in him in recent years many readers have requested that Lin's analysis of Ford's theology be published in book form. A selection is here presented, set in chronological order."

canvass adequately these problems would carry us beyond the space limits permissible in this commentary.'

A perusal of this passage gives us an impression quite different from what Ford tried to make it to appear. Why did he venture to make this sweeping denunciation of Litch's interpretation and seek to enlist the aid of "every Greek scholar in the world" and *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*? Because he was bent on exploding the year-day principle and putting Ellen White in the position of having endorsed an "absolutely wrong" view. The laughter which followed his remarks about *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* being embarrassed by Litch's "wrong" view reveals that his malicious caricature had the desired effect.

We must point out that for a dignified doctor of theology to stoop to such mean tactics is a denial of his sacred office, and incompatible with the spirit of true scholarship. We state further that a truly conscientious scholar is usually reluctant to employ absolutes and superlatives in denouncing the views of others, especially when he himself has nothing better to offer in their place. To say that Litch was absolutely wrong, Ford should come up with an absolutely right view; otherwise he would reveal himself to be a mere wrecker, not a builder.

#### Was Josiah Litch Really Wrong?

Ford has prepared a book, yet unpublished, on Revelation. We presume he has therein written what he believes to be the right view on Revelation 9:15. But judging from the remarks just quoted, we can already gain a fair idea of his position. He maintains that the "hour, day, month and year" refers to a point, not to a period of time. He says, "Every Greek scholar in the world knows it." By this he implies that every Greek scholar in the world supports his view. The converse would be all who disagree with him are not Greek scholars. Here is another example of the methodology of this "great" theologian--always thinking and talking in absolutes.

But we point out that this is all that can be said of this alternative interpretation. It is an isolated point in time--that is all--a point dangling in empty space, contributing nothing to the interpretation of Revelation 9. We have checked *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, and found that it says nothing about this view because, no doubt, there isn't much to be said of it. As for "every Greek scholar in the world," neither Ford nor we have the means whereby we may effectively consult them. In the end Ford has produced no tangible evidence to prove that his own view is absolutely right.

In contrast to this view, Litch's interpretation has undergone the pragmatic test in a spectacular way, and was a positive contribution to the Millerite awakening. "Litch's prediction was a great stimulus to the missionary zeal of the Millerite movement. Years later a participant commented that it was to 'the Advent movement what the power of steam is on the machinery of the railroad locomotive. So from the eleventh day of August, 1840, the Advent cause and message, or angel, careered on its way with greater power than ever before.'" Damsteegt, P. G., *Foundations of the SDA Message and Mission*, 29

That is precisely why Ford is so furious in his attack. You see him slashing away at Litch and even rudely pushing down Ellen White in the process. Litch must go, and (with no apologies whatever) White too must go, Ford tells us. He makes two authoritarian assertions to prove his point:

The day he [Litch] chose to begin the prophecy was years out; he forgot about the dropping out of the days in the calendar change.

Ford's first argument is a strange one. He has just said that Revelation 9:15 speaks of a point, not of a period in time, so there really is no need to argue when this period should begin. Nevertheless, Ford claims to know the "correct" starting point for this span of time which he just said did not exist. What then is the correct date? Ford does not tell us, but simply says that Litch was "years out."

We first quote a passage from page 212 of *The Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* to clarify the matter of the calendar change:

The calendar currently in use in most nations, the Gregorian, is the result of a calendar reform in 1582 that corrected two erroneous suppositions of the Julian calendar, which had been in use since 45 B.C.--namely that the year contains exactly 365.25 days and that 235 lunar months exactly equal 19 solar years. That revision corrected an accumulated error of ten days and stopped the calendar from slipping farther out of line with the seasons.

With these facts in hand, we are ready to answer the question: How does the calendar change of 1582 affect Litch's interpretation? We note first that in 1582, October 4 was followed by October 15, thus adding 10 days to make up for the time slippage through the past 1627 years. That is, all dates after October 15, 1582 are corrected dates, and all dates before that date should be correspondingly shifted so as to be in step with the seasons.

Assuming that one day should be added for every 162 years (approximately), then the July 27, 1299, date Litch used for the beginning of the fifth trumpet should be updated eight days, thus bringing the end of the sixth trumpet to August 19, 1840--eight days after the historic words "provision had been made" were announced to the Sultan of Turkey by the four imperial powers on August 11, 1840.

Inasmuch as this incident marked the loss of independent power by Turkey, any political incident happening eight days later could only be a further advancement of this crucial situation--bringing Turkey's dependence on foreign imperialism to greater maturity, thereby verifying Litch's prediction more clearly. Instead of proving that Litch was absolutely wrong, this inclusion of eight days into his reckoning would take in eight more days of ripening developments to make the fulfilling of his prediction more convincing. On the other hand, Litch's failure to add eight days did not materially impair the accuracy of his prediction.

We see then that Ford has not proved that Litch was absolutely wrong. He fails to give conclusive proof that Revelation 9:15 refers to a point in time; while Litch has demonstrated that it refers to an exact calculable period, and current history has dramatically proved the correctness of his calculation. He was not "years out," but precisely accurate. And Ellen White was not mistaken in her endorsement of Litch's prediction. Yet in spite of all these facts, Ford has a way of making people believe he is right. That is why we must give him credit for good salesmanship. He has the knack of making up for his shortage of factual evidence with a spate of vehement assertions. And the power of his persuasion lies in his vehemence.

#### Hilarious Interlude

Incidentally, Ford also has the gift of entertaining his audience with an occasional play on words to impress us with his wit. Hear him run into a caper as he shifts to high gear:

Ellen White would have been burdened above all measure if she thought she was supposed to know everything about everything. We don't know anything about anything (laughter). Everything is related to everything else, so that we can't know anything about everything or know everything about anything" (laughter again). By this time we are again relaxed, and sink into our pews for another tirade.

#### Attacking Our Foundations

Ford's attack on Litch's interpretation of Revelation 9:15 is aimed chiefly at the year-day principle on which it is based. To endorse Litch's interpretation is to endorse the year-day principle. And since Ford's basic premise is that the year-day principle is not explicitly taught in the Bible, he feels justified in repudiating it, thereby junking all the prophetic calculations based on this principle.

Now we must begin our study of this problem by taking Ford seriously, assuming that he is a painstaking scholar searching for truth. He wants "explicit" evidence, to make sure that he will not be mistaken in his calculations. He is so honest that without an explicit statement by God that a day stands for a year in all symbolic prophecies he will not be guilty of presuming that it does. "I note that Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6 do not yield the day-year principle," says Ford, "nor is it to be found contextually in

either Daniel 8:14 or 9:24." Spectrum, 32. It is presumption to apply this principle without an explicit "thus saith the Lord." By his stance Ford impresses us that his is the scientific approach, and we, with William Miller, are mistaken and deluded.

But this problem is simply solved--just the way we proved Litch to be right. There are but two alternatives. In the case of Litch, we had to choose between the point and the period. In this case we have only to choose between the year-day principle and literal time. Those who take the "2300 evenings and mornings" to mean 1150 days apply this period to the desecration of the temple in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. This span of time is

about 3 years and two months, thus making of none effect the angel's words, "Shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days," and "For at the time of the end shall be the vision." Daniel 8:26, 17

Using literal time, the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation lose all significance for us who live in "the time of the end," and all the time prophecies related to Christ's first advent and the history of the Church (that is, the 3 times and a half, 42 months, 70 weeks, and 1260 days) also fall to the ground.

We conclude therefore that these symbolic time prophecies cannot refer to literal time, and the only alternative is to apply the year-day principle and see whether we get better results. William Miller's chart of the 70 weeks and 2300 days, plus Josiah Litch's calculation of Revelation 9:15 make up a convincing answer: the year-day principle works out perfectly. This test is called pragmatic, and is as "explicit" as any honest scholar would expect.

And if we use Ford's favorite tactic of calling other scholars to his aid, we can cite a formidable host of Reformers and scholars who employed the year-day principle in their study of the symbolic prophecies. Such great minds as Martin Luther and Sir Isaac Newton are on our side. Seventh-day Adventists are not alone here, and the burden of proof rests with Ford to produce a more plausible system of prophetic interpretation exclusive of the year-day principle. (<http://www.temcat.com/China-Letters/China-Letters-8.htm> )

One thing that Lin did not comment on in the SDABC commentary on Chapter 9, was the way the Commentary prefixed its comments regularly with these statements:

"a number of commentators have identified the fifth and sixth trumpets with the ravages of the Saracens and the Turks." (p.791)

"Those who identify the locust symbol with the Saracens have suggested ..." (Ibid)

"some who apply the fifth and sixth trumpet to the Moslem Arabs and Turks see in this..." (p.792)

"most commentators who interpret the fifth trumpet applying to the Saracens have seen..." (p.793)

"Commentators who apply the sixth trumpet to the Turks generally give a literal translation...some others connect the Euphrates with mystical Babylon..." (p.793)

One would be forgiven for believing the authors were non-committal on this topic. And one wonders what David Lin would have to say concerning Maxwell's position and the position of those like Prof. Prescott in the 1919 Conference!!

### **The History behind the Incident in 1840.**

In 2005, a bi-centennial conference was held in memory of Muhammad Ali's rise to power. Papers were presented by academics, mostly from Egypt, which give interesting background information to the times of Muhammad Ali and the incident of 1840, among other things.

But firstly, a general overview of the times of Muhammad Ali is given from the 1911 Encyclopedia Britannica:

---

## Encyclopedia Britannica.

The situation revealed to the astute Albanian boundless possibilities for gratifying his ambition. In spite of his chance victories, he was too shrewd an observer not to recognize the superiority of European methods of warfare; and as the first step towards the empire of which he dreamed he determined to create an army and a fleet on the European model. In 1808 the building and organization of the navy was begun with the aid of French officers and engineers. In 1811 the massacre of the Mamelukes left Mehemet Ali without a rival in Egypt, while the foundations of his empire beyond were laid by the war against the Wahhabis and the conquest of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. The Wahhabi War, indeed, dragged on till 1818, when Ibrahim (q.v.), the pasha's son, who in 1816 had driven the remnant of the Mamelukes into Nubia, brought it to an end. This done, the pasha turned his attention southward to the vast country watered by the Upper Nile. In 1820 the oasis of Siwa was subdued by his arms; in 1823 he laid the foundations of Khartum.

By this time Mehemet Ali was the possessor of a powerful fleet and of an army of veterans disciplined and drilled by European officers. To obtain these money had been necessary; and to raise money the pasha had instituted those internal "reforms" - the bizarre system of state monopolies and the showy experiments in new native industries which are described in the article Egypt (q.v.). The inherent viciousness of these expedients had, however, not as yet been revealed by their inevitable results, and Mehemet Ali in the eyes of the world was at once the most enlightened and the most powerful of the sultan's valis. To Mahmud II., whose whole policy was directed to strengthening the authority of the central power, this fact would have sufficed to make him distrust the pasha and desire his overthrow; and it was sorely against his will that, in 1822, the ill-success of his arms against the insurgent Greeks forced him to summon Mehemet Ali to his aid. The immediate price was the pashalik of Crete; in the event of the victory of the Egyptian arms the pashaliks of Syria and Damascus were to fall to Mehemet Ali, that of the Morea to his son Ibrahim. The part played by Mehemet Ali in the Greek War is described elsewhere (see Turkey: History; Greece: History; Greek Independence, War Of; Ibrahim). The intervention of the powers, culminating in the shattering of the Egyptian fleet at Navarino (q.v.), robbed him of his reward so far as Greece was concerned; the failure of his arms in face of this intervention gave Sultan Mahmud the excuse he desired for withholding the rest of the stipulated price of his assistance.

This disappointment of his ambition would not perhaps in itself have sufficed to stir Mehemet Ali to revolt against his master; but it was ominous of perils to come, which the astute pasha thought it wise to forestall. The sultan's policy had been consistently directed to crushing the overgrown power of his vassals; in the spring of 1831 two rebellious pashas, Hussein of Bosnia and Mustafa of Scutari, had succumbed to his arms; and, since he was surrounded and counselled by the personal enemies of the pasha of Egypt, it was likely that, so soon as he should feel himself strong enough, he would deal in like manner with Mehemet Ali. It was to anticipate this peril that Mehemet Ali determined himself to open the struggle: on the 1st of November 1831 a force of 9000 Egyptian infantry and 2000 cavalry crossed the frontier into Syria and met at Jaffa the fleet which brought Ibrahim as commander-in-chief. The combined forces at once laid siege to St Jean d'Acre.

The stubborn resistance of the garrison delayed Ibrahim's progress; and, meanwhile, wild rumours went abroad as to Mehemet Ali's intentions. He was master of the holy cities, and the official Moniteur Ottoman denounced his supposed plan of aiming at the caliphate in collusion with the sherif of Mecca. As for the pasha himself, he loudly disclaimed any such disloyal pretensions; his aim was to chastise Abdulla, pasha of Acre, who had harboured refugees from his "reforms"; to overthrow Khusrev, who had encouraged him in his refusal to surrender them; to secure the fulfilment of

the sultan's promise with regard to Syria and Damascus. Mahmud, on the other hand, was torn between hatred of the pasha and hatred of the Christian powers which had forced him to make concessions to the Greeks. Voices urged him to come to terms with Mehemet Ali, secure peace in Islam, and turn a united face of defiance against Europe; and for a while he harboured the idea. He was conscious of his own intense unpopularity, the outcome of his efforts at reform; he knew that in popular opinion Mehemet Ali was the champion of Islam against the infidel caliph, and that the issue of a struggle with him was more than doubtful. He was hampered by the unpaid debt to Russia; by unrest in Bosnia and Albania; above all, by the revolt of the Greek Islands, which had left his navy, deprived of its best sailors, in no condition to dispute the Egyptian command of the sea. In the end, however, his pride prevailed; in April 1833 the Turkish commander-in-chief Hussein Pasha left Constantinople for the front; and in the third week in May the ban of outlawry was launched against Mehemet Ali.

Meanwhile, Ibrahim had occupied Gaza and Jerusalem as well as Jaffa; on the 27th of May, a few days after the publication of the ban, Acre was stormed; on the 15th of June the Egyptians occupied Damascus. Ibrahim pressed on with characteristic rapidity, his rapid advance being favoured by the friendly attitude of the various sections of the Syrian population, whom he had been at pains to conciliate. He defeated the Ottoman advance-guard at Horns on the 9th of July and at Hamah on the 11th, entered Aleppo on the 17th, and on the 29th inflicted a crushing defeat on the main Turkish army under Hussein Pasha at the pass of Beilan. All Syria was lost to the sultan, and the Egyptian advance-guard passed the mountain defiles into Adana in Asia Minor.

Mahmud, in desperation, now turned for help to the powers. Russian aid, though promptly offered, was too double-edged a weapon to be used save at the last extremity. Austrian diplomacy was, for the moment, that of Russia. France had broken her long tradition of friendship for Turkey by the occupation of Algiers. Great Britain, prodigal of protestations of goodwill, alone remained; and to her Mahmud turned with a definite offer of an offensive and defensive alliance. Stratford Canning, who was at Constantinople for the purpose of superintending the negotiations for the delimitation of the frontiers of Greece, wrote home urging the government to accept, and suggesting a settlement of the Egyptian question which foreshadowed that of 1841. Palmerston, however, did not share Canning's belief in the possible regeneration of Turkey; he held that an isolated intervention of Great Britain would mortally offend not only Russia but France, and that Mehemet Ali, disappointed of his ambitions, would find in France a support that would make him doubly dangerous.<sup>1</sup> In the autumn Sultan Mahmud, as a last independent effort, despatched against Ibrahim the army which, under Reshid Pasha, had been engaged in pacifying Albania. The result was the crowning victory of the Egyptians at Konia (Dec. 21). The news reached Constantinople at the same time as Count Muraviev arrived on a special mission from the tsar. The Russian offers were at once renewed of a squadron of battleships and of a land force for the protection of the capital. Efforts were made to escape the necessity of accepting the perilous aid. Ottoman agents, backed by letters from the French charge d'affaires, were sent to Mehemet Ali and to Ibrahim, to point out the imminence of Russian intervention and to offer modified terms. Muraviev himself went to Alexandria, where, backed by the Austrian agent, Count Prokesch-Osten, he announced to the pasha the tsar's immutable hatred of rebels. Mehemet Ali merely protested the complete loyalty of his intentions; Ibrahim, declaring that as a soldier he had no choice but to obey his father's orders, advanced to Afium-Karahissar and Kutaiah, whence he wrote to the sultan asking his gracious permission to advance to Brusa. He was at the head of 100,000 men, well organized and flushed with victory; the Ottoman army survived only as demoralized rabble. Panic seized the Seraglio; and at the beginning of February the assistance of Russia was formally demanded. The representatives of France and Great Britain made every effort to secure a reversal of this fatal step; but, while they were threatening and promising, Russia was acting, and on the 10th of February a Russian squadron entered the Bosphorus.

In view of this it became necessary for the objecting powers to take a new line. The new French ambassador, Admiral Roussin, had arrived on the 17th; he now, with the full concurrence of Mandeville, the British charge d'affaires, persuaded the Porte to invite the Russians to withdraw, undertaking that France would secure the acceptance by Mehemet Ali of the sultan's terms. A period of suspense followed. The Russian squadron was detained by contrary winds, and before it could sail peremptory orders arrived from the tsar for it to remain until Ibrahim should have repassed the Taurus mountains. Meanwhile, Mehemet Ali had scornfully rejected the offers of the Porte; he would be content with nothing but the concession of his full demands - Syria, Icheli, Aleppo, Damascus and Adana. France and Great Britain now urged the sultan to yield, and in March a Turkish agent was sent to Ibrahim to offer the pashaliks of Syria, Aleppo and Damascus. The crisis was precipitated by the arrival on the 5th of April of a second division of the Russian fleet in the Bosphorus, and of a Russian force of 6000 men, which landed on the Asiatic shore. The Porte now tried once more to modify its terms; but the Western powers were now intent on getting rid of the Russians at all costs, and as a result of the pressure they brought to bear on both parties the preliminary convention of Kutaiah, conceding all the Egyptian demands, was signed on the 8th of April, and Ibrahim began his withdrawal. The convention stipulated for the bestowal of the pashalik of Adana on Ibrahim; but when on the 16th he received the official list of appointments, he found that Adana had been expressly reserved by the sultan. He at once arrested his march; but the pressure of famine in the capital, caused by the cutting off of supplies from Asia and the presence of the large Russian force, compelled Mahmud to yield, and on the 3rd of May a firman ceded Adana to Ibrahim under the pretext of appointing him muhassil, or collector of the revenue.

When Lord Ponsonby, the new British ambassador, arrived at I Canning's original memorandum is in the Foreign Office Records in the volume marked F.O., Turkey: From Sir Stratford Canning (August to December, 1832). It bears elaborate pencil notes in Palmerston's handwriting, in part already obliterated.

Constantinople on the 1st of May he found Russia practically in possession. Sultan Mahmud was to the last degree embittered against the powers which, with lively protestations of friendship, had forced him to humiliate himself before his hated vassal. Russia had given him deeds, not words; and to Russia he committed himself. A further contingent of six or seven thousand Russians had arrived on the 22nd of April; Russian engineers were busy with the fortifications along the Straits; Russian agents alone were admitted to the sultan's presence. "It is manifest," wrote Lord Ponsonby, "that the Porte stands in the relation of vassal to the Russian government." i The relation was soon to be yet more manifest. Before, on the 9th of July, the Russian fleet, with the Russian troops on board, weighed anchor for the Black Sea, there was signed at the palace of Unkiar Skelassi the famous treaty (July 8, 1833) which, under the guise of an offensive and defensive alliance, practically made Russia the custodian of the gates of the Black Sea. (See Turkey: History.) Mehemet Ali had triumphed, but he was well aware that he held the fruits of his victory by a precarious tenure. He was still but a vali among the rest, holding his many pashaliks nominally by the sultan's will and subject to annual reappointment; and he knew that both his power and his life would be forfeit so soon as the sultan should be strong enough to deprive him of them. To achieve this one end had, indeed, become the overmastering passion of Mahmud's life, to defeat it the object of all Mehemet Ali's policy. So early as 1834 it seemed as though the struggle would be renewed; for Mehemet Ali had extended to his new pashaliks his system of monopolies and conscription, and the Syrians, finding that they had exchanged Turkish whips for Egyptian scorpions, rose in a passion of revolt. It needed the intervention of Mehemet Ali in person before, in the following year, they were finally subdued. Meanwhile it had needed all the diplomatic armoury of the powers to prevent Mahmud hastening to the assistance of his "oppressed subjects." The threats of Great Britain and France, the failure of Russia to back him up, induced him to refrain; but sooner or later a renewal of the war was inevitable; for the sultan, with but one end in view, was

reorganizing his army, and Mehemet Ali, who in the autumn of 1834 had assumed the style of viceroy and sounded the powers as to their attitude in the event of his declaring his complete independence, refused to continue to pay tribute which he knew would be used against himself.

The crisis came in 1838. In March the Egyptians were severely defeated by the revolted Arabs of the Hauran; and the Porte, though diplomatic pressure kept it quiet, hurried on preparations for war. Mehemet Ali, too, had small reason for postponing the conflict. The work of Moltke, who with other German officers who had been engaged in organizing the Turkish army, threatened to destroy his superiority in the field; the commercial treaty signed by the Ottoman government with Great Britain (Aug. 16), which applied equally to all the territories under his rule, threatened to destroy at a blow the lucrative monopolies which supplied him with the sinews of war. Months of suspense followed; for the powers had threatened to cast their weight into the scale against whichever side should prove the aggressor, and Mehemet Ali was too astute to make the first move. In the end Mahmud's passion played into his hands. The old sultan thirsted to crush his rebel ous vassal, at any cost; and on the 21st of April 1839 the Ottoman army, stationed at Bir on the Euphrates, crossed the stream and invaded Syria. On the 23rd of June it was attacked and utterly routed by Ibrahim at Nezib. On the 1st of July the old sultan died, unconscious of the fatal news, leaving his throne to Abdul-Mejid, a lad of sixteen. To complete the desperateness of the situation the news reached the capital that Ahmed Pasha, the Ottoman admiral-in-chief, had sailed to Alexandria and surrendered his fleet to Mehemet Ali, on the pretext that the sultan's advisers were sold to the Russians.

So far as the forces of the Ottoman Empire were concerned, From Lord Ponsonby, F.O., Turkey, May 22, 1833.

Mehemet Ali was now absolute master of the situation. The grand vizier, in the sultan's name, wrote beseeching him to avoid the further shedding of Mussulman blood, offering him a free pardon, the highest honours of the state, the hereditary pashalik of Egypt for himself, and Syria for Ibrahim until he should succeed his father in Egypt. Mehemet Ali replied diplomatically; for, though these offers fell far short of his ambitions, a studious moderation was essential in view of the doubtful attitude of the European powers.

On the 27th of July the ambassadors of the five powers presented to the Porte a joint note, in which they declared that an agreement on the Eastern Question had been reached by the five Great Powers, and urged it "to suspend all definite decision made without their concurrence, pending the effect of their interest in its welfare." The necessity for showing a united front justified the diplomatic inexactitude; but the powers were agreed on little except the need for agreement. Especially was this need realized by the British government, which feared that Russia would seize the occasion for an isolated intervention under the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi. On the 1st of August Palmerston wrote to Ponsonby impressing upon him that the representatives of the powers, in their communications with the Porte, "should act not only simultaneously in point of time, but identically in point of manner" - a principle important in view of later developments. Yet it was a task all but impossible to preserve this appearance of unanimity in view of the divergent views within the concert. France and Great Britain had hitherto acted together through common opposition to the supposed designs of Russia. Austria, too, now that the revolutionary spectres of 1830 had been laid, was reverting to her traditional opposition to Russia in the affairs of the Near East, and Metternich supported Palmerston's proposal of an international conference at Vienna. Everything depended on the attitude of the emperor Nicholas. This was ultimately determined by his growing distrust of Austria and his perennial hatred of the democratic regime of France. The first caused him to reject the idea of a conference of

which the activities would have been primarily directed against Russia; the second led him to drive a wedge into the Anglo-French entente by making direct overtures to Great Britain. Palmerston listened to the tsar's proposals, conveyed through Baron Brunnow, "with surprise and admiration." The emperor Nicholas was prepared to accept the views of Great Britain on the Turco-Egyptian question; to allow the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi to lapse; to act henceforth in the Ottoman Empire only in concert with the other powers, in return for an agreement closing the Dardanelles to the war-ships of all nations and to extend the same principle to the Bosphorus. Finally, Brunnow was empowered to arrange a coalition of the great powers with a view to the settlement of the Egyptian question; and in this coalition the tsar was willing, for political reasons, that France should be included, though he stated his personal preference for her exclusion.

To these views Austria and, as a natural consequence, Prussia acceded without difficulty. The attitude of France was a more doubtful quantity. In France Mehemet Ali had become a popular hero; under him French civilization had gained a foothold in Egypt; he was regarded as invincible; and it was hoped that in alliance with him French influence in the Mediterranean would be supreme. Palmerston, on the other hand, believed that the Ottoman empire would never be secure until "the desert had been placed between" the pasha of Egypt and the sultan; and the view that the coalition should be directed against Mehemet Ali was shared by the other powers. In the circumstances France should either have loyally accepted the decision of the majority of the concert, to which she had committed herself by signing the joint note of the 27th of July, or should have frankly stated her intention of taking up a position outside. The fact that she did neither led to a crisis that for a moment threatened to plunge Europe into war.

For nearly a year the diplomatic pourparlers continued without an agreement being reached; France insisted on Mehemet Ali's receiving the hereditary pashalik of Syria as well as that of Egypt, a proposition to which Palmerston, though sincerely anxious to preserve the Anglo-French entente, refused to agree. The tension of the situation was increased when, on the 10th of February 1840, Thiers came into power. The diplomacy of Guizot, backed now by Austria and Prussia, had succeeded in persuading Palmerston to concede the principle of allowing Mehemet Ali to receive, besides Egypt, the pashalik of Acre as far as the frontiers of Tripoli and Damascus (May 7). Thiers, however, refused to listen to any suggestion for depriving him of any part of Syria; but, instead of breaking off the correspondence and leaving the concert, he continued the negotiations, and before long circumstances came to the knowledge of the British government which seemed to prove that he was only doing so with a view to gaining time in order to secure a separate settlement in accordance with French views.

The opportunity for this arose from a change in the situation at Constantinople, where the dismissal of Khusrev Pasha had, in Mehemet Ali's view, removed the main obstacle to his reconciliation with the sultan. He proposed to the French consul-general at Alexandria to make advances to the Porte, and suggested sending back the Ottoman fleet as an earnest of his good intentions, a course which, it was hoped, "would lead to a direct and amicable arrangement of the Turco-Egyptian question." On the 21st of June his envoy, Sami Bey, actually arrived at Constantinople, ostensibly to congratulate the sultan on the birth of a daughter, really to make use of the French influence now supreme at the Porte in order to effect a settlement. In the circumstances the proper course for Thiers to have pursued would have been to have communicated to the powers, to whom he was bound by the moral engagement of the 27th of July 1839, the new conditions arising out of Mehemet Ali's offer. Instead he wrote to Guizot, on the 30th of June, saying that the situation argued strongly in favour of postponing any decision in London, adding: "I have written to Alexandria and Constantinople to counsel moderation on both sides; but I have been careful to forbid

the agents to enter on their own account, and as a French undertaking, on a negotiation of which the avowed aim is a direct arrangement. If such an enterprise is imputed to us, you will be in a position to deny it." The discovery of what seemed an underhand intrigue on the part of France produced upon the powers exactly the effect that Thiers had foreseen and deprecated. They regarded it as an attempt to ruin the work of the concert and to secure for France a "complete individual triumph" at Alexandria and Constantinople; and their countermove was to sign at London on the 15th of July, without the concurrence of France, a convention with the Porte for the settlement of the affairs of the Levant. By this instrument it was agreed that the terms to be offered to Mehemet Ali having been concerted with the Porte, the signatory powers would unite their forces in order to compel the pasha to accept the settlement. As to the terms to be offered, it was arranged that, in the event of Mehemet Ali yielding within ten days, he should receive the hereditary pashalik of Egypt and the administration for life of southern Syria, with the title of Pasha of Acre and the possession of the fortress of St Jean d'Acre. At the end of ten days, should he remain obdurate, the offer of Syria and Acre would be withdrawn; and if at the end of another ten days he was still defiant, the sultan would hold himself at liberty to withdraw the whole offer and to take such measures as his own interests and the counsels of his allies might suggest to him.

The news of this "mortal affront" to the honour of France caused immense excitement in Paris. The whole press was clamorous for war; Thiers declared that the alliance with Great Britain was shattered, and pressed on warlike preparations; even Louis Philippe was carried away by the fever. The immediate effect was that Mehemet Ali, confident of French assistance, maintained a defiant attitude. The situation, however, was rapidly changed by the unexpected results of the armed intervention of the Allies. The appearance of the combined British, Austrian and Russian fleets, under Sir Charles Napier, off Beirut (Aug. 11) was the signal for a general rising of the Syrians against Ibrahim's tyranny. On the 11th of September, Suleiman Pasha not having obeyed the summons to evacuate the town, the bombardment was begun, and Ottoman troops were landed to co-operate with the rebels. On the 3rd of October Beirut fell; and Ibrahim, cut off from his communications by sea, and surrounded by a hostile population, began a hurried retreat southward. On the 3rd of November Acre surrendered to the allied fleet. Mehemet Ali's power in Syria had collapsed like a pricked bubble; and with it had gone for ever the myth of his humane and enlightened rule. The sole question now was whether he should be allowed to retain Egypt itself.

On the 15th of September the sultan, who had broken off all negotiations with Mehemet Ali on receipt of the news of the Syrian revolt, acting on the advice of Lord Ponsonby, declared the pasha deposed, on the ground that the term allowed by the Convention of London had expired, and nominated his successor. Mehemet Ali received the news with his accustomed sang-froid, observing to the consuls of the four powers, who had come to notify their own removal, that "such denunciations were nothing new to him; that this was the fourth, and that he hoped to get over it as well as he had done the other three, with the help of God and the Prophet." In the end his confidence proved to be justified. The news of the events in Syria and especially of the deprivation of Mehemet Ali had produced in France what appeared to be an exceedingly dangerous temper; the French government declared that it regarded the maintenance of Mehemet Ali in Egypt as essential to the European balance of power; and Louis Philippe sought to make it clear to the British government, through the king of the Belgians, that, whatever might be his own desire to maintain peace, in certain events to do so would be to risk his throne. Palmerston, indeed, who did not believe that under the Bourgeois Monarchy France would translate her brave words into action, was in favour of settling the Turco-Egyptian question once for all by depriving Mehemet Ali of Egypt as well. The influences against him, however, were too powerful. Metternich protested against a course which would result, in his opinion, either in a war or a revolution in France; King Leopold enlarged on the wickedness and absurdity of risking a European war for the sake of putting an end to the power of an old man who could have but few years to live; Queen Victoria urged her ministers to

come to terms with France and relieve the embarrassments of the "dear King"; and Lord Melbourne, with the majority of the cabinet, was in favour of compromise. When therefore, on the 8th of October, Guizot, in an interview with Palmerston, presented what was practically an ultimatum on the part of France, "it was determined that this intimation should be met in a friendly spirit, and that Lord Palmerston should see the Ministers of the other powers and agree with them to acquaint the French that they with England would use their good offices to induce the Porte not to insist on the deprivation of Mehemet Ali so far as Egypt is concerned." In accordance with this Palmerston instructed Ponsonby to press upon the sultan, in the event of Mehemet Ali's speedy submission, not only to withdraw the sentence of deprivation but to confer upon him the hereditary pashalik of Egypt.

For a while it seemed that even this would not avert a European war. Thiers still maintained his warlike tone, and the king's speech prepared by him for the opening of the Chambers on the 28th of October was in effect a declaration of defiance to Europe. Louis Philippe himself, however, was not prepared to use this language; whereupon Thiers resigned, and a new cabinet was formed under Marshal Soult, with Guizot as foreign secretary. The equivocal tone of the new speech from the Throne raised a storm of protest in the Chambers and the country. It was, however, soon clear that Palmerston's diagnosis of the temper of the French bourgeois was correct; the clamour for war subsided; on the 4th of December the address on the Egyptian Question proposed by the government was carried, and peace was assured. Nine days earlier Sir Charles Napier had appeared with a British squadron off Alexandria and, partly by persuasion, partly by threats, had induced Mehemet Ali to submit to the sultan and to send back the Ottoman fleet, in return for a guarantee of the hereditary pashalik of Egypt. This arrangement was ratified by Palmerston; and all four powers now combined to press it on the reluctant Porte, pointing out, in a joint note of the 30th of January 1841, that "they were not conscious of advising a course out of harmony with the sovereignty and legitimate rights of the sultan, or contrary to the duties imposed on the Pasha of Egypt as a subject appointed by His Highness to govern a province of the Ottoman Empire." This principle was elaborated in the firman, issued on the 13th of February, by which the sultan conferred on Mehemet Ali and his heirs by direct descent the pashalik of Egypt, the greatest care being taken not to bestow any rank and authority greater than that enjoyed by other viziers of the empire. By a second firman of the same date Mehemet Ali was invested with the government of Nubia, Darfur, Khordofan and Sennaar, with their dependencies. On the 10th of June the firman was solemnly promulgated at Alexandria.

Thus ended the phase of the Egyptian Question with which the name of Mehemet Ali is specially bound up. The threatened European conflict had been averted, and presently the wounded susceptibilities of France were healed by the invitation extended to her to take part in the Straits Convention. As for Mehemet Ali himself, he now passes off the stage of history. He was an old man; his mind was soon to give way; and for some time before his death on the 2nd of August 1849 the reins of power were held by his son and successor Ibrahim, who did not long survive him.

[http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Mehemet\\_Ali](http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Mehemet_Ali) see also the article on the History of the Ottoman Empire and Turkey, in either the 1911 or current Encyclopedia Britannica.

### **Contemporary Comment by Egyptian Scholars.**

**Raouf Abbas**, chairman of the Egyptian Association for Historical Studies and professor emeritus of modern history at Cairo University. The important points he raises in his article include:

the Ottoman Empire was crumbling, and plans were being devised for the carving up of the empire

Mohamed Ali also tailored his foreign policy towards the ultimate realization of his regional project. Although he was viceroy of an important province in the Ottoman Empire, this empire was crumbling and European powers were hovering for the kill, with dozens of plans already drawn up for partitioning its territory after the empire's demise. Mohamed Ali knew that if he was not to be dragged down with the rest of the empire, he had to build for himself and his descendants a powerful state entity and eventually expand the realm of this entity as much as possible. He also realised that the softening centre of the empire gave him the opening he needed. The Supreme Porte needed his services, and these he readily provided, for his early campaigns in the Hijaz, in Crete and in Greece, gave him the ready pretext for building up his armed forces and, more importantly, the first modern Egyptian navy.

The Morea War, in particular, was the first theatre in which he put his new army to the test and gave it important experience in the field. That war also proved a major testing ground for his new navy, constructed with the aid of European experts as was the new arsenal in Alexandria. In the bargain, the deployment of his forces was his way of proclaiming that there was a new maritime power on the rise in the eastern Mediterranean.

The weakness of the Ottoman state also enticed Mohamed Ali into expanding the physical boundaries of his rule, enabling him to become governor of the most important Arabic-speaking Ottoman provinces. His purpose in doing so was two-fold. Territorial expansion would put him astride of the Middle East's ancient trade routes. It would also enable him to mold Egypt, Sudan, the Arabian Peninsula and the Levant into a small closely integrated self-sufficient empire with a far greater amount and diversity of resources at its disposal.

However, Mohamed Ali was acutely aware that the perpetuity of his reforms and other accomplishments and of his personal rule and that of his successors was contingent upon the will of the sultan. His sole guarantee for the future, therefore, was to secure from the sultan a special status for Egypt within the Ottoman Empire, which would give him that extra room for manoeuvre he needed at the regional and international levels. He had contemplated forging his own path independently. He could have for example seceded from the empire freeing himself from the encumbrances of subordination to the foundering empire. In so doing, he might have continued his economic, administrative and military reforms without having to defer to directives from Istanbul and without having to pay the annual tribute required by the rights of allegiance.

As international circumstances were not ripe for that sort of independence, however, Mohamed Ali resolved to carve out a special preserve of his own within the empire. Although this meant continued recognition of Ottoman hegemony, he would ensure that this hegemony was purely nominal, by securing for himself and his family dynastic rights to the throne of Egypt and the highest possible degree of autonomy.

At the same time, he realised that for Egypt to remain within the general framework of the Ottoman Empire was not without advantages. The reason the empire had managed to remain intact until then was primarily due to the fact that since the European powers could not come to an agreement over how to partition the empire they resolved instead to guarantee its territorial integrity. Egypt, as part of this territory, could benefit from this guarantee.

But, Mohamed Ali knew that that guarantee alone would be meaningless unless he backed it up with the military strength capable of shielding his preserve against foreign ambitions. He had read the writing on the walls of his times. The European powers were lusting after possessions in the Near and Far East and only a few years before he came to power the French had invaded Egypt and the Ottoman sultans were only able to expel them by calling on the assistance of the British. Several decades down the line, it would be the British knocking on Egypt's doors preparatory to occupying it. Meanwhile, to the east, Russian pressures were mounting on Muslim lands south of the Caspian and the remnants of the Islamic empires in India were falling before British colonisation, while to the west the French had seized Algeria, which until then had also been an Ottoman province.

The French expedition in Egypt had riveted European attention towards this part of the world. Although European powers had no direct economic or cultural interests in Egypt, the short-lived French presence here threw into relief Egypt's strategic location at the crossroads to the East where the British in particular were intensifying their colonial drive. It was little wonder therefore that the European ideas of linking their continent to the East by land or sea routes passing through Egypt began to take concrete form in the last two decades of Mohamed Ali's rule. Perhaps Mohamed Ali's reconstruction of the Nile and overland route linking Suez to Alexandria via Cairo was an attempt to curtail European designs to extend their political influence over Egypt in the pursuit of their strategic interests.

In all events, Mohamed Ali hoped to win European support for his drive for independence. His argument was that if a ruler could accomplish as much as he had already achieved, imagine how much more he would be able to accomplish if freed from the restrictions of Ottoman suzerainty. It required little more than a glance to realise that under the first decades of his rule, Egypt had far outstripped Istanbul in its level of progress. Of course, such success could not be attributed to the individual will of a leader alone; the land itself also had to have the potential in terms of manpower and resources to be molded into a modern state of the first order.

Mohamed Ali applied his unique drive and intelligence to getting the most out of this potential. He restored peace and security throughout the land; he founded factories and established a new school system; he brought over European experts to oversee his projects and man his new ministries; he paved the land routes to serve European trade; and he began to shape the people of the country into a modern productive force. In all this, Europe would have no cause to fear for the sultan, for Egypt's strength only added to Istanbul's strength, to which Egypt's service on behalf of the sultan in the Arabian Peninsula and Greece furnished eloquent testimony. Mohamed Ali had given the sultan everything—money and armies, even losing his fleet in the process—obtaining nothing from the sultan in return.

The Europeans therefore had a choice to make. Either they could agree to allow Mohamed Ali to secede from the Ottoman Empire and make Egypt an independent sovereign nation or they could approve to the alternative, which was for Egypt to remain within the Ottoman fold, but on the condition that it was granted a special status in accordance with which its ruler and his descendants would enjoy a broad range of prerogatives.

The first option—Egypt's full independence—would require European powers to abandon their commitment to the non-partitioning of the Ottoman state and to adopt a new approach to the corner of the Near East that sat astride the trade routes and that had a military force to be reckoned with and a strong and ambitious ruler. That scenario did not accord with European designs. What did was for the region to remain under a weak Ottoman authority that posed no threat to speak of to European interests. In addition, France and Britain had no intention of allowing Mohamed Ali's challenge to the sultan lure Russia into invading Turkey from the north and establishing a foothold on the Bosphorus, thereby upsetting the international balance of power.

Nor was Europe thoroughly convinced of the value of the reforms of which Mohamed Ali boasted. The British in particular objected that Mohamed Ali's state monopolies deprived the Egyptian peasant of the fruits of his labour and subjected him to a form of corvee labour. The more moderate critics in Europe felt that while Mohamed Ali had made enormous inroads in developing Egypt, everything depended upon his person, as a result of which all that progress would crumble as soon as his rule came to an end. At the same time, European powers did not regard Mohamed Ali's drive to throw off the yoke of the Sultan as a form of "national revolution," such as that which took place in Greece and would subsequently occur in the Balkans and other Ottoman European possessions. Mohamed Ali, they held, was not Egyptian and his government in Egypt did not rest on the will of the people or even reflect a popular nationalist aspiration, for the people in Arab lands were motivated by religious not national allegiances.

Aware of European motives and attitudes, Mohamed Ali throughout his rule carefully avoided clashing with European policy and with any European force. He knew that any future arrangement between Egypt and the Ottoman authorities stood a better chance of success if it had the approval of the European powers, for only this would ultimately be the surest safeguard against future Ottoman intervention as well as European ambitions.

Mohamed Ali greatly aspired to gain the friendship of the British, whose formidable naval power was palpably present in the Mediterranean and in the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. The Pasha of Egypt had won the admiration of the British in the wake of the Fraser campaign of 1807, when he returned their prisoners of war and undertook the treatment of British sick and wounded. Three years later, he struck an agreement with the East India Company in accordance with which he pledged to protect British trade caravans passing through Egypt and to waive customs tariffs on the personal belongings of British travellers. He also vowed to protect British subjects and property in the event of a war between Britain and the Ottoman state. During the Morea War Mohamed Ali demonstrated the value he attached to British friendship. By withdrawing from that campaign he hoped to win British respect and allay any apprehensions they might have over his eastward expansion.

Mohamed Ali also gave a clear message to the British at the time when the French were soliciting his help to conquer Algeria (1830). In the course of his negotiations with the French, he signaled to Britain that he was willing to help them halt the spread of Russian influence into Turkey and Persia. London, however, could not forget that it was Mohamed Ali's challenge to the Supreme Porte that lured the Russians towards Istanbul to begin with. It therefore preferred to remedy the Russian threat by using its own navy to strengthen its hold on the trade routes to India, which passed through the Red Sea and the Euphrates. For this it did not need an alliance with an ambitious ruler such as Mohamed Ali whose fate was in the balance.

This stance almost led to a clash between the British and Mohamed Ali, who at one point succeeded in occupying a position on the Euphrates and extending his sway across to the shores of the Persian Gulf and the entrance to the Red Sea. Al-Hasa, Al-Qatif, Asir and even Aden for a short time one after the other submitted to his rule. When he began to make overtures to the Shah of Persia, British qualms peaked and London resolved to put an end to Mohamed Ali's expansion in the areas it deemed vital to its interests. These factors, as well as the fear that Russian expansionism might threaten European peace, compelled Britain to adhere to its policy of preserving the integrity of the Ottoman state. This, in turn, meant that Mohamed Ali would ultimately have to withdraw his forces behind Egyptian borders.

France had an entirely different approach to the Ottoman Empire. We recall that France occupied Egypt in 1798 and Algeria in 1830. The French then dispatched a minister plenipotentiary to Alexandria to offer Mohamed Ali a military detachment and French financiers backed this up with an offer of a sizeable loan. The Egyptian Pasha reciprocated the kindness, engaging French experts in his government, guaranteeing French expatriates the most favourable treatment, adopting French systems in the development of Egypt's educational system and armed forces, and sending most Egyptian study missions to France. However, France still wavered in its eastern policy. Like Britain, it feared that Mohamed Ali's expansionist drive would ultimately threaten European peace by furnishing Russia with the pretext to invade the Ottoman Empire from the north. Paris therefore was keen for a diplomatic settlement to the dispute between Mohamed Ali and the Sultan.

Although there was nothing to prevent the two sides from negotiating directly and presenting their agreement to European powers as a *fait accompli*, the European powers had too many interests vested in the region to allow this. Nevertheless, Britain had no intention of allowing the French to mediate on their own, insisting that the Cairo-Istanbul relationship was a matter that concerned the whole of Europe. France eventually came around to this principle, for like Britain it hoped to check the spread of Russian influence, although unlike Britain it also sought to advance Mohamed Ali's interests. Russia then joined the European powers in their drive to prevent a settlement between Mohamed Ali and the Sultan.

Because of France's weakened international position at the time, Britain maneuvered itself into the lead of the negotiating process and was, therefore, the primary architect of the agreement that was struck in 1840. The London Treaty of 1840 upheld the preservation of the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. In addition, although it conferred upon Egypt a status far less than that Mohamed Ali had aspired for, it elevated Egypt above other Ottoman provinces. Mohamed Ali and his descendants were granted dynastic rights over Egypt. The London Treaty also granted him rule over southern Syria (Palestine) for the rest of his life. This provision came with the caveat that if he did not accept the terms of this agreement within ten days his Levantine possessions would be taken away from him and if he persisted in his refusal for another 10 days Egypt would be taken away from him as well.

Mohamed Ali initially rejected this ultimatum, in the hope that the European alliance would fall apart and that King Louis Philippe of France would come to his support. His hope was misplaced. Fearful of the prospect of war, the French king refused to deviate from the European consensus. Soon, the Egyptian coasts were surrounded, Egyptian rule in the Levant collapsed and Mohamed Ali caved in. In June 1841, the sultan issued an amended firman based on the Treaty of London.

The final settlement affirmed Egypt's status as part of the Ottoman Empire, subject to all its laws and international treaties. It also stipulated that the Egyptian army was part of the Ottoman armed forces and that henceforward the Egyptian viceroy would not be allowed to construct warships without the approval of the Supreme Porte. Simultaneously, the agreement conferred the Mohamed Ali family's right to dynastic rule over Egypt. In sum, Mohamed Ali was left with the right to dispose of the resources of the country as he saw fit, after paying the required tribute to the Ottoman capital.

Although the Khedive Ismail succeeded in broadening the prerogatives of the Egyptian rule, the agreement remained in effect until 18 December 1914, when the British declaration of a protectorate over Egypt effectively brought an end to Ottoman suzerainty. Legally it came to an end when Turkey officially relinquished its sovereignty over Egypt in the Conference of Lausanne in 1922.

<http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2005/742/sc2.htm>

**Nasser Rabbat** Aga Khan professor of Islamic architecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

By 1830, Muhammad Ali, who had long been aware of the intrinsic weakness of the Ottoman empire, decided to risk an all-out attack against it despite his awareness that Europe would resist such a daring move. Between 1830 and 1833, his new army marched north and threatened Istanbul before it was halted by European pressure. For eight years afterward, Muhammad Ali defiantly reigned over an empire that extended into the Ottoman heartland of Anatolia, with his son Ibrahim Pasha as the effective governor of greater Syria. He seems not to have totally relinquished his dreams of rising to the pinnacle of the empire until 1841, when his army was driven out of Syria by a combined European- Ottoman assault. Soon afterward, in the Treaty of London forced upon him by the European Powers, he agreed to recognise the sovereignty of the Ottoman sultan in return for a guaranteed hereditary entitlement to rule in Egypt for his family. This act established a semi-autonomous Egyptian kingdom which was ruled by Muhammad Ali's descendants until 1952.

**Assem El-Dessouky:** The writer is professor emeritus of modern history at Helwan University.

Mohamed Ali's territorial expansionism combined with his economic protectionist policies brought him into direct conflict with the Ottoman Sultan and European colonial powers. The first concrete sign of the collusion between Ottoman and

European authorities against Mohamed Ali was the 1838 Balta Liman treaty between London and Istanbul in accordance with which European products were to be allowed into Egyptian markets at stipulated customs rates. When Mohamed Ali refused to implement the agreement because of the threat this posed to his nascent industrialisation project, the sultan gave him a year's grace period, after which Mohamed Ali still refused to comply. The Europeans then joined forces with the Ottomans and ultimately inflicted that defeat that compelled Mohamed Ali to succumb to the Treaty of London of 1840, the provisions of which were specifically designed to curb Mohamed Ali's power.

The Cattai brothers were sensitive to the dynamics at play, having concluded that the Balta Liman was explicitly intended to "cripple Mohamed Ali". They pointed out that the British ambassador to Istanbul drew the attention of the Sultan to the fact that ending Mohamed Ali's monopoly over the Egyptian economy would "undermine his financial base, erode his most important resources and diminish his influence." Although Mohamed Ali initially attempted to resist the Treaty of London, he eventually heeded the French advice to yield. On this, the Cattais remarked, "the accession of that wise, perspicacious and farsighted man was the best way to save his country from destruction."

To Al-Rafie the London Treaty was tangible proof of the might Egypt had attained under Mohamed Ali, "for this had compelled European powers to join forces against him." Mohamed Sabry was not so forgiving. He faulted Mohamed Ali for thinking that "he was capable of standing up against Europe." Shukri, on the other hand, believes that the impact of the Treaty of London on Mohamed Ali was overstated. In his opinion, it did not adversely affect Mohamed Ali's designs for Egypt's revival, for his reform and development projects continued long after his military projects were put to an end. Mohamed Ali's energies never once flagged between 1840 and his death in 1849, Shukri wrote, "contrary to the claims of many who mistakenly believe that all Mohamed Ali's reforms revolved around a single axis - the army -- whereas in fact all the activities of the pasha, including his military projects, revolved around an entirely different axis, which was to build the nation." <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2005/742/sc3.htm>

**Latifa Mohamed Salem** The writer is professor of modern and contemporary history at the Faculty of Arts, Benha University.

Muhammad Ali had various motives to control the Levant, the most significant of which was a need to protect Egypt. The country's eastern threshold was under threat of outside aggression and annexing the Levant would protect it and extend its strategic depth to the north. Economics provided a second motive, for the project he pursued required raw materials, in particular metal used in industry, wood needed for warships and merchant ships and other products the Levant was famous for, as well as products from Asia imported to the Levant. Furthermore, the Levant's material wealth would complement his monopolization policy, while its human resources would be useful in building an army, since Levantines were renowned for a strong warrior nature. In addition the region enjoyed a special religious and cultural value, including as it did Jerusalem and Umayyad Damascus. And finally, Muhammad Ali had a strong desire to launch a new renaissance in the region by doing away with the old styles of rule -- a model that could be applied to the Ottoman Empire as a whole. Hence, a struggle was expected between Cairo and Istanbul, particularly after Mohamed Ali stressed that the natural borders of Egypt were the Taurus Mountains and not the Suez isthmus.

Preparations began early on; the Pasha developed relations with the rulers of the Levant. Some expressed enmity but those who found that he shored up their power grew closer, including the *amir* Bashir Al-Shihabi from Mount Lebanon, who encouraged Muhammad Ali to take control of the Levant and promised assistance. Before long, Egypt's Pasha knew of every minute detail in the region, and made it seem as though Egypt was protecting the Levant.

This situation incited the Sultan who knowing of Muhammad Ali's aspirations resorted to the method of the time: conspiracy. He found in Abdullah Pasha, the ruler

of Sidon and its precincts, his aim. Abdullah Pasha was envious of Muhammad Ali and a war of words broke out between the two. The situation became critical when a large number of peasants from Al-Sharqiya province in Egypt fled to the southern Levant and Abdullah Pasha refused to send them back. Muhammad Ali threatened him and swore that he would return them along with Abdullah himself, and then drew his sword to take by force what he had been unable to obtain through money or politics.

Characteristics of life in the Levant helped the Pasha. The region's strategic location, topography, history and religious significance influenced the nature of its residents and brought under its wing extensive ethnic and religious diversity. There was no natural unity in the Levant, for its society drew upon sectarian divisions and animosity was common. An ongoing administrative struggle between the area's four Pashas was fed by Istanbul. Often the military leaders took control, and all this affected the population, which suffered under these unfortunate circumstances. Internecine fighting broke out, and matters were further complicated by the aggressive behaviour of the Bedouin. Further increasing suffering was the feudal system, which forced slavery upon the peasants. And finally, persecution of non-Muslim subjects formed yet another tragedy. In sum, Levantine society was in a dire state. This paved the way for Muhammad Ali's mission.

The Egyptian offensive of November 1831 was a modern planned affair. The military expedition led by Ibrahim Pasha, Muhammad Ali's own son and an able military officer, was accompanied by warships. The Egyptian army was welcomed in the region from Gaza to Haifa without any combat. Ibrahim confirmed the rulers of this region in their positions, including Bashir Al-Shihabi. Acre, however, was besieged and taken by force. The Egyptian forces began to advance to the interior, Levantine ports fell into Ibrahim's hands, who had controlled Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo.

The army continued to advance as the Ottoman forces withdrew following their defeat. Delegations of Levantines came forward to declare their submission to the new ruler and complain of the injustices they had suffered. The offensive continued to creep towards Anatolia; the Battle of Konya took place on 21 December 1832. There the Egyptians defeated the Ottoman forces and thus the road to Istanbul was opened up to Ibrahim.

The Ottoman Empire was furious, aware as it was of the power and aspirations of Muhammad Ali on the one hand, and the weakness that it had been struck with on the other. Its legal council issued a ruling stripping Muhammad Ali and his son of their posts, ranks and titles. The Pasha responded with a declaration from Al-Azhar scholars apostatising the Sultan and calling on Muslims to rescue Islam from the Ottoman ruler. Egypt had gained the upper hand over the Empire following the military and political outcomes of the war.

These developments were not in line with European interests. Russia rushed to send forces to assist the Sublime Porte, which worried Britain and France and prompted Britain to charge its consul in Egypt with resolving the conflict between the Pasha and the Sultan, while France sent a special envoy to Cairo to the same end. The crisis ended with the Ktahya Accord of 8 April 1833, in which Muhammad Ali was rewarded with what he desired: control of Egypt, the Hijaz, and Crete in return for withdrawing from Anatolia. He was also made to pay 32,000 purses (1 purse = 500 piasters) yet he was not granted the inherited rule he so coveted.

The conflict was not resolved and preparations for the next round were underway as the European role took on a special prominence, with Britain occupying first place. Egypt had threatened its interests by controlling the main commercial routes, whether the Euphrates, the Gulf, or the Red Sea, and so it reacted first by discrediting Muhammad Ali's economic policy. Britain signed with the Ottoman Empire the Treaty of Balta Liman, which required it to impose taxes and tariffs, and it continued to exert pressure until a *firman* issued in December 1835 ended Muhammad Ali's monopoly in the Levant and removed trade restrictions. In August 1838 another agreement abolished monopolies in all Ottoman provinces.

Intense activity against the Egyptian administration continued, and Ibrahim's defeat of the Ottomans at Nasibin (Nezip) on 24 June 1839 provided further motivation for intervention by other states. A memorandum dated 27 July 1839 was sent to the Sublime Porte instructing it not to take any measures against Egypt without the permission of outside states. Britain sent a section of its fleet to the coast of Beirut. On 15 July 1840, the London Accord was signed between Britain, Russia, Austria, Prussia, and the Ottoman Empire, compelling Muhammad Ali to retreat to the Egyptian border, and allowing him inheritable rule of Egypt and rule of Acre for life. He was given ten days to accept the conditions, but lost Acre when British, Austrian and Ottoman fleets attacked the Levantine coast and the local population revolted against Egyptian rule. Muhammad Ali was thus forced to give up Acre and accept only the inheritable rule of Egypt. The Egyptians withdrew from their last strongholds in Gaza on 19 February 1841. Yet the question still remains -- how had Egypt ruled the Levant?

Administration and Justice: Since a unified administration was unfeasible, the Pasha decided to introduce change gradually. He studied the attitudes of those in high posts and those who were found to be cooperative and open to change remained in power. The post of *mutassalim* gained importance, for its holder served as the civil governor and was given sweeping powers including control over administrative supervision and intervention in minutest details.

The *mutassalims* were given tenure in their posts. Ibrahim Pasha harped on them to exert immense effort to be alert and upright at all times. He warned them of punishment for infractions, bribery, blackmail, embezzlement and other crimes. Those who obeyed were rewarded, and those who didn't were punished.

Later as Ibrahim Pasha wanted to devote his attention to military endeavours, Muhammad Ali appointed Sherif Bey as general governor of the Levant, instructing him to work for the public interest, institute order, implement justice, observe tradition, fairly distribute funds, protect the destitute, treat the wealthy and poor equally, and punish and reform deviants.

Sherif Bey was a strict administrator, adept at studying and understanding the local population. He divided the Levant into administrative districts and appointed military governors to the major cities alongside the civil authority to secure order and facilitate administration.

Consultative ( *shura*) councils were established to contain and absorb opposition and earn the respect and loyalty of prominent social figures without racial or religious discrimination. The councils guaranteed that appropriate measures be taken in accordance with the nature of the region, and prevented governors from monopolising power.

The first of these was the consultative council of Damascus, which commenced work in June 1832. It was entrusted with judicial authority in civil and commercial cases and was given financial jurisdiction over taxes, contracts and other matters related to commerce and public relations. Hanna Bahri, a prominent and sophisticated Christian Levantine, headed the council whose powers gradually increased even as its members were vigilantly monitored for signs of negligence. The region's councils then multiplied at Ibrahim's encouragement, bringing positive results.

The judiciary, on the other hand, had been steeped in corruption before the arrival of the Egyptian regime. Under the new regime judges were subservient to the administrative authority and their rulings were monitored. It was the poor condition of the legal system as well as Muhammad Ali's preferred approach that led to such control of the executive authority over the judiciary. After the judges had been in total control of judicial and other matters they became employees of the state, their powers were restricted. The consultative councils also formed another judicial authority alongside the Islamic Shari'a courts.

the economy: Due to his intelligence, experience and friendly relations with the new regime, Hanna Bahri was put in charge of the financial administration. Religious tolerance and a preference for local appointees also backed this choice. The administration inherited burdens from the previous regime. Extensive finances were

required to cover the tribute to Istanbul, the land tax paid to the Sultan, gifts to influential officials, the military's requirements, funds allocated to modernisation projects such as education and transportation reform.

The Egyptian treasury offered assistance, but the taxes multiplied, including the government *miri* tax, which formed the monetary basis of the treasury and which was a heavy burden on the people. The *'ashuri* tax rose and a system was put in place for taxing non-Muslims. A head tax was also established, as well as an *'iana* assistance tax on employees in high posts. This system was shored up by the farming of taxes, *iltizam*.

Heavy taxation caused general discontent and brought negative consequences on the Egyptian administration. However, the government also relinquished some of the money it was due in taxes from certain villages due to their poverty and misery.

The financial administration also relied on tariffs, including domestic ones known as *al-dukhuliya*, city tolls imposed on goods transported from one city to another. External tariffs were imposed on foreign merchants.

Both Egyptian and Ottoman currencies were recognized, measures were taken to stabilise the value of the Egyptian currency and limit its sale. However, its exchange rate did not stabilise and Muhammad Ali was forced to devalue it to maintain and protect the financial market.

As for agriculture, Muhammad Ali tried to copy the Egyptian experience in the Levant. He did away with the feudal system and redistributed agricultural land but kept the tax farming system in place. The agricultural policy fostered production. Ibrahim Pasha offered financial assistance including free loans to peasants with positive results. Orders were issued to pardon farmers from taxes for three years. As a result, fleeing peasants returned and new villages were established. Punishments were handed out to those who exploited or attacked peasant farmers.

Agricultural production varied greatly. Mulberry trees were fundamental as were olives, cabbage, cotton, grain, hemp, tobacco, plants used in dyes, cactus, castor oil plant and all kinds of fruit. Efforts were made to introduce new crops including indigo, corn, coffee, and tubers, while special interest was given to orchards. Due to the need for wood the thick forests of the north, with their abundance, distinction and variety, took on new significance. Irrigation methods advanced, and livestock production became increasingly important. Stocks improved and poultry was given special attention. Yet the agricultural policy faced difficulties, some of them natural, such as locust attacks, and others caused by the administration, such as monopolisation, military conscription, statute labour, and taxes.

The Egyptian regime also focused on industry, primarily on the silk industry, to which modern, scientific methods were applied. Next in priority were the spinning and weaving industries, and machine-produced woolen textiles advanced greatly. Olive presses proliferated, and leather tanneries increased their activity as foreign experts were brought in. There was a revival in the production of glass, horse saddles, swords, porcelain, honey candles, tobacco, wine and wood and marine products. The region's metals, gold, silver, copper, iron and lead, carried their own weight in the industrial field and teams of explorers and drillers were sent out and European experts were brought over.

Muhammad Ali wanted to apply his monopolisation policies in the Levant, whereby the state purchased products at the price it determined and sold them at the price it saw fit. Ibrahim was not supportive of this policy due to the Levant's differences in comparison to Egypt, and yet the Pasha's policy was implemented and silk, cotton, wool and hemp were monopolised. Foreigners opposed this policy when their interests were harmed, and Britain undertook the task of toppling the monopoly, which resulted in the December 1835 *firman* abolishing monopolies.

As for trade, the Levant formed a crossroads between the east and west and the commercial spirit was firmly established among its people. Foreign merchants had invested their own advantageous situations, while the burden of tariff fees fell upon the

local residents, and so the Egyptian administration made efforts to limit the advantages of foreigners. Efforts were also concentrated on increasing foreign trade while protecting local production. The December 1835 *firman* created an obstacle to this, however, and gave foreigners full freedom for exploitation.

Foreign trade depended on imports that increased as trade expansion took place and in response to the needs of society, particularly given the armed forces and its needs. Egypt contributed to the Levant's imports and European products also took on an important role, with Britain occupying first place followed by France. The Levant also exported products to Egypt and Europe. The Egyptian administration took interest in the Levant's ports and decreased shipping fees.

Foreign trade affected domestic trade, and internal roads were paved and protected from Bedouin who might attack them. When the price of foodstuffs rose the financial administration acted to curb prices and created the post of auditor to monitor weights, measures and prices. While the Egyptian administration brought about a commercial renaissance in the Levant, it also faced the same obstacles of monopolisation, military conscription, oscillating fees, animal exploitation and even revolts.

Services and stability: The Egyptian regime brought services to the Levant as Muhammad Ali believed in a modernising reforming role. He was concerned with education, which was poor in the Levant, and was involved with the reinstatement of *kuttabs*, primary Islamic schools. Starting in 1835, a plan was implemented for government schools in major cities, as was the system in Egypt, with the goal of preparing youth for military endeavours following the French Lyce system. These schools were a clear success, and other government colleges were established in Damascus, Aleppo and Antioch for the study of military sciences. Experienced teachers from Egypt served in the new schools and books in arts and sciences were brought from Cairo. Canonical Arab texts were published and the foundations for sending educational missions to Egypt were put into place. The cultural environment improved, and the educational system expanded to include foreigners who were encouraged by the Egyptian regime, in addition to missionary schools.

Improving health services was another Egyptian concern. Despite a clear focus on hospitals to serve the army, these were open to the general populace. Attention was given to pharmacies that produced medicines and to the practice of quarantine after the Levant was struck with cholera and the plague. Special hygiene laws were put in place to wipe out sources of disease, and violators were punished.

Public facilities were an essential component of the services offered by the Egyptian administration, both those that served military purposes and those that served the civilian population. Roads were given special attention, transportation systems improved and mail, especially military post, took on new importance as a mail administration was established.

The Egyptian regime shored up factors of stability. The Bedouin were brought in line and the fees they had forced on the population were abolished. As the administration saw that its military could benefit from their services it took measures to settle and protect them. This had positive results bringing in a community that had been difficult to integrate. Thus stability reigned as heads of tribes took responsibility for the people and areas under their control and punishments became tougher.

Ibrahim took note of his subjects and met with them, assisting them and opening the door to the airing of grievances. Popular sayings arose about him, for example when one wished to praise someone, one would say, "He's like Ibrahim in his justice and fairness," although his fairness was rather strict.

Religious affairs and foreigners: The Egyptian administration's activities in the field of religion were exemplary. Pilgrims on the road to Mecca were provided security, attention was paid to mosques, and the *awqaf* religious endowments were regulated. Muhammad Ali fortified his power with the responsibility of caring for the holy sites not only in Jerusalem but in the Levant in general.

Tolerant Islamic teachings regarding the treatment of non-Muslims, who had previously formed semi-isolated communities, were put into place as the Egyptian administration declared equality between races and religions. Old distinctions were eliminated, religious freedom was granted and financial burdens on Christian pilgrims to Jerusalem were lifted. Strict instructions were issued for the protection of their security, and disputes between the Christian sects in Jerusalem were resolved, particularly those involving the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Egyptian administration granted permission for the renovation of churches and monasteries. Egyptian policies lifted the oppression Christians faced in their daily lives. Traditional discriminatory procedures were done away with and government posts of all kinds were opened up to Christians and they served as representatives in the consultative councils paving the way for religious harmony.

Similarly, the Egyptian administration also lifted financial burdens from Jews visiting holy sites and secured their safe passage. It cancelled the regulations restricting Jewish temples and gave permission for their repair and renovation. At the same time, however, it rejected Jewish requests to pave the area adjacent to the Aqsa Mosque and the site of Buraq [the Wailing Wall] on the basis that it was not religiously legal.

Interest in Jewish affairs was not restricted to the religious realm, for they were provided security in their everyday lives after having suffered alongside the Christians. Jews also served on the consultative councils. While this was part of the Egyptian administration's political agenda, there was also pressure from foreign consuls to protect the Jews. Despite the strict security measures, scattered incidents took place between Muslims and Jews and between Jews and Christians, and consuls intervened on behalf of the Jews.

Jewish delegations visited the Levant due to the open door policy, stability, and special facilities provided at holy sites. Yet the Jerusalem consultative council refused to allow Ashkenazi Jews to own property and only allowed their employment in commerce. Muhammad Ali also refused to open Palestine to Jewish immigration for fear of the danger that might bring.

Yet in general the Egyptian administration welcomed foreigners and permitted them to visit cities in the interior. Their consuls travelled freely after having been confined to the coasts in the past. The open door policy served them, and tourism increased. Foreigners, and especially foreign consuls, were showered with privileges which they sometimes abused them. Some sold their security and consular posts, with all their privileges, to the highest bidder. This prevented the Egyptian administration from enjoying its prerogatives, whether in administration, economy or the judiciary, and had negative effects on society. Relations between officials and consuls soured, and although Muhammad Ali attempted to negotiate with them to rectify the situation and avert the dangers of their hostile behaviour, they adopted an aggressive position toward the Egyptian regime and contributed in large part to its decline.

The downfall: Certainly the Egyptian regime brought unprecedented advantages to the Levant, but these advantages also required measures that caused a rupture in its structure. It employed compulsive policies against the population to provide supplies for the military forces and forced people to work on public projects. This caused obstacles of its own and harmed the economy.

Military conscription was a distressing experience for the population, which was plunged into the ongoing war between the Egyptian and Ottoman forces. Local residents were also used to provide security and weaken tribal forces. The Egyptian administration faced difficulty in such operations, particularly in mountainous regions that sheltered fugitives and those fleeing military conscription under the protection of foreigners. Despite this, it used force in gathering the greatest number of men possible to serve on battle fields. Even those who maimed themselves to avoid conscription were placed in the rear ranks. Only some Levantines joined the military of their own accord, those who were psychologically and mentally prepared and who were mostly from the elite.

Opposition to Egyptian rule increased when it banned the possession of weapons upon undertaking the responsibility of security. Levantines had grown accustomed to

bearing weapons due to social circumstances and found in them a sense of power. It was therefore not easy to disarm them without arousing their anger.

In addition, people suffered under various economic burdens including the monopolies and heavy taxes. The tax farming imposed on various sectors of society led to violent protests.

The Palestinian revolt was the first sign of rebellion against the Egyptian regime. A tribal spirit reigned in the southern Levant, and unrest spread throughout its cities. The Druze revolt was characterised by violence and the Lebanese revolt served as the finale to the rebellions against the Egyptian presence and its administration which had used all forms of domination and destruction.

Yet tax farming was not the only instigation for revolt. Other contributing factors included the measures taken by the central authority that Levantines were not accustomed to. External factors also played a role, for the Ottoman Empire exerted efforts and polarised the old feudal notables in the Levant to cooperate to take things back to where they were prior to the arrival of the Egyptians. That served their interests of course, and thus treachery played its role as well. European states also participated in the downfall through their desire for Muhammad Ali's defeat, either to protect the regional balance of power, which all states were concerned with, or to serve the specific interests of individual states. Britain schemed to break up the Egyptian entity on Levantine land, and Istanbul took advantage of this. France also participated and orchestrated conspiracies within the consulates. Everyone conspired, and war was declared against the Egyptian regime in the Levant, resulting in Egypt's defeat.

It is clear that the decade (1831-1841) during which Muhammad Ali plunged into his Levantine experience drew the curtain on his expansionist endeavour with its end. European states used politics and force to bury it alive out of an urgent need to maintain the Ottoman Empire in its accustomed role and in keeping with their policies which completely contradicted those of Egypt's Pasha.

On the other hand, however, the experience proved Egypt's ability to rule the Levant. Muhammad Ali was able to modernise society through the new systems that were successfully put in place. Despite its flaws, the approach employed in the Levant bore fruitful results at that time. Yet the enemies of the regime exploited the nature of the society that had previously been in control. They were able to feed it and successfully planned for it to lead the Levant backwards to enter a new period of hatred and zealotry.

<http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2005/766/sc1.htm>

**Pascale Ghazaleh** The writer is assistant professor of history at the American University in Cairo.

How could an individual found a country -- especially if that country, due to a great degree of geo-political continuity, seemed always to have existed? If one takes the nation-state as one's primary unit of analysis, then Muhammad Ali's merit is to have recognised Egypt's greatness, not as an Ottoman province but as a former and potential great power in its own right: one that had languished beneath the yoke of Ottoman rule for three centuries, but awaited only the right man to rouse it from its slumber. In seeking to establish the strong army he needed in order to make manifest Egypt's regional prominence, according to this version of events, the viceroy gave the country a powerful push on the road to modernity: he imposed monopolies in agriculture, industry, and commerce; built schools and hospitals; imported European experts and the latest technology. His troops came within striking distance of Istanbul and generally proved if not a major threat then at least a significant nuisance to the established order.

In 1848, the viceroy's career came to an end. His son and successor, Ibrahim, predeceased him; thereafter, his policies were revised almost entirely. The commercial treaty the Ottoman sultan had concluded with England in 1838 had already put in place the conditions for fragmentation: state monopolies were farmed out then abolished;

tariffs were amended in favour of European merchants and the goods in which they traded. The army was reduced and, in 1841, a second treaty removed from Egypt's control the territories it had conquered, with the exception of Sudan. According to individual preference or ideological persuasion, then, the viceroy's half-century either stemmed the inexorable tide of European dominance, which washed over Egypt most thoroughly under Sa'id (r. 1854-1863) and Isma'il (r. 1863-1879), or, on the contrary, paved the way for Egypt's integration -- as a subservient, peripheral supplier of raw materials -- into the world market.

It is not difficult to see why this view of the Muhammad Ali period, reduced to its bare essentials, continues to arouse so many strong emotions. National autonomy, achieved through military strength, import substitution policies, a solid educational and health infrastructure, or some mixture of these elements, is still a burning question -- some would say justifiably so, since nation-states, at least in this region, have rarely seemed more fragile. Whether or not that is a good thing is subject to much debate, which tends to disregard the conditions under which many of these nation-states were born, and the way in which they managed to survive. At any rate, even if most people now agree that private enterprise and competitive advantage are far more interesting than etatism, nationalism is far from being outmoded, and reinterpretation of Muhammad Ali's policies tends to be perceived as an attack on Egypt's last moment of greatness. <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2005/764/special.htm>

### Official British Government Publications

The following are extracts from the relevant official sources relating to this event between the five (or six) major European powers involved in this event. This first one, written in 1839, tells the Sultan not to proceed with any arrangements he is considering for the resolution of the "Eastern question":

COLLECTIVE NOTE from the Representatives of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, to the Sublime Porte. – Constantinople, July 27, 1839.

LES Soussignés ont reçu ce matin de leurs Gouvernements respectifs des instructions en vertu desquels ils ont l'honneur d'informer la Sublime Porte, que l'accord sur la question d'Orient est assuré entre les 5 Grande Puissances, et de l'engager à suspendre toute détermination définitive sans leurs concours, en attendant l'effet de l'intérêt qu'elles lui portent.

Constantinople ce 27 Juillet, 1839.

BARON DE STURMER

PONSONBY.

A. BOUTENEFF.

BARON BOUSSIN  
COMTE DE KENIGSMARCK.

(British and Foreign State Papers, volume 28, 1839-1840, p.408-409.)

### PACIFICATION OF THE LEVANT

Parry and Hopkins' note on this Convention in their index says:

Convention between Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia and Turkey for the pacification of the LEVANT, with Additional Article – Signed at London 15 July 1840. Ratified by Turkey 17 September 1840. Entry into force: on exchange of ratifications. Supplemented by Separate Act and Protocols of 15 July 1840 and Protocol of 17 September 1840. [F.O. 94/367; 28B.S.P. 342; 5H.C.T. 535; M.E.T.1008; 1 Martens (III) 156.]<sup>62</sup> (Parry and Hopkins, 1971, vol. 2, p.210)

<sup>62</sup> These references are acronyms for the references used by Parry, and are given their full title in the next paragraph. For example, B. S. P. stands for *British and Foreign Office State Papers*.

**Convention For the Pacification of the Levant between Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, and Turkey, signed at London, 15 July 1840.**

This convention, which was supplemented by the Separate Act and Protocols of 15 July 1840 (annexed here), and by the Protocol of 17 September 1840, is reproduced from *British and Foreign State Papers*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 342, being printed also in *Hertslet's Commercial Treaties*, vol. V, p.535, and Hertslet, *Map of Europe by Treaty*, p. 1008, and by Martens, *Nouveau Recueil Général*, vol. I, p. 156; Neumann, *Recueil des Traités et Conventions conclus par l' Autriche*, vol. IV, p. 453; *Martens' Russian Treaties*, vol. XII, p. 130; Martens et de Cussy, *Recueil Manuel et Pratique des Traités*, vol. V, p. 42; De Clercq, *Recueil des Traités de la France*, vol. IV, p. 572; *Hertslet's Turkish Treaties*, p. 136; and Noradounghian, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman*, vol. II, p. 303. (Parry, 1969, vol. 90, p.285)

FRENCH TEXT

Au nom de Dieu Très Miséricordieux.

Sa Hautesse le Sultan ayant eu recours à Leurs Majestés La Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, le Roi de Prusse, et l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, pour réclamer leur appui et leur assistance au milieu des difficultés dans lesquelles il se trouve placé par suite de la conduite hostile de Méhémet Ali, Pacha de l'Egypte, - difficultés qui menacent de porter atteinte à l'intégrité de l'Empire Ottoman et à l'indépendance de Trône du Sultan:-Leurs dites Majestés mues par le sentiment d'amitié sinère qui subsiste entr'Elles et le Sultan; animées du désir de veiller au maintien de l'intégrité et l'indépendance de l'Empire Ottoman, dans l'intérêt de l'affermissement de la Paix de l'Europe; fidèles à l'engagement qu'Elles ont contracté par la Note Collective remise à la Porte par Leurs Représentants à Constantinople, le 27 Juillet 1839; et désirant de plus prévenir l'effusion de sang qu'occasionement la continuation des hostilités qui ont récemment éclaté en Syrie entre les Autorités du Pacha d'Egypte et les sujets de Sa Hautesse;

Leurs dites Majestés et Sa Hautesse le Sultan ont résolu, dans le but susdit, de conclure entr'Elles une Convention; et ont nommé à cet effet pour Leurs Plénipotentiaires , savoir:

Sa Majesté la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, le Très Honorable Henri Jean, Vicomte Palmerston, Baron Temple Pair d'Irlande, Conseiller de Sa Majesté Britannique en Son Conseil Privé, Chevalier Grand-Croix du Très Honorable Ordre du Bain, Membre du Parlement, et Son Principal Secrétaire d'Etat ayant le Département des Affaires Etrangères;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, le Sieur Philippe, Baron de Neumann, Commandeur de l'Ordre de Léopold d'Autriche, décoré de la Croix pour le Mérite Civil, Commandeur des Ordres de la Tour et de l'Epée du Portugal, de la Croix du Sud du Brésil, Chevalier Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de St. Stansilas de seconde classe de Russie, Son Conseiller Aulique, et Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Britannique;

Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, le Sieur Henri Guillaume, Baron de Bülow, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge de première classe de Prusse, Grand-Croix des Ordres de Léopold d'Autriche et des Guelphes de Hanovre, Chevalier Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de St. Stansilas de seconde classe, et de St. Wladimir de quatrième classe, de Russie, Commandeur de l'Ordre du Faucon de Saxe-Weimar, son Chambellan, Conseiller intime actuel, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Britannique;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, le Sieur Philippe, Baron de Brunnow, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Ste. Anne de première classe, de St. Stanislas de première classe, de St. Wledimir de troisième, Commandeur de l'Ordre de St. Etienne de Hongrie, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge, et de St. Jean de Jérusalem, son Conseiller Privé, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Britannique;

Et Sa Majesté le Très Majestueux, Très Puissant, et Très Magnifique Sultan, Abdul Medjid, Empereur de Ottomans, Chekib Effendi, décoré du Nichan Iftihar de première classe, Beylikdgi du Divan Impérial, Conseiller honoraire du Département des Affaires Etrangères, son Ambassadeur Extraordinaire près Sa Majesté Britannique;

Lesquels s'étant réciproquement communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, ont arrêté et signé les Articles suivans:-

Art.I. Sa Hautesse le Sultan s'étant entendu avec Leurs Majestés le Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, le Roi de Prusse, et l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, sur les conditions de l'arrangement qu'il est de l'intention de Sa Hautesse d'accorder à Méhémet Ali, - conditions lesquelles se trouvent spécifiées dans l'Acte Séparé ci-annexé, - Leurs Majestés s'engagent à agir un parfait accord, et d'unir leurs efforts pour déterminer Méhémet Ali à se conformer à cet arrangement; chacune des Hautes Parties Contractantes se réservant de co-opérer à ce but selon les moyens d'action dont chacune d'elles peut disposer.

II. Si le Pacha d'Egypte refusait d'adhérer au susdit arrangement qui lui sera communiqué par le Sultan avec le concours de Leurs dites Majestés, celles-ci s'engagent à prendre, à la réquisition du Sultan, des mesures concertées et arrêtées entr' Elles, afin de mettre cet arrangement à execution. Dans l'intervalle, le Sultan ayant invité ses alliés à se joindre à lui pour l'aider à interrompre la communication par mer entre l'Egypte et la Syrie, et à empêcher l'expédition de troupes, chevaux armes, munitions, et approvisionnemens du guerre de tout genre d'une de ces provinces à l'autre; Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, et l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, s'engagent à donner immédiatement à cet effet les ordres nécessaires aux Commandans de leurs forces navales dans la Méditerranée. Leurs dites Majestés promettent en outre, que les Commandans de leurs escadres, selon les moyens dont ils disposent, donneront, au nom de l'Alliance, tout l'appui et toute l'assistance en leur pouvoir à ceux sujets du Sultan qui manifesteront leur fidélité et obeissance à leur Souverain.

III. Si Méhémet Ali, après s'être refusé de se soumettre aux conditions de l'arrangement mentionné ci-dessus, dirigeait ses forces de terre ou de mer vers Constantinople, les Hautes Parties Contractantes, sur la réquisition expresse qui en serait faite par le Sultan à leurs Représentans à Constantinople, sont convenues, le cas échéant, de se rendre à l'invitation de ce Souverain, et de pourvoir à la défense de son trône, au moyen d'une co-opération concertée en commun, dans le but de mettre les deux Détroits du Bosphore et des Dardanelles, ainsi que la Capitale de l'Empire Ottoman, à l'abri de toute agression.

Il est en outre convenu, que les forces qui, en vertu d'une pareille entente, recevront la destination indiquée ci-dessus, y resteront employées aussi longtems [sic] que leur présence sera requise par le Sultan; et lorsque Sa Hautesse jugera que leur presence aura cessé d'être nécessaire, les dites forces se retireront simultanément, et rentreront respectivement dans le Mer Noire et la Méditerranée.

IV. Il est toutefois expressément entendu, que la co-opération mentionnée dans l'Article précédent, et destinée à placer temporairement les Détroits des Dardenelles et du Bosphore, et la capitale Ottomane, sous la sauvegarde des Hautes Parties

Contractantes, contre toute agression de Méhémet Ali, ne sera considérée que comme une mesure exceptionnelle, adoptée à la demande expresse du Sultan, et uniquement pour sa défense dans le cas seul indiqué ci-dessus. Mais il est convenu que cette mesure ne dérogera en rien à l'ancienne règle de l'Empire Ottoman, en vertu de laquelle il a été de tout temps défendu aux bâtimens [sic] de guerre des Puissances Etrangères d'entrer dans les Détroits des Dardenelles et du Bosphore. Et le Sultan, d'une part, déclare par le présent Acte, qu'à l'exception de l'éventualité ci-dessus mentionnée, il a ferme résolution de maintenir à l'avenir ce principe invariablement établi comme ancienne règle de son Empire, et tant que la Porte se trouve en paix, de n'admettre aucun bâtiment de guerre étranger dans les Détroits du Bosphore et des Dardenelles; d'autre part, Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, le Roi de Prusse, et l'Empereur de toutes les Russies, s'engagent à respecter cette détermination du Sultan, et à se conformer au principe ci-dessus énoncé.

V. La présente Convention sera ratifiée, et les ratifications en seront échangées à Londres dans l'espace de 2 mois, ou plus tôt si faire se peut.

En foi de quoi, les Plénipotentiaires respectifs l'ont signé, et y ont apposé les sceaux de leurs armes.

Fait à Londres, le 15 Juillet, l'an de grâce 1840.

(L.S.) PALMERSTON

(L.S.) CHEKIB

(L.S.) NEUMANN.

(L.S.) BULOW.

(L.S.) BRUNNOW.

(Parry, 1969, vol.90, pp.286-288)

#### **Acte Séparé**

Acte Séparé annexé à la Convention conclue à Londres, le 15 Juillet, 1840, entre les Cours de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, et de Russie, d'une part, et la Sublime Porte Ottomane, de l'autre.

§ 1. Sa Hautesse le Sultan promet d'accorder à Méhémet Ali, pour lui et pour ses descendants en ligne directe, l'administration du Pachalic de l'Egypte; et Sa Hautesse promet en outre d'accorder à Méhémet Ali, sa vie durant, avec le titre de Pacha d'Acre, et avec le commandement de la Forteresse de St. Jean d'Acre, l'administration de la partie méridionale de la Syrie, dont les limites seront déterminées par la ligne de démarcation suivante;

Cette ligne, partant du Cap Ras-el-Nakhora sur les côtes de la Méditerranée, s'étendra de là directement jusqu'à l'embouchure de la Rivière Seisaban, extrémité septentrionale du Lac Tibérias; longera la côte occidentale du dit Lac; suivra la rive droite du fleuve Jourdain, et la côte occidentale de la Mer Morte; se prolongera de là en droiture jusqu'à la Mer Rouge, en aboutissant à la pointe septentrionale du Golfe d'Akaba; et suivra de là la côte occidentale du Golfe d'Akaba, et la côte orientale du Golfe de Suez, jusqu'à Suez.

Toutefois, le Sultan, en faisant ces offers, y attaché la condition que Méhémet Ali les accepte dans l'espace de 10 jours après que la communication lui en aura été faite à Alexandrie par un agent de Sa Hautesse; et qu'en même temps Méhémet Ali dépose entre les mains de cet agent les instructions nécessaires aux commandans de ses forces de terre et de mer, de se retirer immédiatement de l'Arabie et de toutes les villes saintes qui s'y trouvent situées; de l'Ile de Candie; du district d'Adana; et de toutes les autres parties de l'Empire Ottoman qui ne sont pas comprises dans les limites de l'Egypte et dans celles du Pachalie d'Acre, tel qu'il a été désigné ci-dessus.

§ 2. Si dans le délai de 10 jours fixé ci-dessus, Méhémet Ali n'acceptait point le susdit arrangement, le Sultan retirera alors l'offre de l'administration viagère du Pachalic d'Acre; mais Sa Hautesse consentira encore à accorder à Méhémet Ali, pour lui et pour ses descendants en ligne directe, l'administration du Pachalic d'Egypte, pourvu que cet offre soit acceptée dans l'espace des 10 jours suivans; c'est-à-dire, dans un délai du 20 jours, à compter du jour où la communication lui aura été faite, et pourvu qu'il dépose également entre les mains de l'agent du Sultan les instructions nécessaires pour ses commandans de terre et de mer de se retirer immédiatement en dedans des limites, et dans les ports, du Pachalic d'Egypte.

§ 3. Le tribut annuel à payer au Sultan par Méhémet Ali, sera proportionné au plus ou moins de territoire don't ce dernier obtiendra l'administration, selon qu'il accepte la première ou la seconde alternative.

§ 4. Il est expressément entendu de plus, que dans la première comme dans la seconde alternative, Méhémet Ali (avant l'expiration du terme fixé de 10 ou de 20 jours) sera tenu de remettre la flotte Turque, avec tous ses équipages et armemens, entre les mains du Préposé Turc qui sera chargé de la recevoir. Les commandans des escadres alliés assisteront à cette remise.

Il est entendu que dans aucun cas Méhémet Ali ne pourra porter en compte, ni déduire de tribut à payer au Sultan, les dépenses qu'il a faites pour l'entretien de la flotte Ottomane pendant tout le tems [sic] qu'elle sera restée dans les ports d'Egypte.

§ 5. Tous les Traités, et toutes les Lois de l'Empire Ottoman, s'appliqueront à l'Egypte et au Pachalic d'Acre, tel qu'il a été désigné ci-dessus, comme à toute autre partie de l'Empire Ottoman. Mais le Sultan consent, qu'à condition du paiement régulier du tribut susmentionné, Méhémet Ali et ses descendants perçoivent, au nom du Sultan, et comme délégué de Sa Hautesse, dans les provinces dont l'administration leur sera confiée, les taxes et impôts légalement établis. Méhémet Ali et ses descendens pourvoiront à toutes les dépenses d'légalement établis. Il est entendu en outre, que moyennant la perception des taxes et impôts susdits, Méhémet Ali et ses descendans pourvoiront à toutes les dépenses de l'administration civile et militaire des dites provinces.

§ 6. Les forces de terre et de mer que pourra entretenir le Pacha d'Egypte et d'Acre, faisant partie des forces de l'Empire Ottoman, seront toujours considerées comme entretenues pour le service de l'Etat.

§ 7. Si à l'expiration du terme de 20 jours après la communication qui lui aura été faite, (ainsi qu'il a été dit plus haut, § 2,) Méhémet Ali n'adhère point à l'arrangement proposé, et n'accepte pas l'hérédité du Pachalic de l'Egypte, le Sultan se considérera comme libre de retirer cette offre, et de suivre, en conséquence, telle marche ultérieure que ses propres intérêts et les conseils de ses alliés pourront lui suggérer.

§ 8. Le présent Acte Séparé aura la même force et valeur que s'il était inséré, mot à mot, dans la Convention de ce jour. Il sera ratifié, et les ratifications en seront échangées à Londres en même temps que celles de la dite Convention.

En foi de quoi, les Plénipotentiaires respectifs l'ont signé, et y ont appose les sceaux de leurs armes.

Fait à Londres, le 15 Juillet, l'an de grâce 1840.

(L.S.) PALMERSTON

(L.S.) CHEKIB

(L.S.) NEUMANN.

(L.S.) BULOW.

(L.S.) BRUNNOW.

(Parry, 1969, vol.90, pp.289-291)

### **Protocole**

Protocole signé à Londres, le 15 Juillet, 1840, par les Plénipotentiaires de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, de Russie, et de la Porte Ottomane.

Porte Ottomane.

En apposant sa signature à la Convention de ce jour, le Plénipotentiaire de la Sublime Porte Ottomane a déclaré:

Qu'en constatant, par l'Article IV de la dite Convention, l'ancienne règle de l'Empire Ottoman, en vertu de laquelle il a été défendu de tout temps aux bâtimens [sic] de guerre étrangers d'entrer dans les Détroits des Dardanelles et du Bosphore, la Sublime Porte se réserve, comme par le passé, de délivrer des Firmans de passage aux bâtimens [sic] légers sous pavillon de guerre, lesquels sont employés, selon l'usage, au service de la correspondance de Légations de Puissances amies.

Les Plénipotentiaires des Cours de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, et de Russie, ont pris acte de la présente Déclaration, pour la porter à la connaissance de leurs Cours.

(L.S.) PALMERSTON

(L.S.) CHEKIB

(L.S.) NEUMANN.

(L.S.) BULOW.

(L.S.) BRUNNOW.

(Parry, 1969, vol.90, p.291)

### **Protocol Réservé**

**Protocol réservé, signé à Londres, le 15 Juillet, 1840, par les Plénipotentiaires de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, de Russie, et de la Porte Ottomane.**

Les Plénipotentiaires des Cours de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, de Russie, et de la Sublime Porte Ottomane, ayant, en vertu de leurs pleins pouvoirs, conclu et signé en ce jour une Convention entre leurs Souverains respectifs, pour la pacification du Levant;

Considérant que, vû la distance qui sépare les capitales de leurs Cours respectives, un certain espace du temps devra s'écouler nécessairement avant que l'échange des Ratifications de la dite Convention puisse s'effectuer, et que les ordres fondés sur cet Acte puissent être mis à exécution;

Et les dits Plénipotentiaires étant profondément pénétrés de la conviction, que vû l'état actuel des choses in Syrie, des intérêts d'humanité, aussi bien que les graves considérations de politique Européenne qui consistent l'objet de la sollicitude commune des Puissances signataires de la Convention de ce jour, réclamant impérieusement d'éviter, autant que possible, tout retard dans l'accomplissement de la pacification que la dite transaction est destinée à atteindre.

Les dits Plénipotentiaires, en vertu de leurs pleins pouvoirs, sont convenus entr'eux que les mesures préliminaires mentionnées à l'Article II de la dite Convention, seront mises à exécution tout de suite, sans attendre l'échange des ratifications; les Plénipotentiaires respectifs constatent formellement par le présent Acte l'assentiment de leurs Cours à l'exécution immédiate de ces mesures.

Il est convenu, en outre, entre les dits Plénipotentiaires, que Sa Hautesse le Sultan procédera de suite à adresser à Méhémet Ali la communication et les offres spécifiées dans l'Acte Séparé annexé à la Convention de ce jour.

Il est convenu de plus, que les Agens Consulaires de la Grande Bretagne, de l'Autriche, de Prusse, et de Russie, à Alexandrie, se mettront en rapport avec l'Agent que Sa Hautesse le Sultan y enverra, pour adresser à Méhémet Ali la communication et

les offres susmentionnées; que les dits Consuls prêteront à cet Agent toute l'assistance et tout l'appui en leur pouvoir; et qu'ils employeront tous leurs moyens d'influence auprès de Méhémet Ali, à l'effet de le déterminer à accepter l'arrangement qui lui sera proposé d'ordre de Sa Hautesse le Sultan.

Les Amiraux des escadres respectives dans la Méditerranée recevront les instructions nécessaires pour se mettre en communication à ce sujet avec les dits Consuls.

PALMERSTON.

CHEKIB

NEUMANN.

BULOW.

BRUNNOW.

(Parry, 1969, vol.90, pp.291-292)

**Protocol Relative to the Pacification of the Levant between Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia and Turkey, signed at London, 17 September 1840**

This self-denying ordinance is taken here from *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. XXVIII, p. 348, being printed also in *Hertslet's Turkish Treaties*, p. 143, by Hertslet, *Map of Europe by Treaty*, p. 1023; and Martens, *Nouveau Recueil Général*, vol. XV, p. 488. (Parry, 1969, vol.90, p.435)

FRENCH TEXT

Protocole d'une Conférence tenue à Londres, le 17 Septembre, 1840.

Présens:

Les Plénipotentiaires de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, de Russie, et de la Turquie.

Les Plénipotentiaires des Cours de la Grande Bretagne, d'Autriche, de Prusse, et de Russie, après avoir échangé les ratifications de la Convention conclue le 15 Juillet dernier, ont résolu, dans le but de placer dans son vrai jour le désintéressement qui a guidé leurs Cours dans la conclusion de cet Acte, de déclarer formellement:

Que dans l'exécution des engagements résultant de la susdite Convention pour les Puissances Contractants, ces Puissances ne chercheront aucune augmentation de territoire, aucune influence exclusive, aucun avantage de commerce pour leurs sujets, que ceux de toute autre nation ne puissent également obtenir.

Les Plénipotentiaires des Cours susdites ont résolu de consigner cette déclaration dans le présent Protocole.

Le Plénipotentiaire de la Sublime Porte Ottomane, en rendant un juste hommage à la loyauté et au désintéressement de la politique des Cours Alliées, a pris acte de la déclaration contenue dans le présent Protocole, et s'est chargé de la transmettre à sa Cour.

PALMERSTON.

CHEKIB

NEUMANN.

BULOW.

BRUNNOW.

(Parry, 1969, vol.90, p.436)

YOU HAVE LEFT OUT THE CONVENTION SIGNED ON 27 NOVEMBER, 1840 BETWEEN MEHEMET ALI AND THE FOUR POWERS AFTER THE WAR AGAINST HIM IN SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER. PARRY, VOL. 91, CHECK ALSO PARRY, 1971, ON THE MICROFICHE.

**Convention between Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia and Russia, and Turkey respecting the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, signed at Paris, 13 July, 1841.**

Parry and Hopkins' entry in their Index on this treaty says:

Convention with Austria, France, Prussia, Russia and Turkey, respecting the [STRAITS OF THE] DARDENELLES AND BOSPHORUS. Signed at London 13 July 1841. Entry into force: on exchange of ratifications. Revised by Convention of 30 March 1856. [F.O. 94/368; P.350, (1842) XLV 95; C.1658; P.(1877) XCII 999; 29 B.S.P.703; 6 H.C.T. 836; H.T.T. 144; M.E.T.1024; 2 Martens (III) 128.]

(Parry and Hopkins, 1971, vol.2, p.215)

This Convention, which was revised by that of 30 March 1856, taken here from *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. XXIX, p. 703, is printed also in *Parliamentary Papers 1842*, vol. XLV, p. 95, *ibid.*, 1877, vol. XCII, p. 999; *Hertslet's Commercial Treaties*, vol. VI, p. 836; *Hertslet's Turkish Treaties*, p. 144; by Hertslet, *Map of Europe by Treaty*, p. 1024; Martens, *Nouveau Revueil Général*, vol. II p. 128; De Clercq, *Recueil des Traités de la France*, vol. IV, p. 598; Noradounghian, *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman*, vol. II, pp. 342, 346; Martens et de Cussy, *Recueil Manuel et Pratique des Traités*, vol. V, p. 123; and in *Martens' Russian Treaties*, vol. XII, p. 155 etc. (Parry, 1969, vol. 92, p.7)

FRENCH TEXT.

Au nom de Dieu Très Miséricordieux.

Leur Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, le Roi des Français, le Roi de Prusse, et l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, persuadées que leur union et leur accord offrent à l'Europe le gage le plus certain de la conservation de la paix générale, objet constant de leur sollicitude; et leurs dites Majestés voulant attester cet accord, en donnant à Sa Hautesse le Sultan une preuve manifeste du respect qu'elles portent à l'inviolabilité de ses droits souverains, ainsi que de leur désir de voir se consolider le repos de son Empire; leur dites Majestés ont résolu de se rendre à l'invitation de sa Hautesse le Sultan, afin de constater en commun, par une acte formel, leur détermination unanime de se conformer à l'ancienne règle de l'Empire Ottoman, d'après laquelle le passage des Détroits des Dardanelles et du Bosphore doit toujours être fermé aux bâtiments de guerre étrangers, tant que la Porte se trouve en paix.

Leurs dites Majestés, d'une part, et Sa Hautesse le Sultan, de de l'autre, ayant résolu de conclure entre elles une Convention à ce sujet, ont nommé à cet effet pour leurs Plénipotentiaires, savoir:

Sa Majesté la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, le Très-Honorable Henri Jean, Vicomte Palmerston, Baron Temple, Pair d'Irlande, Conseiller de Sa Majesté Britannique en son Conseil Privé, Chevalier Grand-Croix du Très-Honorable Ordre du Bain, Membre du Parlement du Royaume Uni, et Principal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Majesté Britannique ayant le Département des Affaires Etrangères;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie at le Bohême, le Sieur Paul, Prince Esterhazy de Galantha, Comte d'Edelstett, Chevalier de la Toison d'Or, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Royal de St. Etienne, Chevalier des Ordres de St. André, de St.

Alexandre Newsky, et de Ste. Anne de la première classe, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Noir, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre du Bain, et des Ordres des Guelphes de Hanovre, de St. Ferdinand et du Mérite de Sicile, et du Christ du Portugal, Chambellan, Conseiller Intime Actuel de Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, et son Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Britannique; - et le Sieur Philippe, Baron de Neumann, Commandeur de l'Ordre de Léopold d'Autriche, décoré de la Croix pour le Mérite Civile, Commandeur des Ordres de la Tour et de l'Epée du Portugal, de la Croix du Sud du Brésil, Chevalier Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de St. Stanislas de première classe de Russie, Conseiller Aulique, et son Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Britannique;

Sa Majesté le Roi des François Adolphe, le Sieur François Adolfe, Baron de Bourqueney, Commandeur de l'Ordre Royal de la Légion d'Honneur, Maître des Requêtes en son Conseil d'Etat, son Chargé d'Affaires et Plénipotentiaire à Londres;

Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, le Sieur Henri Guillaume, Baron de Bülow, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge de première classe de Prusse, Grand-Croix des Ordres de Léopold d'Autriche, de Ste. Anne de Russe, et des Guelphes de Hanovre, Chevalier de l'Ordre de St. Stanislas de seconde classe, et de St. Wladimir de quatrième classe, de Russie, Commandeur de l'Ordre du Faucon Blanc de Saxe-Weimar, son Chambellan, Conseiller Intime Actuel, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Britannique;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, le Sieur Philippe, Baron de Brunnow, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Blanc, de Ste. Anne de première classe, de St. Stanislas de première classe, de St. Wladimir de troisième classe, Commandeur de l'Ordre de St. Etienne de Hongrie, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge, et de St. Jean de Jérusalem, son Conseiller Privé, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Britannique:

Et Sa Majesté le Très-Majestueux, Très-Puissant, Très-Magnifique Sultan Abdul-Medjid, Empereur des Ottomans, Chekib Effendi, décoré du Nichan Iftihar de première classe, Beylikdgi du Divan Impérial, Conseiller Honoraire du Département des Affaires Etrangères, son Ambassadeur Extraordinaire près Sa Majesté Britannique:

Lesquels, s'étant réciproquement communiqué leurs pleins-pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, ont arrêté et signé les Articles suivants:

ART. I. Sa Hautesse le Sultan, d'une part, déclare qu'il a la ferme résolution de maintenir à l'avenir le principe invariablement établi comme ancienne règle de son Empire, et en vertu duquel il a été de tout tems [sic] défendu aux bâtimens de guerre des Puissances Etrangères d'entrer dans les Détroits des Dardanelles et du Bosphore; et que, tant que la Porte se trouve en paix, Sa Hautesse n'admettra aucun bâtiment de guerre Etranger dans les dits Détroits:

Et leurs Majesté la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, Roi de Hongrie et de Bohême, le Roi de François, le Roi de Prusse, et l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, de l'autre part, s'engagent à respecter cette détermination du Sultan, et à se conformer au principe ci-dessus énoncé.

II. Il est entendu, qu'en constatant l'inviolabilité de l'ancienne règle de l'Empire Ottoman mentionnée dans l'Article précédent, le Sultan se réserve, comme par le passé, de délivrer des firmans de passage aux bâtimens légers sous pavillon de guerre, lesquels seront employés, come il est d'usage, au service de Légations des puissances amies.

III. Sa Hautesse le Sultan se réserve de porter la présente Convention à la connaissance de toutes les Puissances avec lesquelles la Sublime Porte se trouve en relation d'amitié, en les invitant à y accéder.

IV. La présente Convention sera ratifiée et les ratifications en seront échangées à Londres à l'expiration de 2 mois, ou plus tôt si faire se peut.

En foi de quoi, les Plénipotentiaires respectifs l'ont signée, et y ont apposé les sceaux de leurs armes.

Fait à Londres, le 13 Juillet, l'an de grace 1841.

(L.S.) PALMERSTON.

(L.S.) CHEKIB.

(L.S.) ESTERHAZY.

(L.S.) NEUMANN.

(L.S.) BOURQUENEY.

(L.S.) BULOW.

(L.S.) BRUNNOW.

(Parry, 1969, vol.92, pp.8-10)

**Convention between Russia and Turkey limiting their Naval Forces on the Black Sea, signed at Paris, 30 March 1856.**

The Convention, taken here from *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. XLVI, p. 22, is printed also by Solar de la Marguerite, *Traité Publics de la Royale Maison de Savoie*, vol. VIII, p.400; De Clercq, *Recueil des Traités de la France*, Vol. VII, p. 71; Martens, *Nouveau Revueil Général*, vol. XV, p. 786; Neumann, *Recueil des Traités et Conventions conclus par l'Autriche*, vol. VI, p.289, etc., etc. (Parry, 1969, vol. 114, p.401.

THE FRENCH TEXT.

[Ratifications exchanged at Paris, April, 27, 1856.]

Au nom de Dieu Tout-Puissant.

Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, et Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan, prenant en considération le principe de la neutralisation de la Mer Noire établi par les Préliminaires consignés au Protocole No. 1, signé à Paris le 25 Fevrier de la présente année, et voulant, en conséquence, régler d'un commmun accord le nombre et la force des bâtiments légers qu'elles se sont réservé d'entretenir dans la Mer Noir pour le service de leurs côtes, ont résolu de signer, dans ce but, une Convention Spéciale, et ont nommé à cet effet:

Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, le Sieur Alexia Comte Orloff, son Aide-de-Camp Général et Général de Cavalerie, Commandant du Quartier-Général de Sa Majesté, Membre du Conseil de l'Empire et du Comité des Ministres, décoré des 2 Portraits en diamants de leurs Majestés feu l'Empereur Nicolas et l'Empereur Alexandre II, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint André en diamants et des Ordres de Russie, Grand-Crois de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne d'Autriche de première classe, de l'Aigle Noir de Prusse en diamants, de l'Annonciade de Sardaigne, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers; et le Sieur Philippe Baron de Brunnow, son Conseiller Privé, son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près la Confédération Germanique et près son Altesse Royale le Grand Duc de Hesse, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Wladimir de première classe, de Saint Alexandre Niewski, enrichi de diamants, de l'Aigle Blanc, de Saint Anne de première classe, de Saint Stanislas de première classe, Grand-Crois de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse de première classe, Commandeur de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne d'Autriche, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers;

Et Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan, Mouhammed Emin Aali Pacha, Grand Vézir de l'Empire Ottoman, décoré des Ordres Impériaux du Medjidyé et du Merité de première classe, Grand-Crois de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, de Saint Etienne

d'Autriche, de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, de Sainte Anne de Russie, des Saints Maurice et Lazare de Sardaigne, de l'Etoile Polair de Suède, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers; et Mehemmed Djemil Bey, décoré de l'Ordre Impérial du Medjidyé de seconde classe, et Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, son Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français, accredité en la même qualité près Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne;

Lesquels, après avoir échangé leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenues des Articles suivants:

I. Les Hautes Parties Contractantes s'engagent mutuellement à n'avoir dans la Mer Noire d'autres bâtiments de guerre que ceux dont le nombre, la force, et les dimensions sont stipulés ci-après.

II. Les Hautes Parties Contractantes se réservent d'entretenir chacune dans cette mer, 6 bâtiments-à-vapeur de 50 mètres de longueur à la flottaison, d'un tonnage de 800 tonneaux *au maximum*, et 4 bâtiments légers à vapeur ou à voile d'un tonnage qui ne dépassera pas 200 tonneaux chacun.

III. La présente Convention, annexée qu Traité Général signé à Paris en ce jour, sera ratifiée, et les ratifications en seront échangées dans l'espace de 4 semaines [sic], ou plus tôt si faire se peut.

En foi de quoi les Plénipotentiaires respectifs l'ont signée, et y ont apposé le sceau de leurs armes.

Fait à Paris, le 30 jour du mois de Mars, de l'an 1856.

(L.S.) ORLOFF

(L.S.) BRUNNOW.

(L.S.) AALI.

(L.S.) MEHEMMED DJEMIL.

(Parry, 1969, vol.114, pp.402-403)

**General Treaty for the Re-establishment of Peace between Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, Sardinia, and Turkey, and Russia, signed at Paris, 30 March 1856.**

This text is taken from *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. XLVI, p.8. The Treaty, the ratification of which were proclaimed at Paris on 27 April, 1856, was modified by the Treaties of 13 March 1871 and 13 July 1878. It is printed also in *Parliamentary Papers, 1856*, vol. LXI, p.1; *Parliamentary Papers, 1877*, vol. XCII, p.1001; *Hertslet's Commercial Treaties*, vol. X, p.533; by Hertslet, *Map of Europe by Treaty*, p. 1250; Martens, *Nouveau Recueil Général*, vol. XV, p.770; Neumann, *Recueil des Traités et Conventions conclus par l'Autriche*, vol. VI, p. 274; Solar de la Marguerite, *Traités Publics de la Royale Maison de Savoie*, vol. VIII, p. 380; De Clercq, *Recueil des Traités de la France*, vol. VII, p. 59; Garcia de la Vega, *Traités etc. concernant le Royaume de Belgique*, vol. III, p.90; Martens et de Cussy, *Recueil Manuel et Pratique des Traités*, vol. VII, p. 497; etc, etc. (Parry, 1971, vol 114. p.409)

FRENCH TEXT

[Ratifications exchanged at Paris April 27, 1856.]

Au nom de Dieu Tout-Puissant.

Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne at d'Irlande, l'Empereur des Français, l'Empereur des Français, l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, le Roi de Sardaigne, et l'Empereur des Ottomans, animées du désir de mettre un terme aux calamatiés de la guerre, et voulant prévenir le retour des complications qui l'one faite

nâitre, ont résolu de s'entendre avec Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche sur les bases à donner au rétablissement et à la consolidation de la paix, en assurant, par des garanties efficaces et réciproques, l'indépendance et l'intégrité de l'Empire Ottoman.

A cet effet, leurs dites Majestés ont nommé pour leurs Plénipotentiaires, savoir:

Sa Majesté la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, le Très Honorable George Guillaume Frédéric Comte de Claredon, Baron Hyde de Hindon, Pair du Royaume Uni, Conseiller de Sa Majesté Britannique en Son Conseil Privé, Chevalier du Très Noble Ordre de la Jarretetière, Chevalier Grand-Croix du Très Honorable Ordre du Bain, Principal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Majesté pour les Affaires Etrangères; et le Très Honorable Henri Richard Charles Baron Cowley, Pair du Royaume Uni, Conseiller de Sa Majesté en Son Conseil Privé, Chevalier Grand-Croix de Très Honorable Ordre de Bain, Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire de Sa Majesté près Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, le Sieur Charles Ferdinand Comte de Buol-Schauenstein, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de Léopold d'Autriche, et Chevalier de l'Ordre de la Couronne de Fer de première classe, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, Chevalier des Ordres de l'Aigle Noir et de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, Grand-Croix des Ordres Impériaux d'Alexandre Niewski, en brillants, et de l'Aigle Blanc de Russie, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de Saint Jean de Jérusalem, décoré de l'Ordre Impérial du Medjidy de première classe &c., Son Chambellan et Conseiller Intime Actuel, Son Ministre de la Maison et des Affaires Etrangères, Président de la Conférence des Ministries; et le Sieur Joseph Alexandre Baron de Hübner, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Couronne de Fer, Grand Officier de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, Son Conseiller Intime Actuel, et Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire à la Cour de France;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français, le Sieur Alexandre Comte Colonna Walewski, Sénateur de l'Empereur, Grand Officier de l'Ordre Imperial de la Légion d'Honneur, Chevalier Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Equestre des Séraphins, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, décoré de l'Ordre Impérial du Medjidy de première classe, &c., Son Ministre et Secrétaire d'Etat au Département des Affaires Etrangères; et le Sieur François Adolphe Baron de Bourqueney, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur et de l'Ordre de Léopold d'Autriche, décoré du Portrait du Sultan en diamants, &c., Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Impériale et Royale Apostolique;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, le Sieur Alexis Comte Orloff, Son Aide-de-camp, Général et Général de Cavalerie, Commandant du Quartier-Général de Sa Majesté, Member du Conseil de l'Empire et du Comité des Ministres, décoré des 2 Portraits en diamants de leurs Majestés feu l'Empereur Nicolas et l'Empereur Alexandre II, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint André en diamants, et des Ordres de Russie, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne d'Autriche de première classe, de l'Aigle Noir de Prusse en diamants, de l'Annonciade de Sardaigne, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers; et le Sieur Philippe, Baron de Brunnow, Son Conseiller Privé, Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près la Confédération Germanique et près Son Altesse Royale le Grand Duc de Hesse, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Wladimir de première classe, de Saint Alexandre Niewski enrichi de diamants, de l'Aigle Blanc, de Saint Anne de première classe, de Saint Stanislas de première classe, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse de première classe, Commandeur de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne d'Autriche, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers;

Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne, le Sieur Camille Benso, Comte de Cavour, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, Chevalier de l'Ordre du Mérite Civil de

Savoie, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, décoré de l'Ordre Impériale du Medjidy de première classe, Grand-Croix de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers, Prèsident du Conseil des Ministres, et Son Ministre Secrétaire d'Etat pour les Finances; et le Sieur Salvator, Marquis de Villamarina, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, Grand Officier de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, &c., Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire à la Cour de France;

Et Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Ottomans, Mohammed Emin Aali Pacha, Grand Vézir de l'Empire Ottoman, décoré des Ordres Impériaux du Medjidy et du Mérite de première classe, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, de Saint Etienne d'Autriche, de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, de Sainte Anne de Russie, des Saints Maurice et Lazare de Sardaigne, de l'Etoile Polaire de Suède, et le plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers; et Mehemmed Djemil Bey, décoré de l'Ordre Impérial du Medjidy de seconde classe, et Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, Son Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français, accredité en la même qualité près Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne;

Lesquels se sont réunis en Congrès à Paris.

L'entente ayant été heureusement établie entre eux, Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grand-Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, l'Empereur des Français, l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, le Roi de Sardaigne, et l'Empereur des Ottomans, considérant que, dans un intérêt Européen, Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, signataire de la Convention de 13 Juillet, 1841, devait être appelée à participer aux nouveaux arrangements à prendre, et appréciant la valeur qu'ajouterait à un œuvre de pacification générale le concours de Sa dite Majesté, l'ont invitée à envoyer des Plénipotentiaires au Congrès.

En conséquence, Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse a nommé pour ses Plénipotentiaire, savoir:

Le Sieur Othon Théodore Baron de Manteuffel, Prèsident de Son Conseil et Son Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Chevalier de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, première classe, avec Feuilles de Chêne, Couronne et Sceptre, Grand Commandeur de l'Ordre de Hohenzollern, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Jean de Prusse, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne de Hongrie, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Alexandre de Niewski, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, et de l'Ordre du Nichan-Iftihar de Turquie, &c., et le Sieur Maximilien Frédéric Charles François, Comte de Hatzfeldt Wildenbury-Schoenstein, Son Conseiller Privé Actuel, Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire à la Cour de France, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, seconde classe, avec Feuilles de Chêne et Plaque, Chevalier de la Croix d'Honneur de Hohenzollern, première classe, &c.

Les Plénipotentiaires, après avoir échangé leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, ont convenus des Articles suivants:

Art. I. Il y aura, à dater du jour de l'échange de ratifications de présent Traité, Paix et Amitié entre Sa Majesté le Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français, Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne, Sa Majesté Imperial le Sultan, d'une part; et Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, de autre part; ainsi qu'entre leur héritiers et successeurs, leurs états et sujets respectifs, à perpétuité.

II. La paix étant heureusement rétablie entre leurs dites Majestés, les territoires conquis ou occupés par leurs armées pendant la guerre seront réciproquement évacués.

Des arrangements spéciaux régleront le mode de l'évacuation, qui devra être aussi prompte que faire se pourra.

III. Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies s'engage à restituer à Sa Majesté le Sultan la ville et citadelle de Kars, aussi bien que les autres parties du territoire Ottoman dont les troupes Russes se trouvent en possession.

IV. Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur des Français, le Roi de Sardaigne, et le Sultan, s'engagent à restituer à Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies les villes et ports de Sébastopol, Balaklava, Kamiesch, Eupatoria, Kertch, Jenikale, Kinburn, ainsi que tous autres territoires occupés par les troupes alliées.

V. Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur des Français, l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, le Roi de Sardaigne, et le Sultan, accordent une amnistie pleine et entière à ceux de leurs sujets qui auraient été compromis par une participation quelconque aux événements de la guerre en faveur de la cause ennemie.

Il est expressément entendu que cette amnistie s'étendra aux sujets de chacune des Parties belligérantes qui auraient continué, pendant la guerre, à être employés dans le service de l'un des autres belligérants.

VI. Les prisonniers de guerre seront immédiatement rendus de part et d'autre.

VII. Sa Majesté le Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français, Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, et Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne, déclarent la Sublime Porte admise à participer aux avantages du droit public et du concert Européens. Leurs Majestés s'engagent, chacune de son côté, à respecter l'indépendance et l'intégrité territoriale de l'Empire Ottoman: garantisement en commun la stricte observation de cet engagement: et considéreront, en conséquence, toute acte de nature à y porter atteinte comme une question d'intérêt général.

VIII. S'il survenait, entre la Sublime Porte et l'une ou plusieurs des autres Puissances signataires, un dissentiment qui menaçât le maintien de leurs relations, la Sublime Porte et chacune de ces Puissances, avant de recourir à l'emploi de la force, mettront les autres Parties Contractantes en mesure de prévenir cette extrémité par leur action médiatrice.

IX. Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan, dans sa constante sollicitude pour le bien-être de ses sujets, ayant octroyé un firman qui, en améliorant leur sort, sans distinction de religion ni de race, consacre ses généreuses intentions envers les populations Chétiens de son Empire, et voulant donner un nouveau témoignage de ses sentiments à cet égard, a résolu de communiquer aux Puissances Contractantes le dit firman spontanément émané de sa volonté souveraine.

Les Puissances Contractantes Constatent la haute valeur de cette communication. Il est bien entendu qu'elle ne saurait, en aucun cas, donner le droit aux dites Puissances de s'immiscer, soit collectivement, soit séparément dans les rapports de Sa Majesté le Sultan avec ses sujets, ni dans l'administration intérieure de son empire.

X. La Convention du 13 Juillet, 1841, qui maintient l'antique règle de l'Empire Ottoman relative à la clôture des Détroits du Bosphore et des Dardanelles, a été révisée d'un commun accord.

L'acte conclu à cet effet et conformément à ce principe entre les Hautes Parties Contractantes, est et demeure annexé au présent Traité, et aura même force et valeur que s'il en faisant partie intégrante.

XI. La Mer Noire est neutralisée: ouverts à la marine marchande de toutes les nations, ses eaux et ses ports sont formellement et à perpétuité interdits au pavillon de guerre, soit des Puissances riveraines, soit de toute autre Puissances, sauf les exceptions mentionnées aux Articles XIV et XIX du présent Traité.

XII. Libre de tout entrave, le commerce dans les ports et dans les eaux de la Mer Noire ne sera assujetti qu'à des réglemens de santé, de police, conclus dans un esprit favorable au développement des transactions commerciales.

Pour donner aux intérêts commerciaux et maritimes de toutes les nations la sécurité désirable, la Russie et la Sublime Porte admettront des Consuls dans leurs ports situés sur le littoral de la Mer Noire, conformément aux principes du droit international.

XIII. La Mer Noire étant neutralisée aux termes de l'Article XI, le maintien ou l'établissement sur son littoral d'arsenaux militaires-maritimes devient sans nécessité comme sans objet; en conséquence, Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies et Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan s'engagent à n'élever et à ne conserver, sur ce littoral, aucun arsenal militaire-maritime.

XIV. Leurs Majestés l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies et le Sultan ayant conclu une Convention à l'effet de déterminer la force et le nombre de bâtimens légers, nécessaires au service de leurs côtes, qu'elles se réservent d'entretenir dans la Mer Noire, cette Convention est annexée au présent Traité, et aura même force et valeur que si elle en faisant partie intégrante. Elle ne pourra être ni annulée ni modifiée sans l'assentiment des Puissances signataires du présent Traité.

XV. L'Acte du Congrès de Vienne ayant établi les principes destinés à régler la navigation des fleuves qui séparent ou traversent plusieurs Etats, les Puissances Contractantes stipulent entre elles qu'à l'avenir ces principes seront également appliqués au Danube et à ses embouchures. Elles déclarent que cette disposition fait désormais partie de droit public de l'Europe, et la prennent sous leur garantie.

La navigation du Danube ne pourra être assujettie à aucune entrave ni redevance qui ne serait pas expressément prévue par les stipulations contenues dans les Articles suivans. En conséquence, il ne sera perçu aucun péage basé uniquement sur le fait de la navigation du fleuve, ni aucun droit sur les marchandises qui se trouvent à bord de navires. Les réglemens de police et de quarantaine à établir, pour la sûreté des Etats séparés ou traversés par ce fleuve, seront conçus de manière à favoriser, autant que faire se pourra, la circulation des navires. Sauf ces réglemens, il ne sera apporté aucun obstacle, quelque'il soit, à la libre navigation.

XVI. Dans le but de réaliser les dispositions de l'Article précédent, une Commission dans laquelle la Grande Bretagne, l'Autriche, la France, la Prusse, la Russie, la Sardaigne, et la Turquie seront, chacune, représentées par un Délégué, sera chargée de désigner et de faire exécuter les travaux nécessaires, depuis Isatcha, pour dégager les embouchures du Danube, ainsi que les parties de la mer y avoisinantes, des sables et autres obstacles que les obstruent, afin de mettre cette partie de fleuve et les dites parties de la mer dans les meilleures conditions possibles de navigabilité.

Pour couvrir les frais de ces travaux, ainsi que des établissemens ayant pour objet d'assurer et de faciliter la navigation aux bouches du Danube, des droits fixes d'un taux convenable, arrêtés par la Commission à la majorité des voix, pourront être prélevés, à la condition expresse que, sous ce rapport comme sous les autres, les pavillons de toutes les nations seront traités sur le pied d'une parfaite égalité.

XVII. Une Commission sera établie et se composera des délégués de l'Autriche, de la Bavière, de la Sublime Porte, et du Wurtemberg (un pour chacune de ces Puissances), auxquels se réuniront les commissaires des trois Principautés Danubiennes, dont la nomination aura été approuvée par la Porte. Cette Commission, qui sera permanente: 1, élaborera les réglemens de navigation et de police fluviale; 2, fera disparaître les entraves, de quelque nature qu'elles puissent être, qui s'opposent encore à l'application au Danube des dispositions du Traité de Vienne; 3, ordonnera et

fera exécuter les travaux nécessaires sur tout le parcours du fleuve; et, 4, veillera, après la dissolution de la Commission Européenne, au maintien de la navigabilité des embouchures du Danube et des parties de la mer y avoisinantes.

XVIII. Il est entendu que la Commission Européenne aura rempli sa tâche, et que la Commission Riveraine aura terminé les travaux désignés dans l'Article précédent sous les Nos. 1 et 2, dans l'espace de 2 ans. Les Puissances signataires réunies en conférence, informées de ce fait, prononceront, après en avoir pris acte, la dissolution de la Commission Européenne; et, dès lors, la Commission Riveraine permanente jouira des mêmes pouvoirs que ceux dont la Commission Européenne aura été investie jusqu'alors.

XIX. Afin d'assurer l'exécution des règlements qui auront été arrêtés d'un commun accord, d'après les principes ci-dessus énoncés, chacune des Puissances Contractantes aura le droit de faire stationner, en tout temps, 2 bâtiments légers aux embouchures du Danube.

XX. En échange des villes, ports, et territoires énumérés dans l'Article IV du présent Traité, et pour mieux assurer la liberté de la navigation du Danube, Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies consent à la rectification de sa frontières en Bessarabie.

La nouvelle frontière partira de la Mer Noire, à un kilomètre à l'est du Lac Bourna Sola, rejoindra perpendiculairement la route d'Akerman, suivra cette route jusqu'au Val de Trajan, passera au sud de Bolgrad, remontera le long de la Rivière de Yalpuck jusqu'à la Hauteur de Saratsika, et ira aboutir à Katamori sur le Pruth. En amont de ce point, l'ancienne frontière entre les 2 Empires ne subira aucune modification.

Des Délégués des Puissances Contractantes fixeront dans ses détails le tracé de la nouvelle frontière.

XXI. La territoire cédé par la Russie sera annexé à la Principauté de Moldavie sous la suzeraineté de la Sublime Porte.

Les habitants de ce territoire jouiront des droits et privilèges assurés aux Principautés; et, pendant l'espace de trois années il leur sera permis de transporter ailleurs leur domicile, en disposant librement de leurs propriétés.

XXII. Les Principautés de Valachie et de Moldavie continueront à jour, sous la suzeraineté de la Porte et sous la garantie des Puissances Contractantes, des privilèges et des immunités dont elles sont en possession. Aucune protection exclusive ne sera exercée sur elles par une des Puissances garantes. Il n'y aura aucun droit particulier d'ingérence dans leurs affaires intérieures.

XXIII. La Sublime Porte s'engage à conserver aux dites Principautés une administration indépendante et nationale; ainsi que la pleine liberté de culte, de législation, de commerce et de navigation.

Les lois et statuts aujourd'hui en vigueur seront révisés. Pour établir un complet accord sur cette révision, une Commission Spéciale, sur la composition de laquelle les Hautes Puissances Contractantes s'entendront, se réunira sans délai à Bucharest, avec un Commissaire de la Sublime Porte.

Cette Commission aura pour tâche de s'enquérir de l'état actuel des Principautés, et de proposer les bases de leur future organisation.

XXIV. Sa Majesté le Sultan promet de convoquer immédiatement dans chacune des 2 Provinces un Divan *ad hoc*, composé de manière à constituer la représentation la plus exacte des intérêts de toutes les classes de la société. Ces Divans seront appelés à exprimer les vœux des populations relativement à l'organisation définitive des Principautés.

Une instruction du Congrès réglera les rapports de la Commission avec ces Divans.

XXV. Prenant en considération l'opinion émise par les 2 Divans, la Commission transmettra sans retard, au siège actuel des Conférences, le résultat de son propre travail.

L'entente finale avec la Puissance Suzeraine sera consacrée par une Convention conclue à Paris entre les Hautes Parties Contractantes; et un hattî-sheriff, conforme aux stipulations de la Convention, constituera, définitivement l'organisation de ces provinces, placée, désormais, sous la garantie collective de toutes les Puissances signataires.

XXVI. Il est convenu qu'il aura dans les Principautés une force armée nationale, organisée dans le but de maintenir la sûreté de l'intérieur et d'assurer celle des frontières. Aucune entrave ne pourra être apportée aux mesures extraordinaires de défense que, d'accord avec la Sublime Porte, elles seraient appelées à prendre pour repousser toute agression étrangère.

XXVII. Si le repos intérieur des Principautés se trouvait menacé ou compromis, la Sublime Porte s'entendra avec les autres Puissances Contractantes sur les mesures à prendre pour maintenir ou rétablir l'ordre légal. Une intervention armée ne pourra avoir lieu sans un accord préalable entre ces Puissances.

XXVIII. La Principauté de Servie continuera à relever de la Sublime Porte, conformément aux Hats Impériaux qui fixent et déterminent ses droits et immunités, placés désormais, sous la garantie collective des Puissance Contractantes.

En conséquence, la dite Principauté conservera son administration indépendante et nationale, ainsi que la pleine liberté de culte, de législation, de commerce, et de navigation.

XXIX. Le droit de garnison de la Sublime Porte, tel qu'il se trouve stipulé par les règlements antérieurs, est maintenu. Aucune intervention armée ne pourra avoir lieu en Servie sans un accord préalable entre les Hautes Puissances Contractantes.

XXX. Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies et Sa Majesté le Sultan maintiennent, dans son intégrité, l'état de leurs possessions en Asie, tel qu'il existait légalement avant la rupture.

Pour prévenir toute contestation locale, le tracé de la frontière sera vérifié, et, s'il y a lieu, rectifié, sans qu'il puisse en résulter un préjudice territorial pour l'une ou l'autre des 2 Parties.

A cet effet, une Commission Mixte, composée de 2 Commissaires Russes, de 2 Commissaires Français, sera envoyée sur les lieux immédiatement après la rétablissement des relations diplomatiques entre la Cour de Russie et la Sublime Porte. Son travail devra être terminé dans l'espace de 8 mois à dater de l'échange des ratifications du présent Traité.

XXXI. Les territoires occupés pendant le [sic] guerre par les troupes de leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, l'Empereur des Français, et le Roi de Sardaigne, aux termes des Conventions signées à Constantinople le 12 Mars, 1854, entre la Grande Bretagne, la France, et la Sublime Porte; le 14 Juin de la même année, entre l'Autriche et la Sublime Porte; et le 15 Mars, 1855, entre la Sardaigne et la Sublime Porte; seront évacuées après l'échange des ratifications du présent Traité, aussitôt que faire se pourra. Les délais et les moyens d'exécution feront l'objet d'un arrangement entre la Sublime Porte et les Puissances dont les troupes ont occupé son territoire.

XXXII. Jusqu'à ce que les Traités ou Conventions qui existaient avant la guerre entre les Puissances belligérantes aient été ou renouvelés ou remplacés par des Actes nouveaux, le commerce d'importation ou d'exportation aura lieu réciproquement sur le

ped des réglemens en vigueur avant la guerre; et leurs sujets en toute autre matière seront respectivement Traités sur le pied de la nation la plus favorisée.

XXXIII. La convention conclue en ce jour entre leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur des Français, d'une part, et Sa Majesté l'Empereur de toutes le Russies , de l'autre part, relativement aux Iles d'Aland, est et demeure annexée au présent Traité, et aura même force et valeur que si elle en faisant partie.

XXXIV. Le présent Traité sera ratifié, et les ratifications en seront échangées à Paris dans l'espace de 4 semaines, ou plus tôt si faire se peut.

En foi de quoi les Plénipotentiaires respectifs l'ont signé, et y ont apposé le sceau de leurs armes.

Fait à Paris, le 30 jour du mois de Mars, de l'an 1856.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.  
 (L.S.) COWLEY.  
 (L.S.) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.  
 (L.S.) HUBNER.  
 (L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.  
 (L.S.) BOURQUENEY.  
 (L.S.) MANTEUFFEL.  
 (L.S.) C. M. D'HATZFELDT.  
 (L.S.) ORLOFF.  
 (L.S.) BRUNNOW.  
 (L.S.) C. CAVOUR.  
 (L.S.) DE VILLAMARINA.  
 (L.S.) AALI.  
 (L.S.) MEHEMED DJEMIL.

*Article Additional et Transitoire.*

Les stipulations de la Convention de Détroits, signée en ce jour, ne seront pas applicable aux bâtiments de guerre employés par les Puissances belligérantes pour l'évacuation, par mer, des territoires occupés par leurs armées; mais les dites stipulations reprendront leur entier effet aussitôt que l'évacuation sera terminée.

Fait à Paris, le 30 jour du mois de Mars, de l'an 1856.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.  
 (L.S.) COWLEY.  
 (L.S.) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.  
 (L.S.) HUBNER.  
 (L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.  
 (L.S.) BOURQUENEY.  
 (L.S.) MANTEUFFEL.  
 (L.S.) C. M. D'HATZFELDT.  
 (L.S.) ORLOFF.  
 (L.S.) BRUNNOW.  
 (L.S.) C. CAVOUR.  
 (L.S.) DE VILLAMARINA.  
 (L.S.) AALI.  
 (L.S.) MEHEMED DJEMIL.

(Parry, 1969, vol.114, pp.410-420)

**Convention between Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia and Sardinia, and Turkey respecting the Straits of the Dardenelles and the Bosphorus, signed at Paris, 30 March, 1856.**

This Convention, the ratifications of which were exchanged at Paris on 27 April 1856, is here taken from *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. XLVI, p. 18, being also printed in *Parliamentary Papers, 1856*, vol. LXI, p. 12; *Parliamentary Papers, 1877*, vol. XCII, p. 1009; *Hertslet's Commercial Treaties*, vol. X, p. 541; and by Hertslet, *Map of Europe by Treaty*, p. 1266; Martens, *Nouveau Recueil Général*, vol. XV, p. 782; Neumann, *Recueil des Traités et Conventions conclus par l'Autriche*, vol VI, p. 286; De Clercq, *Recueil des Traités de la France*, vol. VII, p. 69, and Solar de la Marguerite, *Traités Publics de la Royale Maison de Savoie*, vol. VIII, p. 395. (Parry, 1969, vol.114, p.421)

FRENCH TEXT

[Ratifications exchanged at Paris, April 27, 1856]

Au nom de Dieu Tout-Puissant

Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, l'Empereur des Français, le Roi de Prusse, l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, signataires de la Convention du 13 Juillet, 1841; et Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne; voulant constater en commun leur détermination unanime de se conformer à ancienne règle de l'Empire Ottoman, d'après laquelle les Détroits des Dardenelles et du Boshore sont fermés aux bâtimens de guerre étrangers tant que la Porte se trouve en paix;

Les dites Majestés, d'une part, et Sa Majesté le Sultan, de l'autre, ont résolu de renouveler la Convention conclue à Londres le 13 Juillet 1841, sauf quelques modifications de détail qui ne portent aucune atteinte au principes sur lequel elle repose.

En conséquence, leurs dites Majestés ont nommé à cet effet pour leurs Plénipotentiaires, savoir:

Sa Majesté la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, le Très Honorable George Guillaume Frédéric Comte de Claredon, Baron Hyde de Hindon, Pair du Royaume Uni, Conseiller de Sa Majesté Britannique en Son Conseil Privé, Chevalier du Très Noble Ordre de la Jarretière, Chevalier Grand-Croix du Très Honorable Ordre du Bain, Principal Secrétaire d'Etat de Sa Majesté pour les Affaires Etangères; et les Très Honorable Henri Richard Charles Baron Cowley, Pair du Royaume Uni, Conseiller de Sa Majesté en son Conseil Privé, Chevalier Grand-Croix du Très Honorable Ordre du Bain, Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire de Sa Majesté près Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur d'Autriche, le Sieur Charles Ferdinand Comte de Buol-Schauenstein, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de la Couronne de Fer de Première Classe, Grand-Croix des Ordres Impériaux de la Legion d'Honneur, Chevalier des Ordres de l'Aigle Noir et de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, Grand-Croix des Ordres Impériaux d'Alexandre Niewski, en brillants, et de l'Aigle Blanc de Russie, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de Saint Jean de Jérusalem, décoré de l'Ordre Impérial du Medjidyé de première classe &c., son Chambellan et Conseiller Intime Actuel, Son Ministre de la Maison et des Affaires Etrangères, Président de la Conférence des Ministries; et le Sieur Joseph Alexandre Baron de Hübner, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Couronne de Fer, Grand Officier de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, son Conseiller Intime Actuel, et Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire à la Cour de France;

Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français, le Sieur Alexandre Comte Colonna Walewski, Sénateur de l'Empire, Grand Officier de l'Ordre Imperial de la Légion d'Honneur, Chevalier Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Equestre des Séraphins, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, décoré de l'Ordre Impérial du Medjidyé de première classe, &c., son Ministre et Secrétaire d'Etat au Département des Affaires Etrangères; et le Sieur François Adolphe Baron de Bourqueney, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur et de l'Ordre de Léopold d'Autriche, décoré du Portrait du Sultan en diamants, &c., Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté Impériale et Royale Apostolique;

Sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse, Le Sieur Othon Théodore Baron de Manteuffel, Président de Son Conseil at son Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Chevalier de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, première classe, avec Feuilles de Chêne, Couronne, et Sceptre, Grand Commandeur de l'Ordre de Hohenzollern, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Jean de Prusse, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne de Hongrie, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Alexandre de Niewski, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, et de l'Ordre du Nichan-Iftihar de Turquie, &c., et le Sieur Maximilien Frédéric Charles François, Comte de Hatzfeldt Wildenbury-Schoenstein, son Conseiller Privé Actuel, son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire à la Cour de France, Chevalier de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, seconde classe, avec Feuilles de Chêne et Plaque, Chevalier de la Croix d'Honneur de Hohenzollern, première classe, &c.

Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, le Sieur Alexis Comte Orloff, son Aide-de-Camp, Général et Général de Cavalerie, Commandant du Quartier-Général de Sa Majesté, Member du Conseil de l'Empire et du Comité des Ministres, décoré des 2 Portraits en diamants de leurs Majestés feu l'Empereur Nicolas et l'Empereur Alexandre II, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint André en diamants, et des Ordres de Russie, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne d'Autriche de première classe, de l'Aigle Noir de Prusse en diamants, de l'Annonciade de Sardaigne, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers; et le Sieur Philippe, Baron de Brunnow, Son Conseiller Privé, Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près la Confédération Germanique et près son Altesse Royale le Grand Duc de Hesse, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Wladimir de première classe, de Saint Alexandre Niewski enrichi de diamants, de l'Aigle Blanc, de Saint Anne de première classe, de Saint Stanislas de première classe, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse de première classe, Commandeur de l'Ordre de Saint Etienne d'Autriche, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers;

Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne, le Sieur Camille Benso, Comte de Cavour, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, Chevalier de l'Ordre du Mérite Civil de Savoie, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, décoré de l'Ordre Impériale du Medjidyé de première classe, Grand-Croix de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers, Prèsident du Conseil des Ministres, et son Ministre-Secrétaire d'Etat pour les Finances; et le Sieur Salvator, Marquis de Villamarina, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, Grand Officier de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, &c., Son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire à la Cour de France;

Et Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan, Mouhammed Emin Aali Pacha, Grand Vézir de l'Empire Ottoman, décoré des Ordres Impériaux du Medjidyé et du Mérite de première classe, Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Impérial de la Légion d'Honneur, de Saint Etienne d'Autriche, de l'Aigle Rouge de Prusse, de Sainte Anne de Russie, des Saints Maurice et Lazare de Sardaigne, de l'Etoile Polaire de Suède, et de plusieurs autres Ordres Etrangers; et Mehemmed Djemil Bey, décoré de l'Ordre Impérial du Medjidyé de seconde classe, et Grand-Croix de l'Ordre des Saints Maurice et Lazare, Son

Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté l'Empereur des Français, accredité en la même qualité près Sa Majesté le Roi de Sardaigne;

Lesquels, après avoir échangé leurs pleins pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des Articles suivants:

Art. I. Sa Majesté le Sultan, d'une part, déclare qu'il a la ferme résolution de maintenir à l'avenir le principe invariablement établi comme ancienne règle de son Empire, et en vertu duquel il a été de tout temps défendu aux bâtiments de guerre de Puissances étrangères d'entrer dans les Détroits des Dardanelles et du Bosphore; et que, tant que la Porte se trouve en paix, Sa Majesté n'admettra aucun bâtiment de guerre étranger dans le dits Détroits.

Et Leurs Majestés la Reine du Royaume Uni de la Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande, l'Empereur d'Autriche, l'Empereur des Français, le Roi de Prusse, l'Empereur de Toutes les Russies, et le Roi de Sardaigne, de l'autre part, s'engagent à respecter cette détermination du Sultan et à se conformer au principe ci-dessus énoncé.

II. Le Sultan se réserve, comme par le passé, de délivrer des firmans de passage aux bâtiments légers sous pavillon de guerre, lesquels sont employés, comme il est d'usage, au service des Légations de Puissances amies.

III. La même exception s'applique aux bâtiments légers sous pavillon de guerre que chacune des Puissances Contractantes est autorisée à faire stationer aux embouchures du Danube, pour assurer l'exécution de réglemens relatifs à la liberté du fleuve, et dont le nombre ne devra pas excéder 2 pour chaque Puissance.

IV. La présente Convention, annexée au Traité Général signé à Paris en ce jour, sera ratifiée, et les ratifications en seront échangées dans l'espace de quatre semaines, ou plus tôt si faire se peut.

En foi de quoi, les Plénipotentiaires respectifs l'ont signée, et y ont apposé le sceau de leurs armes.

Fait à Paris, le 30 jour du mois de Mars, de l'an 1856.

(L.S.) CLARENDON.

(L.S.) COWLEY.

(L.S.) BUOL-SCHAUENSTEIN.

(L.S.) HUBNER.

(L.S.) A. WALEWSKI.

(L.S.) BOURQUENEY.

(L.S.) MANTEUFFEL.

(L.S.) C. M. D'HATZFELDT.

(L.S.) ORLOFF.

(L.S.) BRUNNOW.

(L.S.) C. CAVOUR.

(L.S.) DE VILLAMARINA.

(L.S.) AALI.

(L.S.) MEHEMED DJEMIL.

(Parry, 1969, vol.114, pp.422-425)

### **Index to the British Treaties**

The following quotation comes from an index on the British treatises covering a eight hundred years, and indicates that Turkey did indeed need to ratify the treaty, indicating that she had signed the treaty (making Turkey an *equal* with the other powers) , and further, Turkey did not ratify the London Convention on the pacification of the Levant until the 17<sup>th</sup> September, 1840, (the same day it came into force):

"Convention between Great Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia and Turkey, for the pacification of the LEVANT, with Additional Article. Signed at London 15 July 1840. **Ratified by Turkey 17 September 1840.**" [There is then further information about ratifications and] "Entry into force: 17 September 1840." (Parry and Hopkins, 1970, vol. 2, p. 210)<sup>63</sup>

Why is ratification to be considered the decision of the country and not just the signing of the treaty? Because that is the way things are done. It is the ratification that expresses the view of the nation, and becomes binding on the signee in international law. Being a multilateral treaty between more than two parties, (in this case, five), ratification was sought in the treaty, and Turkey was one country who needed to ratify the treaty. If international recognition applies to the ratification of the treaty as the binding act, and not just the signing, then surely, one must recognize international convention and follow precedent in defining the relationship of events to the interpretation of the prophecy given by Litch.

This puts beyond doubt that: (1) Turkey was an equal partner in the treaty, as quoted by Haskell above when he reported a part of the treaty verbatim, indicating that Turkey, "together with" the other powers, had made this treaty. Turkey was a partner with signatory power in a coalition, not a subservient power, at least as far as the treaty is concerned; (2) It was not the *signing* of the treaty that was significant, but the

---

<sup>63</sup> Regarding the procedure of treaties and their nomenclature, notice the following comments:

"Broadly speaking, international law is the body of rules which govern relations between nation States; the relationships and behaviour of multinational corporations; and human rights. According to Article 38(1) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the main sources of international law are: treaties, custom, reports of decisions of international courts and tribunals, scholarly writings.

"A treaty is a written agreement between States which is governed by international law. A treaty may also be concluded by States and international organizations. The *Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969*, sets out the rules for the negotiation of treaties between States. A treaty may also be known as a "convention", "protocol", "covenant" or "exchange of letters".

#### **"Signatories**

"A nation State, that is, an independent sovereign nation, will express its consent to be bound by the terms of a treaty by signing it. The authority to sign is usually vested in the diplomats assigned to negotiate the treaty's terms. In most cases the treaty is not binding until it is ratified.

#### **"Ratification**

"Once the treaty has been signed, the Heads of State or the governments of the signatory countries then 'confirm' that the country agrees to be bound by the provisions of the treaty. This procedure is known as ratification. In Australia, treaties are tabled in both Houses of Parliament for at least 15 sitting days before the Government takes action to bring the treaty into force. Tabled treaties are now accompanied by a National Interest Analysis.

"The terms of a treaty will usually stipulate if ratification is necessary and this procedure is implemented for multilateral treaties (treaties to which there are more than two parties). However, in the case of bilateral treaties (treaties between two parties), ratification rarely occurs as it is viewed as an onerous task and a signature is usually viewed as sufficient. The ratification of a bilateral treaty usually occurs only if one of the parties insists on it.

"Treaties that Australia is a party to are published in the [Australian Treaty Series](#). Multilateral treaties can also be found in the *United Nations Treaty Series* (L/KC10/U5).

#### **"Entry into force**

"A treaty usually enters into force in accordance with the procedure laid down within the treaty itself. For example, a treaty may contain a provision stating that it will enter into force once a certain number of countries have signed it.

"A treaty may sometimes require implementing legislation. If so, the text of the treaty may be reproduced in the legislation as a schedule." (<http://info.library.unsw.edu.au/law/guides/intlaw.html> )

*ratification* of that treaty. This brings the time frame of Revelation 9 to 17<sup>th</sup> September, 1840, not 11<sup>th</sup> August, 1840.

### **The New Cambridge Modern History – ChXVI –The Mediterranean**

The Sultan's command of the sea, and of the Levant generally, was now [1830s] no longer challenged, within the Mediterranean, by Normans or Italians or Spaniards or even Frenchmen, but by his own insurgent subjects who dreamed, in Greece of a new Byzantium, or in Egypt of a new Arab empire; and, from without, by that comparatively recent intruder, the British navy, or that other potential intruder from the new naval arsenals of Odessa and Sebastopol. Greece, Egypt, Britain, Russia – each spelt a different danger for the sultan. (p.425-6)

The decision in 1830 to make the new Greece a small but independent kingdom, under the diplomatic guarantee of England, France and Russia as protecting powers, relieved both their own and the sultan's immediate anxieties. It recognised the presence on the stage of a new and unpredictable actor, representing hopes of future expansion and so of further changes; but, during the next forty years, the ambitions of the Greeks proved to be less disturbing to international affairs than to their own internal political stability....

Egypt was the second disturbing force, unpredictable and immediately much more alarming. The reappearance of North Africa in Mediterranean politics, as something more than a lair of 'Barbary pirates,' began effectively with Napoleon I's expedition to Egypt (1809-49) was no doubt a barbarian, but he was at least as intelligent as some of the rulers in Europe who were his contemporaries. His face was not turned only towards the Mediterranean, for he secured control of the Muslim Holy Places in Arabia and he was interested in the slaves and gold of the Sudan; but his position could never be secure while he was still only the sultan's viceroy. This made him deeply interested in rivalries of the European powers at Constantinople, and at Cairo too; rivalries which he hoped to turn to his own advantage. If he preferred French to British soldiers, engineers and archaeologists, he also had a realistic aspect for the British navy and desired to stand well with both France and England. In the Greek affair, before 1830 he had been too deeply committed as the sultan's ally to withdraw without a show of fighting when England, France and Russia managed at last to agree on a joint intervention in favour of Greece; but he was careful to show these powers that he bore no malice for the destruction of his fleet, along with that of Turkey, at Navarino in October, 1827, and that, while he kept Crete as the sultan's reward to him for his services, he was determined to rebuild his fleet and to prove to Europe that he would be a more reliable ally, and a more dangerous enemy, than the sultan himself. In the 'thirties, many Frenchmen believed that their old ally would do better for himself, and incidentally for France, by making large concessions to their new friend Mehemet Ali. Many, though not all, interested Englishmen took an opposite view; but both countries agreed in wishing to prevent that tsar from becoming the heir of the sultan.

Mehemet Ali refused in 1830 to be drawn into the French adventure which led to the conquest and settlement of Algeria. This enterprise, though less tempting to France than the historic lure of Egypt, was ultimately to prove more fruitful in opening up to her the North African empire to offset her relative decline in Europe. The eastern and western projects were closely linked in French minds at the start. [Inserts footnotes: "G. Douin, *Mohamed Ali et l'expédition d'Alger* (Cairo, 1930)"] Polignac's first plan (September, 1829) took up the recent suggestion by the French consul at Alexandria that Mehemet Ali should be induced to turn his eyes away from a lone adventure into Syria towards an attack upon Algiers in alliance with France. The viceroy pitched his terms so high (a loan of 20 million francs, free of interest, and a gift of four warships)

that in January, 1830 Polignac proposed instead a purely French attack on Algiers, with a loan of 10 million francs to Mehemet Ali if he would attack Tripoli and Tunis at the same time with 25,000 men.

‘North African coast, and the viceroy, recognised as lieutenant of the king of France, would eventually, in spite of England, have carried French influence into the heart of Asia.’ [Inserts footnote: “Polignac, *Etudes historiques*, p.227 (written after the fall of Charles X), quoted by G. Douin, *op. cit.* p.lviii.”] But in February the viceroy decisively rejected even this more limited plan, on the grounds, partly that an enterprise against Muslim rulers, shared with a Christian power, would shake his prestige in the Muslim world, and partly that he was not prepared to face the known objections of England to such a plan. He told the British Consul at Alexandria that Turkey was finished, and that England should prepare to create a power in Asia to help her confront the Russians. Where could she find such a power but in Mehemet Ali and his son after him? With English friendship he could do anything, with it, nothing. [Inserts footnote: “Consul *Barker* to Aberdeen, 8 March 1830, quoted by G. Douin, *op.cit.* p xci.”] Consequently, France proceeded alone (June 1830) to capture the fortress of Algiers (and the treasure accumulated there by the Bey) at a moment when England was too much preoccupied to interfere. This first success was not undone by the fall of Charles X a month later; it was followed, under Louis Philippe, by a slow and costly struggle, whose final success came only on the eve of his own fall eighteen years afterwards. But, thereafter, with the decision in principle to treat Algeria, not as a colony but as an extension of France itself into Africa, development went on steadily, not much affected by political revolutions in Paris, and nourished by the capital and the commercial enterprise of Marseilles and by settlers from the Mediterranean coastlands and the vineyards of southern France.

Mehemet Ali, having declined to be tempted by France in the west, was still determined to have Syria next, and believed that here at least he could play off France and England against each other, and both against Russia. France continued, indeed, to woo him as ‘a Power naturally the friend of France and interested, like France, in the liberty of the Mediterranean’; [inserts footnote: “Sébastien’s instructions to Mimaut, the French consul at Alexandria, 30 July 1832, quoted by G. Douin, *La mission du Baron de Boislecote: l’Égypte et las Syrie en 1833* (Cairo, 1927), p.1”] but she wanted to use him as her tool against British preponderance, whereas his only object was to make use of any of the powers, or of the rivalries between them, for his own purposes. In England he had his advocates, but he was to have no success in his attempts to woo Palmerston, who was at this moment interested in the project of an ‘alternative route’ to the East through Syria and across the desert to the Euphrates, and thence down the river by steamboat to the Persian gulf. Nevertheless, without the certainty of effective support even by France, or of acquiescence by England in a *fait accompli*, he proceeded alone into Syria (November 1831) and into Asia Minor a year later, rashly forgetting his own words of wisdom. The victory of his son Ibrahim at Konieh (21 December 1832) opened the road towards Constantinople, and converted an important but local issue into a major threat to the independence of Turkey, a threat coming not so much from Mehemet himself as from the Russians in their new role of patron-protectors of a feeble sultan (ch x, pp. 251-2). Probably Mehemet was relieved to be halted by the obviously unanswerable argument of a Russian fleet and army inside the Bosphorus; in the general alarm at that sight, that he was able to obtain as much as he had ever expected from this campaign, namely the government of Syria, Acre and Damascus for himself, and that of Adana for his son, Ibrahim, the commander of his armies. Perhaps he would have been wiser not to insist upon so much.

The sultan was determined upon revenge. Palmerston was equally determined to undo the Russo-Turkish treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, to expel Mehemet Ali from Syria, and if possible force him to give up his system of state monopolies in trade. It appears that the secret article of this treaty of 8 July 1833 was not so alarming as was supposed, for the Russian government considered itself as much bound as the sultan to keep the Dardenelles closed to foreign warships, even Russian ones, in time of peace; but it was not so certain that this principle applied to the Bosphorus under this treaty, and there remained that threat of an apparent Russian 'protectorate' over Turkey. [Inserts footnote: "P. E. Moseley, *Russian Diplomacy and the Opening of the Eastern Question in 1838 and 1839* (Harvard, 1934), ch.II and App A." ] The Anglo-Turkish Trade Convention of Balta Liman (16 August 1838), on the other hand, was equally believed by the Russians to have unfriendly political implications; if Mehemet Ali should refuse to recognise it as applying to Egypt, because that would involve giving up his monopolies, England might have a good legal case for coercing Mehemet Ali into submission on the sultan's behalf. For this reason, among others, he had been pressing for recognition of his independence, so that Egypt would not be affected by the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The sultan rashly played into the hands by initiating, without any ally, an attack on the Egyptians in Syria in the spring of 1839; in a single week his army was defeated at Nezib, his fleet deserted to the Egyptians, and he himself died (1 July) before the news of these disasters reached Constantinople. [Inserts footnote: "Cf. ch x, pp. 254-8 for a fuller account of the Near Eastern Crisis of 1839-1841." ]

Mehemet Ali was not to enjoy the fruits of these successes. Since no one of the powers could hope alone to impose a settlement, all five endorsed the action of their ambassadors at Vienna (27 July 1839) in warning the Porte [another name for Constantinople-FB], at Metternich's instance, not to make hasty concessions to Mehemet without their consent. The French did so with reserve, not wishing to see Mehemet Ali any more than the sultan humiliated, and refused to press upon him the terms which were suggested by Palmerston. Reassured as to the intentions of Russia on this occasion at least, Palmerston felt safe, after a struggle with his cabinet, in imposing a settlement without France, by means of the four-power Convention of London (15 July 1840), which envisaged, first the coercion of Mehemet if necessary, and secondly a reassertion of the principle of the closure of the Straits. Deceived by the bellicose attitude of his friends in France, Mehemet refused both stages of the offer made to him, and submitted to the powers only in December 1840, after a display of force against him by land and sea on the coast of Syria, and after the dramatic fall of Their's government in October. His reconciliation with Turkey, on the conditions imposed by the powers, was not complete until the end of June 1841; he secured a hereditary right to Egypt under the nominal suzerainty of the sultan, but had to restore everything else.

By 1841 France came back into the fold by signing a five-power Straits of Convention which provided that both the Dardenelles and the Bosphorus should be closed to the passage of warships when Turkey was not at war. In spite of their later denials, it was not intended that even a request by the sultan should justify entry in peace-time without the agreement of all the signatory powers. The principle was not new, but it now rested on a formal international pact, which was reasserted in 1856 and 1871 and never repudiated.

Thus, at the price of a serious but not insuperable rift in the Anglo-French *entente*, this settlement of Egypt put an end to the alarms occasioned by the ambitions of Mehemet Ali outside Egypt over the next twenty years. ...

Anglo-French relations were again to be strained because of the strategic position of Egypt in relation to the Suez Canal...

---

The two forces...England and Russia...It was the predominance, in any emergency, of British sea-power in the Levant and the pressure of Russian influence in the Levant, and the hostility between these two external powers, that gave a new and distinctive character to Mediterranean politics during the half-century 1828-78. It is true that the tension between the two was relaxed for more than ten years after the settlement of Egypt and the Straits in 1841, but to some people in both countries that seemed to be an unnatural interlude, and the advent of the Crimean War to be a recognition of the true situation created by the weakness of Turkey as a buffer between the despotic empire of Russia and the commercial empire of Great Britain. However natural the Russian interest in the Mediterranean might be, it was to most Englishmen a new and portentous thing, whereas their quarrels with France in this region seemed traditional, almost domestic. The French too, though unwilling to see Britannia ruling the waves, or British influence taking the lead over the French in the Levant, preferred the British fact to the Russian prospect. The other Mediterranean powers were really of the same mind; during the Crimean War, the Austrian government showed a very benevolent neutrality to France and England, and Cavour, in sending a Piedmontese contingent to the siege of Sebastopol, was not only seeking future favours with France and England for his designs in Italy, but also staking the claim of Italy as a future Mediterranean power, a claim which he knew could not be made good in opposition to Britain and one which Russia could do nothing to promote. (Bury, 1964, pp.425-430)

The Date for the beginning of the Ottoman Empire was 1281, not 1299–1302.

The Ottoman Dynasty (or the Imperial House of Osman) ruled the Ottoman Empire from 1281 to 1923, beginning with Osman I (not counting his father, Ertuğrul), though the dynasty was not proclaimed until 1383 when Murad I declared himself sultan. Before that the tribe/dynasty might have been known as Söğüt but was renamed Osmanlı (Ottoman in English) in honour of Osman.

The sultan was the sole and absolute regent, head of state and head of government of the empire, at least officially, though often much power shifted de facto to other officials (in principle all his subservient creatures), especially the Grand Vizier, after whose palace the Ottoman government was known as High Porte, the Sultan's own Topkapi palace being mainly a seraglio, 'harem'. Wikipedia, article on Ottoman Empire.

**Other historians date the beginning of the Ottoman empire from the capture of its future capital:**

The victories around Nicaea made Osman famous, and thousands of immigrant Turkish households flocked to his standard. As a result the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus became so concerned by the Ottoman threat that he sought alliances. A deal was struck with the Persian Ilkhan Oljeitu, to whom the emperor offered his sister in marriage. As a result of this arrangement a force of Mongols invaded the Ottoman district of Eskisehir, where they were soundly beaten by Osman's son Orkhan. The Ottomans were triumphant. The old Seljuk kingdom had ceased to exist in 1302 and the likhanate was in disarray, so there was little to stop any further Ottoman moves against the Byzantine Empire. Wars and raiding continued, and shortly after Osman's death in 1326 Orkhan captured Brusa (Bursa), which became the first Ottoman capital. It is from this event that historians commonly date the founding of the Ottoman Empire and the beginning of a long process of military conquest.

<http://www.ottomanonline.net/history/1.html>

**The Greek empire became a vassal Ottoman state around the 1360s, not 1448/9, as SDA historicists claim.**

Murad I stepped successfully into his brother's conquering shoes and after consolidating his position in Asia Minor won an important victory when he captured Adrianople in 1361. This city, renamed Edirne, was later to become the new Ottoman capital. The newly captured lands were settled with immigrants from Anatolia.

Murad also demonstrated how easily Constantinople could be outflanked by marching eastwards to the Black Sea. The current Byzantine Emperor, John V Palaeologus, could only look on helplessly from the walls of Constantinople as his capital was surrounded. In desperation he signed a treaty with Murad I. It guaranteed his safety but made the emperor into practically an Ottoman vassal. But in contrast to his humiliation the nearby Balkan states were preparing for war against the Ottomans. So from Edirne the Turks moved upstream in 1363 to capture Philippopolis (Plovdiv) with its valuable rice fields. It was an important, yet isolated, frontier base, but it brought the growing power of the Ottomans close to the sphere of influence of Serbia.

<http://www.ottomanonline.net/history/1.html>

Notice also these comments from Wikipedia:

John V Palaiologos or Palaeologus (Greek: Ιωάννης Ε' Παλαιολόγος, Iōannēs V Palaiologos), (1332 – February 16, 1391) was the son of Emperor Andronikos III Palaiologos and Anna of Savoy. His maternal grandparents were Count Amadeus V of Savoy and his second wife Maria of Brabant. He succeeded his father as Byzantine Emperor in 1341, at age nine.

John VI Kantakouzenos, his father's friend, served as his regent and co-emperor (1347–1354), after having fought a civil war (1342–1347) against the regency for

young John V headed by Anna of Savoy. Forced to fight John Kantakouzenos, who had usurped the throne during his minority, John V became sole emperor in 1354.

His long reign was marked by the gradual dissolution of the imperial power. In his reign the Ottomans, led by Suleyman Paşa the son of the Ottoman sultan, took Adrianople and Philippopolis, and exacted tribute from the emperor. After the Ottoman Turks gained control of Gallipoli and threatened Constantinople, John V appealed to the West for help, proposing to end the schism between the Byzantine and Latin churches by submitting to the supremacy of the Roman Church. Impoverished by war, he was detained as a debtor when he visited Venice (1369). In 1371 he recognized the suzerainty of the Ottoman sultan Murad I, who later helped him to regain the throne (1379) after he was deposed by his son Andronikos IV Palaiologos in 1376. In 1390 his grandson, John VII Palaiologos, briefly usurped the throne, but was quickly overthrown. John V was succeeded by his son Manuel II Palaiologos. His younger son Theodore I Palaiologos succeeded to the so-called Despotate of Morea in 1383.

Towards the end of his reign, in 1390, John ordered the strengthening of the Constantinople Golden Gate, utilizing marble from the decayed churches of city. Upon the completion of this construction, Bayezid I, [the sultan of the Ottoman Empire from 1389 to 1402-FB ] threatening war, demanded that John raze these new works. John V obeyed the Sultan's order, but is said to have suffered from this humiliation and, according to historians, died of a nervous shock on February 16, 1391.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John\\_V\\_Palaiologos](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_V_Palaiologos)

Commenting further on this treaty, Gibbon says:

At length, the ambition of the victorious sultan pointed to the conquest of Constantinople; but he listened to the advice of his vizier, who represented that such an enterprise might unite the powers of Christendom in a second and more formidable crusade. His epistle to the emperor was conceived in these words:

"By the divine clemency, our invincible cimeter has reduced to our obedience almost all Asia, with many and large countries in Europe, excepting only the city of Constantinople; for beyond the walls thou hast nothing left. Resign that city; stipulate thy reward; or tremble, for thyself and thy unhappy people, at the consequences of a rash refusal."

But his ambassadors were instructed to soften their tone, and to propose a treaty, which was subscribed with submission and gratitude. A truce of ten years was purchased by an annual tribute of thirty thousand crowns of gold; the Greeks deplored the public toleration of the law of Mahomet, and Bajazet enjoyed the glory of establishing a Turkish cadhi, and founding a royal mosque in the metropolis of the Eastern church. [Gibbon footnotes: "Cantemir, p. 50 - 53. Of the Greeks, Ducas alone (c. 13, 15) acknowledges the Turkish cadhi at Constantinople. Yet even Ducas dissembles the mosque."] Yet this truce was soon violated by the restless sultan: in the cause of the prince of Selybria, the lawful emperor, an army of Ottomans again threatened Constantinople; and the distress of Manuel implored the protection of the king of France. His plaintive embassy obtained much pity and some relief; and the conduct of the succour was intrusted to the marshal Boucicault, [Gibbon footnotes: "Memoires du bon Messire Jean le Maingre, dit *Boucicault*, Mar&eacute;chal de France, partie i<sup>re</sup>, c. 30-35."] whose religious chivalry was inflamed by the desire of revenging his captivity on the infidels. He sailed with four ships of war, from Aiguesmortes to the Hellespont; forced the passage, which was guarded by seventeen Turkish galleys; landed at Constantinople a supply of six hundred men-at-arms and sixteen hundred archers; and reviewed them in the adjacent plain, without condescending to number or array the multitude of Greeks. By his presence, the blockade was raised both by sea and land; the flying squadrons of Bajazet were driven to a more respectful distance; and several castles in Europe and Asia were stormed by the emperor and the marshal, who fought with equal valour by each other's side. But the Ottomans soon returned with an increase of numbers; and the intrepid Boucicault, after a year's struggle, resolved to evacuate a country which could no longer afford either pay or provisions for his soldiers. The marshal offered to conduct Manuel to the

French court, where he might solicit in person a supply of men and money; and advised, in the mean while, that, to extinguish all domestic discord, he should leave his blind competitor on the throne. The proposal was embraced: the prince of Selybria was introduced to the capital; and such was the public misery, that the lot of the exile seemed more fortunate than that of the sovereign. Instead of applauding the success of his vassal, the Turkish sultan claimed the city as his own; and on the refusal of the emperor John, Constantinople was more closely pressed by the calamities of war and famine. Against such an enemy prayers and resistance were alike unavailing; and the savage would have devoured his prey, if, in the fatal moment, he had not been overthrown by another savage stronger than himself. By the victory of Timour or Tamerlane, the fall of Constantinople was delayed about fifty years; and this important, though accidental, service may justly introduce the life and character of the Mogul conqueror.

<http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/volume2/chap64.htm#Palaeologus>

Here we see the Greek emperor in desperate straits with the Ottomans. He is keen to make a treaty with the Ottomans first, and when that is violated ten years later by the sultan, he seeks help from the French to avert his demise.

So to the treaty he made with Murad, referred to in the previous quote, Wikipedia also reports the Greek emperor as paying tribute to Suleyman Paşa, the son of the sultan. The Wikipedia also indicates that Murad I eventually controlled, not only the Greek empire, but also the Serbian empire, in that the Serbs had to pay tribute as well:

Murad I (nick-named Hüdavendigâr, "the God-liked one") (1319 (or 1326)–1389) (Arabic: مراد الأول) was the ruler of the Ottoman Empire from 1359 to 1389. He was the son of Orhan I and the Byzantine princess Helen (Nilüfer) and became the ruler following his father's death in 1359. He established the Empire by building up a society and government in the newly conquered city of Adrianople (Edirne in Turkish) and by expanding the realm in Europe, bringing most of the Balkans under Ottoman rule and forcing the Byzantine emperor to pay him tribute. It was Murad who established the former Osmanli tribe into an empire. He established the title of sultan in 1383 and the corps of the janissaries and the devşirme recruiting system. He also organised the government of the Divan, the system of timars and timar-holders (timariots) and the military judge, the kazasker. He also established the two provinces of Anadolu (Anatolia) and Rumeli (Europe).

Murad fought against the powerful emirate of Karamanid in Anatolia and against the Serbs, Bulgarians and Hungarians in Europe. His moves in the Balkans brought together a Christian coalition under the king of Hungary, but they were defeated at the Battle of Maritsa on September 26, 1371 by Murad's capable second lieutenant Lala Şâhin Paşa, the first governor (beylerbey) of Rumeli. In 1366 the Serbian king was forced to pay tribute to the Sultan and in 1385 Sofia fell to the Ottomans. In 1389 Murad's army indecisively defeated a Balkan Christian army at the first Battle of Kosovo. After the battle, Murad I was assassinated by Milos Obilic, a Serbian noble who earlier swore that it would be his sword that would kill Murad. (Article, Murad I, Wikipedia, see also the conquests of Murad I).

Furthermore, the Greek emperor, John V Palaeologus, sought aid from Western European powers and he also proposed submitting to the authority of the Roman Church. Furthermore, when he strengthened the Golden Gate of the city, he was ordered by the sultan to demolish the new works, which he did and died, supposedly as a consequence of this humiliation. These events occurred long before 1448/9, but are indicative of the subservience of the Greek Roman Empire to the Ottoman Empire. Just to illustrate how subservient the Greek Empire was, Pope Innocent III's action toward Palaeologus the Greek emperor was, unbeknowns to the Emperor, just a farce, but the Emperor was prepared to give to the pope full power over his family, his government,

the Greek church, in return for some galleys, 500 men, and 1,000 archers. That it was never executed is immaterial; it illustrates how low a position the emperor had come.

The first article of the treaty is an oath of fidelity and obedience to Innocent the Sixth and his successors, the supreme pontiffs of the Roman and Catholic church. The emperor promises to entertain with due reverence their legates and nuncios; to assign a palace for their residence, and a temple for their worship; and to deliver his second son Manuel as the hostage of his faith. For these condescensions he requires a prompt succour of fifteen galleys, with five hundred men at arms, and a thousand archers, to serve against his Christian and Mussulman enemies. Palaeologus engages to impose on his clergy and people the same spiritual yoke; but as the resistance of the Greeks might be justly foreseen, he adopts the two effectual methods of corruption and education. The legate was empowered to distribute the vacant benefices among the ecclesiastics who should subscribe the creed of the Vatican: three schools were instituted to instruct the youth of Constantinople in the language and doctrine of the Latins; and the name of Andronicus, the heir of the empire, was enrolled as the first student. Should he fail in the measures of persuasion or force, Palaeologus declares himself unworthy to reign; transferred to the pope all regal and paternal authority; and invests Innocent with full power to regulate the family, the government, and the marriage, of his son and successor. But this treaty was neither executed nor published: the Roman galleys were as vain and imaginary as the submission of the Greeks; and it was only by the secrecy that their sovereign escaped the dishonour of this fruitless humiliation...

After the labor of nine months, and the debates of twenty-five sessions, they attained the advantage and glory of the reunion of the Greeks. Four principal questions had been agitated between the two churches;

The use of unleaven bread in the communion of Christ's body.

The nature of purgatory.

The supremacy of the pope. And,

The single or double procession of the Holy Ghost.

The cause of either nation was managed by ten theological champions: the Latins were supported by the inexhaustible eloquence of Cardinal Julian; and Mark of Ephesus and Bessarion of Nice were the bold and able leaders of the Greek forces. We may bestow some praise on the progress of human reason, by observing that the first of these questions was *now* treated as an immaterial rite, which might innocently vary with the fashion of the age and country. With regard to the second, both parties were agreed in the belief of an intermediate state of purgation for the venial sins of the faithful; and whether their souls were purified by elemental fire was a doubtful point, which in a few years might be conveniently settled on the spot by the disputants. The claims of supremacy appeared of a more weighty and substantial kind; yet by the Orientals the Roman bishop had ever been respected as the first of the five patriarchs; nor did they scruple to admit, that his jurisdiction should be exercised agreeably to the holy canons; a vague allowance, which might be defined or eluded by occasional convenience. The procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, or from the Father and the Son, was an article of faith which had sunk much deeper into the minds of men; and in the sessions of Ferrara and Florence, the Latin addition of *filioque* was subdivided into two questions, whether it were legal, and whether it were orthodox...

In the treaty between the two nations, several forms of consent were proposed, such as might satisfy the Latins, without dishonouring the Greeks; and they weighed the scruples of words and syllables, till the theological balance trembled with a slight preponderance in favour of the Vatican.... the pope should defray all the expenses of the Greeks in their return home; that he should annually maintain two galleys and three hundred soldiers for the defence of Constantinople: that all the ships which transported pilgrims to Jerusalem should be obliged to touch at that port; that as often as they were required, the pope should furnish ten galleys for a year, or twenty for six months; and that he should powerfully solicit the princes of Europe, if the emperor had occasion for land forces.

[Pope Eugene IV] was revered as the true and holy vicar of Christ, who, after a separation of six hundred years, had reconciled the Catholics of the East and West in one fold, and under one shepherd. The act of union was subscribed by the pope, the emperor, and the principal members of both churches; even by those who, like Syropulus, [Gibbon footnotes: "Syropulus, rather than subscribe, would have assisted, as the least evil, at the ceremony of the union. He was compelled to do both; and the great ecclesiarch poorly excuses his submission to the emperor, (p. 290 - 292.)"] had been deprived of the right of voting. Two copies might have sufficed for the East and West; but Eugenius was not satisfied, unless four authentic and similar transcripts were signed and attested as the monuments of his victory. [Gibbon footnotes: "None of these original acts of union can at present be produced. Of the ten MSS. that are preserved, (five at Rome, and the remainder at Florence, Bologna, Venice, Paris, and London,) nine have been examined by an accurate critic, (M. de Brequigny,) who condemns them for the variety and imperfections of the Greek signatures. Yet several of these may be esteemed as authentic copies, which were subscribed at Florence, before (26th of August, 1439) the final separation of the pope and emperor, (Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. xliii. p. 287 -311.)"] On a memorable day, the sixth of July, the successors of St. Peter and Constantine ascended their thrones the two nations assembled in the cathedral of Florence; their representatives, Cardinal Julian and Bessarion archbishop of Nice, appeared in the pulpit, and, after reading in their respective tongues the act of union, they mutually embraced, in the name and the presence of their applauding brethren.

Gibbon (<http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/volume2/chap66.htm#Embassy> )

When the real treaty was negotiated some years later between the Greek emperor and the Pope, the concessions, though not as drastic as those dictated to Palaeologus, were significant nonetheless:

The fathers of Basil aspired to the glory of reducing the Greeks, as well as the Bohemians, within the pale of the church; and their deputies invited the emperor and patriarch of Constantinople to unite with an assembly which possessed the confidence of the Western nations. Palaeologus was not averse to the proposal; and his ambassadors were introduced with due honours into the Catholic senate. But the choice of the place appeared to be an insuperable obstacle, since he refused to pass the Alps, or the sea of Sicily, and positively required that the synod should be adjourned to some convenient city in Italy, or at least on the Danube. The other articles of this treaty were more readily stipulated: it was agreed to defray the travelling expenses of the emperor, with a train of seven hundred persons, to remit an immediate sum of eight thousand ducats for the accommodation of the Greek clergy; and in his absence to grant a supply of ten thousand ducats, with three hundred archers and some galleys, for the protection of Constantinople.

<http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/volume2/chap66.htm#Embarks>

Another problem in the fifth and sixth trumpet of reading the Ottoman empire rather than the Seljuk empire as the major Turkish scourge is the fact that the Seljuk empire was much earlier than the Ottoman empire originally, and it was a Turkish empire.<sup>64</sup> If SDA historicists start the other kingdoms at the start of the empire (such as Babylon, Media-Persia, Greece and Rome), then surely, to be consistent, we must look to the mother of this scourge, rather than to its children? For instance, the Persian Empire constituted the major part of the dominance of that power, with the Median power only existing for a short time. Yet SDA historicists are content to include the Median phase of the Medo-Persian empire in the interpretation, in harmony with the

<sup>64</sup> Within ten years of the Battle of Manzikert [1071], the Seljuks had won control of most of Anatolia.. See the article at <http://countrystudies.us/turkey/5.htm>

interpretation given in Daniel 8:20: "The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Me'dia and Persia." If the symbol is the Turkish hordes, then one must go to the establishment of the Turkish kingdom with the conquests of the Seljuks.

### **Embassy of the younger Andronicus to pope Benedict XII. A.D. 1339.**

In the four last centuries of the Greek emperors, their friendly or hostile aspect towards the pope and the Latins may be observed as the thermometer of their prosperity or distress; as the scale of the rise and fall of the Barbarian dynasties. When the Turks of the house of Seljuk pervaded Asia, and threatened Constantinople, we have seen, at the council of Placentia, the suppliant ambassadors of Alexius imploring the protection of the common father of the Christians. No sooner had the arms of the French pilgrims removed the sultan from Nice to Iconium, than the Greek princes resumed, or avowed, their genuine hatred and contempt for the schismatics of the West, which precipitated the first downfall of their empire. The date of the Mogul invasion is marked in the soft and charitable language of John Vataces. After the recovery of Constantinople, the throne of the first Palaeologus was encompassed by foreign and domestic enemies; as long as the sword of Charles was suspended over his head, he basely courted the favour of the Roman pontiff; and sacrificed to the present danger his faith, his virtue, and the affection of his subjects. On the decease of Michael, the prince and people asserted the independence of their church, and the purity of their creed: the elder Andronicus neither feared nor loved the Latins; in his last distress, pride was the safeguard of superstition; nor could he decently retract in his age the firm and orthodox declarations of his youth. His grandson, the younger Andronicus, was less a slave in his temper and situation; and the conquest of Bithynia by the Turks admonished him to seek a temporal and spiritual alliance with the Western princes. After a separation and silence of fifty years, a secret agent, the monk Barlaam, was despatched to Pope Benedict the Twelfth; and his artful instructions appear to have been drawn by the master-hand of the great domestic.

<http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/volume2/chap66.htm#Embassy>

### **Treaty of John Palaeologus I. With Innocent VI. A.D. 1355.**

Yet of all the Byzantine princes, that pupil, John Palaeologus, was the best disposed to embrace, to believe, and to obey, the shepherd of the West. His mother, Anne of Savoy, was baptized in the bosom of the Latin church: her marriage with Andronicus imposed a change of name, of apparel, and of worship, but her heart was still faithful to her country and religion: she had formed the infancy of her son, and she governed the emperor, after his mind, or at least his stature, was enlarged to the size of man. In the first year of his deliverance and restoration, the Turks were still masters of the Hellespont; the son of Cantacuzene was in arms at Adrianople; and Palaeologus could depend neither on himself nor on his people. By his mother's advice, and in the hope of foreign aid, he abjured the rights both of the church and state; and the act of slavery, <sup>(7)</sup> subscribed in purple ink, and sealed with the *golden bull*, was privately entrusted to an Italian agent. The first article of the treaty is an oath of fidelity and obedience to Innocent the Sixth and his successors, the supreme pontiffs of the Roman and Catholic church. The emperor promises to entertain with due reverence their legates and nuncios; to assign a palace for their residence, and a temple for their worship; and to deliver his second son Manuel as the hostage of his faith. For these condescensions he requires a prompt succour of fifteen galleys, with five hundred men at arms, and a thousand archers, to serve against his Christian and Mussulman enemies. Palaeologus engages to impose on his clergy and people the same spiritual yoke; but as the resistance of the Greeks might be justly foreseen, he adopts the two effectual methods of corruption and education. The legate was empowered to distribute the vacant benefices among the ecclesiastics who should subscribe the creed of the Vatican: three schools were instituted to instruct the youth of Constantinople in the language and doctrine of the Latins; and the name of Andronicus, the heir of the empire, was enrolled as the first student. Should he fail in the measures of persuasion or force, Palaeologus declares himself unworthy to reign; transferred to the pope all regal and paternal authority; and invests Innocent with full power to regulate the

family, the government, and the marriage, of his son and successor. But this treaty was neither executed nor published: the Roman galleys were as vain and imaginary as the submission of the Greeks; and it was only by the secrecy that their sovereign escaped the dishonour of this fruitless humiliation.

<http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/volume2/chap66.htm#Embassy>  
**Visit of John Palaeologus to Urban V. at Rome, A.D. 1369, October 13 etc.**

The tempest of the Turkish arms soon burst on his head; and after the loss of Adrianople and Romania, he was enclosed in his capital, the vassal of the haughty Amurath, with the miserable hope of being the last devoured by the savage. In this abject state, Palaeologus embraced the resolution of embarking for Venice, and casting himself at the feet of the pope: he was the first of the Byzantine princes who had ever visited the unknown regions of the West, yet in them alone he could seek consolation or relief; and with less violation of his dignity he might appear in the sacred college than at the Ottoman *Porte*. After a long absence, the Roman pontiffs were returning from Avignon to the banks of the Tyber: Urban the Fifth, of a mild and virtuous character, encouraged or allowed the pilgrimage of the Greek prince; and, within the same year, enjoyed the glory of receiving in the Vatican the two Imperial shadows who represented the majesty of Constantine and Charlemagne. In this suppliant visit, the emperor of Constantinople, whose vanity was lost in his distress, gave more than could be expected of empty sounds and formal submissions. A previous trial was imposed; and, in the presence of four cardinals, he acknowledged, as a true Catholic, the supremacy of the pope, and the double procession of the Holy Ghost. After this purification, he was introduced to a public audience in the church of St. Peter: Urban, in the midst of the cardinals, was seated on his throne; the Greek monarch, after three genuflections, devoutly kissed the feet, the hands, and at length the mouth, of the holy father, who celebrated high mass in his presence, allowed him to lead the bridle of his mule, and treated him with a sumptuous banquet in the Vatican. The entertainment of Palaeologus was friendly and honourable; yet some difference was observed between the emperors of the East and West; nor could the former be entitled to the rare privilege of chanting the gospel in the rank of a deacon. In favour of his proselyte, Urban strove to rekindle the zeal of the French king and the other powers of the West; but he found them cold in the general cause, and active only in their domestic quarrels. The last hope of the emperor was in an English mercenary, John Hawkwood, or Acuto, who, with a band of adventurers, the white brotherhood, had ravaged Italy from the Alps to Calabria; sold his services to the hostile states; and incurred a just excommunication by shooting his arrows against the papal residence. A special license was granted to negotiate with the outlaw, but the forces, or the spirit, of Hawkwood, were unequal to the enterprise: and it was for the advantage, perhaps, of Palaeologus to be disappointed of succour, that must have been costly, that could not be effectual, and which might have been dangerous. The disconsolate Greek prepared for his return, but even his return was impeded by a most ignominious obstacle. On his arrival at Venice, he had borrowed large sums at exorbitant usury; but his coffers were empty, his creditors were impatient, and his person was detained as the best security for the payment. His eldest son, Andronicus, the regent of Constantinople, was repeatedly urged to exhaust every resource; and even by stripping the churches, to extricate his father from captivity and disgrace. But the unnatural youth was insensible of the disgrace, and secretly pleased with the captivity of the emperor: the state was poor, the clergy were obstinate; nor could some religious scruple be wanting to excuse the guilt of his indifference and delay. Such undutiful neglect was severely reprov'd by the piety of his brother Manuel, who instantly sold or mortgaged all that he possessed, embarked for Venice, relieved his father, and pledged his own freedom to be responsible for the debt. On his return to Constantinople, the parent and king distinguished his two sons with suitable rewards; but the faith and manners of the slothful Palaeologus had not been improved by his Roman pilgrimage; and his apostasy or conversion, devoid of any spiritual or temporal effects, was speedily forgotten by the Greeks and Latins.

<http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/volume2/chap66.htm#Embassy>

---

## External Threats and Internal Transformations

During the eighteenth century, the Ottoman Empire was almost continuously at war with one or more of its enemies--Persia, Poland, Austria, and Russia. Under the humiliating terms of the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kaynarja that ended the Russo-Ottoman War of 1768-74, the Porte abandoned the Tartar khanate in the Crimea, granted autonomy to the Trans-Danubian provinces, allowed Russian ships free access to Ottoman waters, and agreed to pay a large war indemnity.

The implications of the decline of Ottoman power, the vulnerability and attractiveness of the empire's vast holdings, the stirrings of nationalism among its subject peoples, and the periodic crises resulting from these and other factors became collectively known to European diplomats in the nineteenth century as "the Eastern Question." In 1853 Tsar Nicholas I of Russia described the Ottoman Empire as "the sick man of Europe." The problem from the viewpoint of European diplomacy was how to dispose of the empire in such a manner that no one power would gain an advantage at the expense of the others and upset the political balance of Europe.

The first nineteenth-century crisis to bring about European intervention was the Greek War of Independence (1821-32). In 1827 an Anglo-French fleet destroyed the Ottoman and Egyptian fleets at the Battle of Navarino, while the Russian army advanced as far as Edirne before a cease-fire was called in 1829. The European powers forced the Porte to recognize Greek independence under the London Convention of 1832.

Muhammad Ali, an Ottoman officer who had been designated pasha of Egypt by the sultan in 1805, had given substantial aid to the Ottoman cause in the Greek war. When he was not rewarded as promised for his assistance, he invaded Syria in 1831 and pursued the retreating Ottoman army deep into Anatolia. In desperation, the Porte appealed to Russia for support. Britain then intervened, constraining Muhammad Ali to withdraw from Anatolia to Syria. The price the sultan paid Russia for its assistance was the Treaty of Hünkâr Iskelesi of 1833. Under this treaty, the Bosphorus and Dardanelles straits were to be closed on Russian demand to naval vessels of other powers.

War with Muhammad Ali resumed in 1839, and Ottoman forces were again defeated. Russia waived its rights under the 1833 treaty and aligned itself with British efforts to support the Ottoman Empire militarily and diplomatically. Under the London Convention of 1840, Muhammad Ali was forced to abandon his claim to Syria, but he was recognized as hereditary ruler of Egypt under nominal Ottoman suzerainty. Under an additional protocol, in 1841 the Porte undertook to close the straits to warships of all powers.

The Ottoman Empire fought two more wars with Russia in the nineteenth century. The Crimean War (1854-56) pitted France, Britain, and the Ottoman Empire against Russia. Under the Treaty of Paris, which ended the war, Russia abandoned its claim to protect Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire and renounced the right to intervene in the Balkans. War resumed between Russia and the Ottoman Empire in 1877. Russia opened hostilities in response to Ottoman suppression of uprisings in Bulgaria and to the threat posed to Serbia by Ottoman forces. The Russian army had driven through Bulgaria and reached as far as Edirne when the Porte acceded to the terms imposed by a new agreement, the Treaty of San Stefano. The treaty reduced Ottoman holdings in Europe to eastern Thrace and created a large, independent Bulgarian state under Russian protection.

Refusing to accept the dominant position of Russia in the Balkans, the other European powers called the Congress of Berlin in 1878. At this conclave, the Europeans agreed to a much smaller autonomous Bulgarian state under nominal Ottoman suzerainty. Serbia and Romania were recognized as fully independent states, and the Ottoman provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina were placed under Austrian administration. Cyprus, although remaining technically part of the Ottoman Empire, became a British protectorate. For all its wartime exertions, Russia received only minor territorial concessions in Bessarabia and the Caucasus. In the course of the nineteenth century, France seized Algeria and Tunisia, while Britain began its occupation of

Egypt in 1882. In all these cases, the occupied territories formerly had belonged to the Ottoman Empire.

The Ottoman Empire had a dual economy in the nineteenth century consisting of a large subsistence sector and a small colonial-style commercial sector linked to European markets and controlled by foreign interests. The empire's first railroads, for example, were built by foreign investors to bring the cash crops of Anatolia's coastal valleys--tobacco, grapes, and other fruit--to Smyrna (Izmir) for processing and export. The cost of maintaining a modern army without a thorough reform of economic institutions caused expenditures to be made in excess of tax revenues. Heavy borrowing from foreign banks in the 1870s to reinforce the treasury and the undertaking of new loans to pay the interest on older ones created a financial crisis that in 1881 obliged the Porte to surrender administration of the Ottoman debt to a commission representing foreign investors. The debt commission collected public revenues and transferred the receipts directly to creditors in Europe.

The 1860s and early 1870s saw the emergence of the Young Ottoman movement among Western-oriented intellectuals who wanted to see the empire accepted as an equal by the European powers. They sought to adopt Western political institutions, including an efficient centralized government, an elected parliament, and a written constitution. The "Ottomanism" they advocated also called for an integrated dynastic state that would subordinate Islam to secular interests and allow non-Muslim subjects to participate in representative parliamentary institutions.

In 1876 the hapless sultan was deposed by a *fetva* (legal opinion) obtained by Midhat Pasha, a reformist minister sympathetic to the aims of the Young Ottomans. His successor, Abdül Hamid II (r. 1876-1909), came to the throne with the approval of Midhat and other reformers. In December of that year, on the eve of the war with Russia, the new sultan promulgated a constitution, based on European models, that had been drafted by senior political, military, and religious officials under Midhat's direction. Embodying the substance of the Young Ottoman program, this document created a representative parliament, guaranteed religious liberty, and provided for enlarged freedom of expression. Abdül Hamid II's acceptance of constitutionalism was a temporary tactical expedient to gain the throne, however. Midhat was dismissed in February 1877 and was later murdered. The sultan called the empire's first parliament but dissolved it within a year.

Unrest in Eastern Rumelia led the European powers to insist on the union of that province with Bulgaria in 1885. Meanwhile, Greek and Bulgarian partisans were carrying on a running battle with Ottoman forces in Macedonia. In addition, the repression of revolutionary activities in Armenia during 1894-96 cost about 300,000 lives and aroused European public opinion against the Ottoman regime. Outside support for a rebellion on Crete also caused the Porte to declare war on Greece in 1897. Although the Ottoman army defeated the Greeks decisively in Thrace, the European powers forced a compromise peace that kept Crete under Ottoman suzerainty while installing the son of the Greek king as its governor.

More isolated from Europe than it had been for half a century, the Ottoman regime could count on support only from Germany, whose friendship offered Abdül Hamid II a congenial alternative to British and French intervention. In 1902 Germany was granted a ninety-nine-year concession to build and operate a Berlin-to-Baghdad rail connection. Germany continued to invest in the Ottoman economy, and German officers held training and command posts in the Ottoman army.

Opposition to the sultan's regime continued to assert itself among Westernized intellectuals and liberal members of the ruling class. Some continued to advocate "Ottomanism," whereas others argued for pan-Turanism, the union of Turkic-speaking peoples inside and outside the Ottoman Empire. The Turkish nationalist ideologist of the period was the writer Ziya Gökalp, who defined Turkish nationalism within the context of the Ottoman Empire. Gökalp went much farther than his contemporaries, however, by calling for the adoption of the vernacular in place of Ottoman Turkish. Gökalp's advocacy of a national Turkish state in which folk culture and Western values

would play equally important revitalizing roles foreshadowed events a quarter-century in the future.

<http://countrystudies.us/turkey/10.htm>

**New Cambridge Modern History –*The Crimean War*, Vol. X., pp.468-492.**

For nearly two centuries there was a war between Russia and Turkey about every twenty years. In October 1853 the ninth of this series began. But from the outset it was radically different from its predecessors; for Turkey felt confident of the armed support of Britain and France. By March 1854 they had joined her as allies. The Emperor stood alone, deserted to his intense chagrin even by his young protégé, the Emperor Francis Joseph, whom he had saved from the Hungarians...

Never before had the Ottomans had more than diplomatic support from the West, usually from France. Once, indeed, they had faced a momentary combination of Britain and France with Russia and had suffered the loss of their fleet at Navarino. The Habsburgs, their most ancient foe in Europe, had more than once been leagued with Russia against them, and, as recently as 1849, hand in hand with her, had quarrelled virulently with them over Hungarian and Polish refugees in Turkey. This last acute incident was a pointer to the future which gave much encouragement to the Turks and should have warned the Russians. Both France and Britain vigorously supported Turkey and sent their fleets to the Aegean.

In 1840-1 for the first time the problem of the Straits had been recognised as an European concern and regulated by the five power. Nicholas and Nesselrode, his Foreign Minister, joined with surprising readiness in this settlement, because they judged it impossible to renew their very favourable treaty of Unkiar Skelessi and wished to use the second Mehemet Ali crisis to divide Britain from France. Now in 1853-4 the far greater question of the future of the Ottoman Empire was raised by Russia's action and she was to find that it, too, must be regarded as the common concern of the powers, and no longer, as Nicholas and his predecessors had, in essentials, assumed, a matter to be determined by Russia with or without agreement with Austria. This new development in the relations of Europe with Turkey came to a head in the Crimean War. Herein, in large part, lies the importance of the war...(p. 468)

War began because a nationalist and defiant Turkey would not yield to Russian demands which she held to be humiliating and threatening to the maintenance of her empire. France and Britain joined her, and Austria openly swung towards her allies because they were not prepared to allow Russia to settle her score with Turkey by herself and to gain thereby complete ascendancy in the Balkans and Asia Minor.

The Russian demands upon Turkey arose out of the dispute over the Holy Places, which gradually became envenomed after the arrival in Constantinople (5 May) of a new French ambassador, the fiery and ambitious La Valette. The French position as protector of the rights of the Latins in the Holy Places in Jerusalem and Bethlehem had suffered through the increasing ascendancy of the Greeks during the previous half-century. This ascendancy was not unnatural since Orthodox pilgrims outnumbered the Catholic by a hundred to one. ...In Constantinople, however, where the complicated negotiations were centred, intense rivalry developed between the French and Russian diplomats, encouraged by certain individuals in their respective Foreign Office and certain newspapers. By October 1851 La Valette seemed to be on the verge of success. Nicholas now intervened with a personal demand to the sultan for the maintenance of the *status quo*. The Porte, harried from both sides, addressed a note to France, in February, 1852, which made concessions to the Latins and seemed to give full satisfaction to her. Almost immediately afterwards it secretly gave a firman to the Greeks, which seemed to confirm their rights...(p.469)

By 1852 the confusion was worse than ever. The Russians were prepared to help the sultan against the French if he carried out fully what he had promised, but they feared that the Grand Vizier, Mehemet Ali, and Foreign Minister, Fuada Pasha, were tools of La Valette...

By the new year Nicholas was contemplating drastic steps. The sultan had broken his word; he must be made to keep it, and to give guarantees for the future. Fear had thrown the Porte into the arms of France; fear would bring the Porte back into the hands of Russia. Nicholas recognised that Turkish resistance would probably lead to war, but was prepared to face that...he decided to send a special envoy to Constantinople to demand both a satisfactory settlement of the question of the Holy Places and also a treaty or convention guaranteeing the future by making explicit the Russian claims, under the Treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji of 1774, in relation to the immunities and privileges of the Orthodox church.... (p.470)

The suggestion of a treaty or convention had been received from Reshid Pasha who was not then in office. Nicholas himself was pondering a sudden attack on Constantinople and, as his private notes show, was scheming in expectation of the collapse of the Ottoman empire. He contemplated, as the least bad of all bad possibilities, an arrangement which would reduce the Ottoman empire to Asia, give the Principalities and northern Bulgaria to Russia, independence to the rest of Bulgaria and Serbia, the littoral of the Archipelago and of the Adriatic to Austria, Egypt and perhaps Cyprus and Rhodes to England, Crete to France, the Aegean isles to Greece, and make Constantinople a free city, with a Russian garrison on the Bosphorus and an Austrian on the Dardenelles. Convinced that the death of the 'sick man' impended and that preparations for what should follow must be made in advance, Nicholas broached similar ideas in four conversations with Sir Hamilton Seymour, the British ambassador in St. Petersburg....

In March 1854, when war had come, a British Blue Book published the Seymour conversations and part of the 1844 discussions with Aberdeen. It did much to stimulate or confirm the belief that the tsar was planning the dissolution of Turkey. Nicholas' object, now, as in 1844, was an understanding between gentlemen (his favourite diplomatic panacea) about what should follow the collapse of Turkey. It was especially important that each should know what the other would not allow. The British government, on the contrary, though it did not instruct Seymour to cease handling these hot coals until 5 April, from the first denied the tsar's assumption that the Ottoman empire was about to fall; any concert with Russia could only be to prevent collapse, not to hasten it by an agreement disposing in advance of the sultan's territory.

Both parties did, indeed, that they could not allow Constantinople to fall to any great power, a Byzantine empire to be set up or Greece to be substantially enlarged. The British further consented, much to Russia's satisfaction, not to make any other agreement, anticipating the fall of Turkey, with previous communication with St. Petersburg. But they did not rise to Nicholas' bait of Egypt or Crete, and they could only view with alarm the suggestion that the Principalities, Serbia and Bulgaria might be independent states under his protection and, with still greater alarm his avowal that, while he would not establish himself in Constantinople as proprietor..., circumstances might force him to do so as trustee...

(p.471-2)

Within another fortnight the Turks were faced with another special envoy, Prince Menshikov (28 February). Would they yield a second time to threatening demands...?

...Menshikov was caught in the prevailing mizmaze of intrigue and Turkish delaying tactics and was victimised by rival dragomans and extremist counsellors in the embassy. 'The old Turks', the men of Unkiar Skelessi, was too old or unavailing and there were no other groups or individuals with the ear of the sultan who would stand out against the rising nationalist desire to resist Russian intimidation. This mood of defiance was typified by Mehemet Ali, the Grand Vizier, and Mehemet Rushdi, the Minister for War.

It hardened into determination the more the Turks felt that they would in the last resort, receive French and British armed support. On 20 March, after news had reached Paris of the enforced resignation of Fuad Pasha and of the Russian military and naval preparations, the French fleet was ordered from Toulon to Salamis....(p.472)

Although the British did not send their fleet, they sent Stratford de Redcliffe. The Turks, like everybody else, feared him. But at this juncture his arrival (5 April) gave them hope that, if they stood firm, they would have his backing. 'If the Russians are in the wrong, as I believe they are,' wrote Stratford to his wife (27 April), 'my business is to make the wrong appear, and to stand by the Porte, or rather make the P. stand by me.'

The Turks were further encouraged by the settlement of the immediate issue of the Holy Places on 22 April. They was brought about by amicable conversations between de Lacour and Menshikov with the assistance of Stratford de Redcliffe, who admitted that the Russians had had justifiable complaints. It cleared the ground for the main matter, a treaty or convention binding the sultan *vis-à-vis* Russia to the preservation of all the religious and spiritual immunities of the Orthodox church (the religious immunities included the upkeep of churches, religious buildings and pious foundations as well as the civil rights and exemptions of the Orthodox clergy; the spiritual immunities, included the right of the clergy to celebrate). Menshikov was empowered to offer the sultan a defensive alliance if he accepted the Russian proposals and incurred thereby the hostility of any of the powers. He did not, however, make the offer. It is difficult to suppose it could have succeeded. Stratford de Redcliffe would have exerted all his influence against it; if Turkey allied with any power it would be Britain, as he himself had proposed in 1849. Now he declared to the Russians that too close a friendship with the Turks would arouse as much suspicion in Europe as a rupture leading to war.

There was little likelihood of any friendship from the side of the Turks. They regarded Menshikov's draft treaty or convention as incompatible with their sovereign independence and tantamount to recognising Russia as arbiter in all matters relating to the Orthodox in Turkey, a view strongly supported by Stratford de Redcliffe and de Lacour and later shared by Claredon and Drouyn de Lhuys. Although Menshikov greatly modified his original terms, deferred his departure and in the end proposed a note from the sultan to the emperor instead of a treaty or convention, he failed to obtain anything...Menshikov's brighter hopes were shattered when a Grand Council decided overwhelmingly to reject the Russian requirements (17 May). The final Turkish reply of 20 May referred only to the spiritual immunities and not in the binding form required. In consequence, Menshikov left Constantinople on 21 May and diplomatic relations were broken off. (p.473)

Both in London and Paris suspicions of Russian's intentions, already aroused by her military and naval measures, were deepened when only a part of Menshikov's instructions, and that the least important, was communicated to them. They concluded that the Turkish interpretation of Menshikov's demands was justified. Further, a Russian armed counterstroke, probably in the shape of an occupation of the Principalities, seemed imminent. On 2 June, the Aberdeen government ordered the Malta fleet to Besika Bay, just outside the Dardenelles, and Napoleon immediately followed suit...

The Emperor Nicholas felt, as he said, that his face had been slapped by the sultan...Ever since January the tsar had had an attack on Constantinople, either from the Bosphorus or by land through the Principalities and Bulgaria, in mind. By May, in view of the French attitude, now supported by Great Britain he decided on a half-measure – the occupation of the Principalities as a gage until Turkey satisfied his demands. At the same time he asked Austria similarly to occupy Herzegovina and Serbia, an invitation that was declined. Nicholas did not intend to cross the Danube, but if the Turks did not yield, the Principalities and Serbia might be declared independent. A general rising of the Christians would probably follow and 'the last hour of the Ottoman Empire strike.'...(p.474)

As the Russians crossed the Pruth, he [Palmerston] was urging the dispatch of the combined squadrons to the Bosphorus; a bold strong course was the safest way to maintain peace....The cabinet went forward into a maze of negotiations which now took place in Paris, Vienna and Constantinople...Great Britain, France, Austria and Prussia concurred in a note to be sent by the sultan to the tsar which would settle the question at issue and lead to the evacuation of the Principalities. Known as the Vienna

note, it was the handiwork in part of Napoleon and in part of Buol, the Austrian Foreign Minister. It was skillfully designed to harmonise the interests of Russia and France without apparently trenching upon the sovereign rights of Turkey. Its main importance lay in its being the joint product of the four powers. The fate of the Ottoman empire was, thus, in a sense, recognised as an European question. Moreover, far from backing up the Menshikov mission as Russia had backed up the Leiningen, Austria led the concert of the western powers and Prussia followed her. This step, though not regarded by Nicholas or Nesselrode as inimical, was none the less a sign that the alliance of the three eastern powers was ending. The Austrians were already telling the Russians that they were not prepared to join them in a policy based on the imminent collapse of Turkey in Europe.

The draft note was sent to St. Petersburg on 28 July and was promptly accepted, but in Constantinople it was received with vehement opposition. Nationalist and religious fervour had welled up on Russia's entry into the Principalities. The extremists pressed on military measures and used the Constantinople populace for their ends. Encouragement was given by news of British public opinion, heading strongly against Aberdeen and pacification, and immense enthusiasm was aroused by the arrival in mid-August of the Egyptian fleet with 15, 000 troops. News of Russia's complaisance confirmed suspicions that the note was really her concoction. Stratford de Redcliffe did not believe in it – for it was not of his making – and he knew that his personal, as distinct from his official influence in favour of acceptance would have been disregarded. The utmost that could be salvaged was a reply requiring three amendments instead of the plain rejection (20 August).

The amendments were designed to rule out any far-reaching Russian (p.475) interpretation of the Treaty of Kutchuk Kainardji and any claim to protect the religious as well as the spiritual privileges of the Orthodox church. Nicholas was at first inclined to accept the Turkish modifications, but yielded to the unusual combination of the politic Nesselrode with national and Slavophile extremists. On 7 September he declared that the Vienna note must remain unmodified. Diplomatically, he was in strong position; for the other four powers, though not their representatives in Constantinople, were also still backing it.

Within a fortnight Russia's position was ruined by a confidential commentary, drawn up in her Foreign Office, on the note and its Turkish amendments. It so interpreted these as to give fair warrant for the belief that the 'old Nick policy of aggression and aggrandisement' was in full control. It leaked out into the press, being published in London on 22 September, and immediately produced deplorable results both in government circles and among the public at large in Great Britain, and France. Simultaneously, in Constantinople war feeling was worked up by mass demonstrations. The weak and intimidated sultan and the Sheikh-al-Islam swam with the tide and the belligerent Mehemet Ali, now Minister of War, and Omer Pasha the Croat renegade in command of a large army in Bulgaria, had everything their own way. By the end of September the issue was decided. On 4 October the sultan announced war if the Principalities were not evacuated within a fortnight. The Russians of course refused to go and on 23 October 1853 the Turks began hostilities on the Danube and a few days later near Batum... (p.476)

The two Western powers did not declare war until 28 March, but it was certain once they decided to deny the Black Sea to Russian but not to Turkish naval operations...The Russo-Turkish war had now become a quadripartite struggle and Russia stood alone. (p.478)

A series of conferences began in Vienna on 15 March [1855?]. Nobody believe that they would in fact produce peace...(p.482) Yet they carried the powers some way towards the peace terms ultimately laid down. Russia conceded point one of the four points, that the protectorate of the Principalities should belong to the powers jointly, and point two, that international measures should be taken to improve the navigation of the Danube and assure its freedom. Point four however, that Russia's special relationship to the Orthodox should cease and their privileges be guaranteed by the powers jointly, was postponed. Contention had fastened on the third point, providing for the revision of the Straits Convention of 1841. Whereas it was agreed that this

implied a European guarantee to Turkey and recognition that a conflict between the Porte and any one of the great power was the concern of them all, divergence persisted on the naval arrangements themselves. The opening, or the partial opening, of the Straits, and a system of counterpoise to keep the rule of closure, but to admit so many western ships into the Black Sea as would offset any increase in the Russian fleet, and to allow Turkey to call up help at need, were all discussed. The outcome indicated that an arrangement to keep the Straits closed and to neutralise the Black Sea – an idea of French origin – was the only likely to be both acceptable to the allies and impossible upon Russia. (p.482)

The unique alliance of Britain and France with Turkey brought more Europeans behind the Ottoman curtain and probably caused a more realistic Turkish approach to reform and westernisation. On the other hand, its cost had caused a fall in the value of the paper money, which had largely replaced coin., and so a steep rise in prices, distress and restiveness. No measures were taken to remedy the worsening financial mismanagement until 1859 when a council of finance was created. But it failed to check the arbitrary personal expenditure of the sultan and to produce a regular budget. Meanwhile immediate needs were met by foreign loans. Two loans were raised in 1854 and 1855 which were guaranteed by France and Britain. Turkey was to contract a dozen more before then next eastern crisis. From this time the European bond-holders became a new force with an interest in Turkish reform and their guaranteed rights opened the possibility of interference in Turkish internal affairs in case of default. (p.487)

The congress opened in Paris on 25 February. Britain and Russia were the leading opponents...Britain fought for a system of securities which might prevent or postpone a renewal of Russian aggression upon Turkey...The Treaty of Paris, 30 March, 1856, thus pushed Russia back from the Danube mouths...The treaty, in the second place, ended Russia's claim to act in a special relationship to Turkey and her practice based on the claim. Europe, not Russia, was recognised as the protector of the Roumanian Principalities and the Orthodox Christians... European guaranteed Turkish integrity and independence...and henceforward any power or powers in conflict with Turkey were to seek the mediation of a third party before resort to arms. A separate tripartite treaty, signed on 15 April, by Britain, France and Austria reinforced the guarantee. Thirdly, Russian naval preponderance over Turkey was ended; for the Black Sea was neutralised... and ceased to be a Russian lake. The Straits Convention of 1841 was replaced by a new convention which maintained the rule of closure, while the Porte was at peace. These naval arrangements were an especially sharp blow to Russian pride. Neutralisation and closure together were an effective restraint upon Russia, but there was nothing to prevent Turkey from keeping a squadron in the Straits or in the Sea of Marmora, and in time of war she could call up an ally through the Straits, who would find Russia unarmed and vulnerable. The neutralisation, however, lasted barely fifteen years. The Treaty of London in March 1871 sanctioned Russia's denunciation of November 1870. (p.488)

In diplomatic history the Crimean War acted as a solvent, and much that had been accepted as diplomatically normal disappeared...the Crimean war had broken up the eastern pattern of European relations only so that it might reappear, but as a group pivoting upon Prussia or Germany rather than one turning upon the Russo-Austrian axis.

Similarly the war had reshaped the eastern question. It had postponed the collapse and partition of Turkey and set up a defensive wall around her empire, in which the tripartite alliance and, more especially, the Franco-British alliance should have been the reinforcing steel. The struggle would never again lie simply between the Russian tsar, greedy for territory, and the sultan his defenceless victim, still less between Orthodox and Muslim. (p.491)

It was nowhere expected that the arrangements of 1856 would be permanent...The conflict then between Britain and Russia had been broken off but not settled. In a new eastern crisis Britain might find herself alone and faced with a dilemma: the old anti-Russian course would entail opposition to nationalist and constitutionalist causes with which she sympathised, and a new liberal course would involve an anti-Turkish policy

of allowing Russia a free hand which was against her interests. Never again could Turkey rely upon the support in arms of Britain or France or Austria against Russia. If the new starting point, made in the declarations of the common concern of the great powers in the Turkish question, meant anything at all, it would mean concern to agree among themselves on such modifications of Turkish integrity and independence as might stop up the antagonism between Britain and Russia and the parallel antagonism, foreshadowed in the Crimean War, between Austria and Russia. (p.492)

(Bury, 1964, pp.468-492).

### ***Material Associated with 1844.***

#### **The Day of Atonement in 1844: Was it October 22, or September 23?**

One of the earliest proponents for the date of 1844 was Snow. William Miller set his first date for the Second Coming of Christ somewhere in 1843. When it came closer to the time, a more specific date was needed.

#### **Establishing the 1843 date.**

Damsteegt's comments on the dating in 1843 are very helpful:

When the year 1843 arrived, the Millerite missionary thrust became stronger than ever, for this was the year of the termination of several time prophecies, the year of Christ's personal return, and the last chance for the church and the world to accept the truth. The Millerites were unanimous that "the year 1843" was the year of the Second Advent. Some however, expected Christ to come within the regular Gregorian calendar year (January 1 to December 31, 1843), whereas Miller himself anticipated this event sometime between March 21, 1843 and March 21, 1844. Miller assumed that the "Jewish mode of computation of time" was based on the reckoning from the vernal equinox of 1843 to the vernal equinox when the sun is in Aries."<sup>65</sup> According to this method, the Jewish year of 1843 commenced on April 1, 1843 and terminated on March 20, 1844,<sup>66</sup> a period which fell within the limits of Miller's year. The other method was the Karaite reckoning and was derived from the Karaite Jews, a small group who "still adhere to the letter of the Mosaic law, and commence [the year] with the new moon nearest the barley harvest in Judea...which is one moon later than the Rabbinical [*sic*] year."<sup>67</sup> The Karaites stressed Lev.23:10,11, which required the Jews to bring a sheaf of the first fruits of their harvest to the priest as a wave offering on the 16<sup>th</sup> of the first month, a ceremony which, quite obviously, could only be observed when the barley harvest was ripe in Judea. On this basis, the Karaite Jewish year 1843 commenced April 29, 1843 and terminated on April 17, 1844.<sup>68</sup> The Millerites also learned that most Jews followed the Rabbinical reckoning because it was more practical to calculate the year by astronomical calculations related to the vernal equinox than by the ripening of the barley harvest in Judea.<sup>69</sup>

During the year 1843 various dates were looked upon with different degrees of interest as possibilities for Christ's return, but there was no unanimity of opinion on any one of them....as a result of careful analysis of the prophetic time calculations, several adjustments were introduced which were gradually accepted. The first correction may be designated the "full year" concept. It was discovered that it was a mistake to calculate the period between 457 B.C. and A.D. 1843 by simply adding the figures together as if they were cardinal numbers. They are ordinal numbers, not separated by a zero year, so that only one year separates 1 B.C. from A.D. 1. It was therefore recognized that in order "to make out 2300 full years, it is necessary that there should

<sup>65</sup> Editorial, "Chronology," *ST*, June 21, 1843, p.123.

<sup>66</sup> Editorial, "The Midst of the Week," *ST*, Dec 5, 1843, p. 134; Editorial, "Chronology," p. 123. Later, the end of the Rabbinical Jewish year of 1843 was terminated on March 18, 1844 (Hale, "The Tenth Day of the Seventh Month," *AH*, Sept 25, 1844, p. 60). Cf. Nathan Daboll, *The New England Almanac...*, 1844, p.7; Editorial "The Jewish Year," *MC*, Oct. 11, 1844, p.117)

<sup>67</sup> Editorial, "Chronology," p. 123 Lev. 23:5, 10-21. Cf. Editorial, "Midst of the Week," pp. 133-135.

<sup>68</sup> Editorial, "Chronology," p.123; Daboll, *Almanac*, 1844, p.8; [Hale], "Seventh Month," p. 60.

<sup>69</sup> Editorial, "Chronology," p.123; Editorial, "Midst of the Week," p.134.

be 457 full years, B.C. and 1843 full years after Christ. It is evident that from a given point in the year 1 B.C., to the same point A.D. 1, would be but no entire year. Upon the same principle, from a given point in the year 457 B.C. to the same point A.D. 1843, would be but 2299 entire years; it is *minus* one year of 2300 full years...If, therefore, the 2300 year began at a given point in the year 457 B.C. they will not end till the same point is reached A.D. 1844.<sup>70</sup>

The second correction was related to the correct year for the parousia. Miller's "Jewish year" from March 21, 1843 to March 21, 1844, was at first quite generally accepted among his followers. Gradually, however, as attention was called to different Jewish reckonings, the general trend of discussion favored the Karaite reckoning above the Rabbinical as being more biblical. Acceptance of the Karaite reckoning led them to the correction of the date for the Crucifixion...in this light the view of Dr. William Hales, an Irish clergyman and chronologist, who determined the year of the Crucifixion as A.D. 31 on the basis of historical accounts about the darkening of the sun, came to be generally accepted. Hale placed the Crucifixion in the middle of the 70<sup>th</sup> week (Dan. 9:27), making the end of the week fall in A.D. 34.<sup>71</sup> His interpretation became especially acceptable because it fitted into the shift of emphasis from the year 1843 to the year 1844 that was going on at that time.

In the winter of 1843-1844 the last correction was introduced by Samuel S. Snow. His calculations were based on the assumption that the decree "to restore and build Jerusalem" (Dan.9:25), had been issued toward the latter part of 457 B.C. and that the 69<sup>th</sup> week (Dan.9:25), according to the "full year" concept, terminated in the autumn of A.D. 27 when Jesus began His ministry as the Messiah.<sup>72</sup> He concluded that "if then, the 69 weeks ended in the autumn of A.D. 27, when may we expect the 2300 days to end? The answer is plain. Deduct 483 from 2300, and the remainder is 1817. So many years remained to be fulfilled in the autumn of A.D. 27. Then add to that date, these 1817 years, and we see it brings us to the autumn of A.D. 1844."<sup>73</sup>

So no specific date was chosen for that year, even though a few were proposed. Damsteegt says there was no unanimity of opinion on the matter and so the year passed without a definite date being named. But before the end of the Jewish year 1843, Samuel Snow had already formulated his views on why he saw the Day of Atonement in 1844 as the specific date for the return of Christ.

The following information comes from the website :

<http://www.gospeloutreach.net/karaite1844.html> (Accessed 2006, 2007, Apr, 2008)

### **Day of Atonement of the Karaite Jews in 1844 by Robert K. Sanders**

The Karaite Jews has now confirmed the "Day of Atonement" in 1844 was Late September and not Late October. Their research is presented further down in this topic, but first we need to preface why this is important.

#### **Why is the Karaite date of the Day of Atonement important?**

Seventh-day Adventists claim that in 1844, a very small Jewish sect called the "Karaites," used a different calendar and thus celebrated the Day of Atonement (10th of Tishri) on October 22, *one month later* than the Rabbinical/Orthodox Jews who did so on September 23. Thus the entire Seventh-day Adventist teaching regarding the 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, the Investigative Judgment, the Great Disappointment, and Jesus' entrance into the Most Holy Place, hinges only on the words of their prophet Ellen White and on their claim Karaites celebrated the Day of Atonement on October 22 in 1844. If either of these assertions is incorrect, then Seventh-day Adventism is in serious theological trouble.

<sup>70</sup> Editorial, "Chronology," p.123. Cf. Hotchkiss, "The 2300 Days," *MC*, Aug. 22, 1844, p.49; E.G. White, *SG*, I, 137, 137, 153.

<sup>71</sup> Editorial, "Midst of the Week," p. 135.

<sup>72</sup> Letter, Samuel, S. Snow to Southard, *MC*, Feb.22, 1844, p.243. Cf. Hales, *New Chronology*, I, 1830, p.97.

<sup>73</sup> Letter, Snow to Southard, p. 243.

The Rabbinical Day of Atonement in 1844 is easy to for anyone to prove from Jewish sources, that it came on September 23, 1844.

Samuel Snow, was first to espouse the October 22, 1844 date and claimed that it was from the calendar of the Karaite Jews.

"SNOW, SAMUEL S. (1806-1870). A Congregationalist, then a skeptic, later a Millerite minister; initiator of the "seventh-month movement." Beginning with an article written Feb. 16, 1843, he emphasized the tenth day of the Jewish seventh month, *Tishri*, the Jewish Day of Atonement, as the true ending date of the prophetic 2300 years. Later he set forth the specific *day* as Oct. 22, 1844, our calendar equivalent of the tenth day of the seventh month in that year according to the old Karaite Jewish calendar. At first there was but little interest or response, but when Snow preached on July 21 in the large Boston Tabernacle on the text, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh [on the tenth day of the seventh month]; go ye out to meet him," some began to be roused." *From the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia Volume 10*, p. 1357.

Ellen G. White put her prophetic stamp of approval on the false Karaite date that S. S. Snow thought up. Ellen was not aware that the Karaite "Day of Atonement," was the same as the Rabbinical date of September 23, 1844.

Ellen G. White: "*The tenth day of the seventh month, the great Day of Atonement, the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, which in the year 1844 fell upon the 22d of October, was regarded as the time of the Lord's coming. This was in harmony with the proofs already presented that the 2300 days would terminate in the autumn ... the close of the 2300 days in the autumn of 1844, stand without impeachment.*" -- *The Great Controversy*, pp. 400, 457.

FACTS: Seventh-day Adventists have FAILED to provide any Karaite calendar or any documentation from the Karaite Jews to show their Day of Atonement was on October 22 and that it was a month later than the Rabbinical Date. S. S. Snow was wrong in setting the wrong date and Ellen G. White was wrong in endorsing it with her prophetic seal. Ellen's date of October 22, 1844 HAS BEEN IMPEACHED, AS WELL AS HER SANCTUARY AND INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT DOCTRINE.

We now have official documentation by the Karaites that the Day of Atonement in 1844 is the same as the Rabbinical Day of Atonement which is late September and not late October. Note the red highlighted statements further down in the letter.

### Official Karaite Documentation

Subject: Yom Kippur 1844

Date: Fri, 27 Nov 1998 18:07:55 +0200

From: The Karaite Korner <[comments@karaite-korner.org](mailto:comments@karaite-korner.org)>

Dear Sir,

In the past you have asked regarding the Karaite date of Yom Kippur 1844. I have recently received further inquiries in this matter and have done some investigation of this subject. Here are my preliminary results:

In the Middle Ages the Karaites ardently maintained that the Biblical year begins with the ripeness of the Barley crop in Israel (called in the Bible "Abib"). The Rabbinic calendar had originally followed this practice but around the 9th century CE they adopted a 19 year cycle of intercalation (leap years) which approximates the Abib but which is far from accurate. This often caused a difference of a month between the Karaite and Rabbanite calendars. The Seventh Day Adventist tradition seems to have heard of this Karaite practice or perhaps they assumed it was the Karaite practice based on their (correct) assumption that the Karaites strictly follow the Bible. The Abib was a central issue to the Karaites and to this day the Karaite marriage contract includes a vow that the marrying couple will celebrate the holidays "according to the visibility of the moon and the appearance of the Abib in the land of Israel." However, already in the Middle Ages there were Karaite communities who slowly adopted the Rabbinic 19 year cycle. At first it was only Karaites in the distant lands of the Dispersion who followed the Rabbinic 19 year cycle. They claimed that it was difficult to receive reports of the state of the Barley crop in Israel from so far away. As late as the 15th century though the Karaites of the Holy Land continued to follow the Abib even

though their compatriots in the Dispersion accepted the 19 year Rabbinic cycle. The 15th century Karaite Hacham Elijah Baschyatchi writes:

"Having explained that the beginning of the year according to the law of our Torah is according to the Abib which is found in the Land of Israel in the conditions which we have mentioned, because of our great sins we have been distanced from the Holy Land and we do not have the capability of finding the Abib, we have been forced to follow the Calculation of Intercalation like that done by our brothers the Rabbanites ..."

Baschyatchi continues further down the page:

"And the Hacham R' Aharon [ben Elijah] author of the book 'Etz Haim' also said\*\* that in the 269th cycle we heard that in the 4th year of the cycle [i.e. 1354/1355 C.E.] what was for us the month of Elul was for the people of the Land of Israel the month of Tishrei ...' ... And this has also happened in our [Baschyatchi's] times in the year 5240 [i.e. 1479/1480 C.E.], the 15th year of the cycle, people went from our community in the

Holy City [i.e. Jerusalem] and said that the 14th year of the 276 cycle, which we are in, which was for us an intercalated year [i.e. 13 months] was for them a regular year [i.e. 12 months]. And our faith should not be weakened by this because they [in Israel] go after the observable and we [in the Diaspora] go after approximation... The end of the matter is, all maintain the legal decision that the inhabitants of the Land of Israel should go according to the Abib in the Land of Israel and those far away should go after the calculation of intercalation of leap years and simple years." (From "Aderet Eliyahu" by Elijah Baschyatchi, Israel 1966, p.39a (written in the 15th century) [translation from the Hebrew by Nehemia Gordon, square brackets added by translator for clarity])

As can be seen, in Baschyatchi's own time the Karaites of the Dispersion followed the Rabbinic 19 year cycle while those of Israel followed the actual appearance of the Abib and at times this caused a difference of one month in the calendar.

Nevertheless, by the 19th century the Karaites universally followed the 19 year Rabbinic cycle both in the Diaspora and in Israel. The 19th century Karaite Hacham Shlomoh ben Afedah Hacoheh wrote an abridged paraphrase of Elijah Baschyatchi's Aderet Eliyahu. In his abridgement, Shlomoh Afedah paraphrases the above quoted passage but adds the following words:

"And for some time now the quest for the Abib has been abandoned even in the Land of Israel and they [the inhabitants of Israel] intercalate years using the above mentioned system [i.e. the 19 year Rabbinic cycle] like we do outside of Israel, [this is] against the legal decision of the Rav [i.e. Baschyatchi] and the Hachamim [mentioned in the above quoted passage of Aderet Eliyahu] perhaps in order to unite with all the communities and so that we will not have a disagreement between them and us in fixing the year."

(From "Gefen Ha'Aderet", Shlomoh ben Afedah Hacoheh, Israel 1987, pp.22-23 (written in 1860) [translation from the Hebrew by Nehemia Gordon, square brackets added by translator for clarity.]

Clearly in the time of Shlomoh ben Afedah Hacoheh (c. 1860) all Karaites everywhere had for many years been using the 19-year Rabbinic cycle. Therefore, Yom Kippur must have been celebrated by the Karaites in late September 1844 in accordance with the 19 year Rabbinic cycle and not in late October 1844. While late September may or may not have been the correct month in which to celebrate Yom Kippur (only a crop report from that year would decide that issue) it was undoubtedly the month actually observed by Karaites everywhere.

That Yom Kippur 1844 was celebrated by the Karaites in September and not October is confirmed by a Karaite Tomb Stone inscription cited by Abraham Firkowitz in his book "Avnei Zicharon" (lit. 'Stones of Remembrance'. published Vilna 1872). It should be noted that while claims have been made that Firkowitz altered some of the

inscriptions cited in his book, all of these dubious accusations are in regards to Tomb Stones from the early centuries of the Common Era and there can be no doubt as to the authenticity of the later Tomb Stones, especially those from the 19th century. On p.242 Firkowitz quotes from a Karaite Tomb Stone from the "New Cemetary" in Gozlow which reads:

"And Yosef Shlomoh died at seventy five years of age. And all Israel mourned him and cried for him 'Woe master and woe his glory'. And they buried him in great honor on the 12th day of the month Tevet in the year 605 of the sixth millenium since creation according to our counting, and according to the counting of Rome, the tenth of the month December in their year 1844 here in Gozlow, or Yeupetoria, on the Crimean Peninsula in the reign of the master the great and mighty Czar, King of Russia and the other lands, that is, the Emporer his majesty Nicolai the first Pavelovitz in the twentieth year of his reign, and in the sixty-first year of this Crimean Peninsula being under the rule of the Kings of Russia since the days of the Czarina Catherine the Second who conquered it from the hand of the Tartaric king and Shekhan Gari Khan who was king of Crimea at that time." [Translation from the Hebrew by Nehemia Gordon]

As can be seen the Karaite date 12 Tevet corresponds to December 10, 1844. Bearing in mind that the Russian Empire used the Julian calendar, December 10 of the Julian year must be understood to refer to December 22 in the Gregorian year (i.e. the system used universally today). If 12 Tevet was equivalent to December 22, 1844 (Gregorian) then Tevet would have begun on December 10 (Gregorian). Bearing in mind that Tevet is the tenth Hebrew month and Tishrei (in which Yom Kippur falls out) is the seventh Hebrew month it becomes clear that Yom Kippur 1844 must have been celebrated in late September and not late October. This is illustrated in the following correlation of months for months in late 1844:

September 14/15\* = Tishrei 1 (Yom Kippur = September 23)

October 13/14\* = Heshvan 1

November ? = Kislev 1

December 10 = Tevet 1

\*The correct date for the beginning of these months, based on the predicted visibility of the New Moon, would have been September 15 and October 14 (both beginning the prior evening). However, it is possible that with some of the inaccurate calculation system used by the Karaites in the 19<sup>th</sup> century some Karaites may have observed the beginning of these months one day earlier. It would seem that according to the system of Isaac ben Solomon, which was wide-spread in the 19th century, some Karaites would have celebrated September 14th as the beginning of the month and not September 15th [this last fact has been relayed to me by Magdi Shamuel, an expert on the Karaite calendar and lunar crescent visibility]. October 13th would not have been celebrated as the beginning of the month even according to Isaac ben Solomon's system. However, further investigation is required to rule out the possibility that some Karaites would have celebrated the beginning of the month on October 13th instead of October 14th.

\*\*The original report of Aharon ben Elijah regarding the difference of one month between the Karaite calendar in Israel and the Diaspora in 1354/1355 C.E. can be found in his book "Gan Eden", Israel 1972 (written in the 14<sup>th</sup> century), p.22a

Thank you,

Nehemia Gordon

Jerusalem, Israel

Visit the **KARAITE KORNER** at:

<http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Forum/3384/>

Note by RKS: We would like to ask the Seventh-day Adventist researchers why they did not go to the Karaite Jews for documentation as we have done and as was done by Ballenger in 1941? Could it be they did and did not reveal their findings as it would nullify their prophet's date?

E.S. Ballenger found the truth by a letter from the Karaite. "The defenders of the creed declare that while the orthodox Jews may have celebrated the Day of Atonement on Sept. 23, the Karaite Jews observed it on Oct 22. We have made careful investigation, and we find that this is a false claim. The leading Karaite rabbi of Cairo, Egypt, Youseff Ibrahim Marzork, in reply to an inquiry as to the day on which they celebrated the atonement in 1844, wrote:

"As to the dates of the Passover and Yom Kippur they are the following: "According to the Karaite Jews in the year 1843 the Yom Kippur is on Wednesday the 4<sup>th</sup> October, and just the same date according to the Rabbinical." **"In the year 1844 it is on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> September for the Karaite and Rabbinical."** *The Gathering Call* by E.S. Ballenger, May-June 1941, pp. 14-15.

Instead of accepting Ballenger's documentation or getting the facts from the Karaite Jews, William Shea played the numbers game with the ancient Babylonian calendar and attempted to make it come out to October 22, 1844. William H. Shea, M. D., PhD. *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, Appendix, vol. 1 of the Daniel and Revelation committee series.

In conclusion, Ellen G. White had the wrong year, wrong month, wrong day of the return of Jesus Christ, and when that failed, she had the wrong year, month, and day to begin her false Sanctuary and Investigative Judgment doctrines that were to begin on the Day of Atonement in 1844.

## When Was the "Day of Atonement in 1844"? by Robert K. Sanders

### Why is the accuracy of these dates important?

It is important to Seventh-day Adventists to maintain October 22, 1844 as the Day of Atonement regardless of historical documents that bear out September 23, 1844 as the Day of Atonement. The reason for this is their prophet Ellen G. White, had confirmed October 22, 1844 as the Day of Atonement. If the October date is false then the Seventh-day Adventists would have to concede that their prophet endorsed a false date for Day of Atonement. Ellen G. Whites Sanctuary and Investigative Judgment doctrines would also be incorrect. October 22, 1844 is the date she believed and taught from vision, that Jesus and the Father moved from the Holy Apartment to the Most Holy Apartment to begin the Investigative Judgment and the cleansing of the Sanctuary. Ellen G. White states her beliefs:

"So it was believed that Christ, our great High Priest, would appear to purify the earth by the destruction of sin and sinners, and to bless His waiting people with immortality. The tenth day of the seventh month, the great Day of Atonement, the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary, **which in the year 1844 fell upon the twenty-second of October**, was regarded as the time of the Lords coming." *The Great Controversy*, p. 400. "The preaching of a definite time for the judgment, in giving the first message, was ordered of God. The computation of the prophetic periods on which that message was based, placing the close of the 2300 day in the autumn of 1844, **stands without impeachment.**" *The Great Controversy*, p.457.

Ellen G. White is saying:

1. That Christ would appear and purify the earth by the destruction of sin and sinners. (Didn't happen.)
2. Christ would bless the people with immortality. His people are the Little Flock or Seventh-day Adventists. (Didn't happen.)
3. This would take place October 22, 1844. (Didn't happen.)
4. God ordered preaching a definite time for judgment. This definite time was October 22, 1844. (Didn't happen.)
5. The preaching of a definite time for judgment at the close of the 2300 days (October 22, 1844) stands without impeachment. (Didn't happen.)

The first quote from *The Great Controversy* is from the chapter titled, *Prophecies Fulfilled*. It is amusing to say the least not one of these prophecies was fulfilled as well as having the date incorrect for the Day of Atonement and Christ's coming. Did God order two false dates, the 1843 failure and the 1844 failure?

It is no wonder the October 22, 1844 is called, "The Great Disappointment." Wm. Miller and his followers including Mrs. White would not have been disappointed if only they believed the Word of God, that no one knows the day and hour of Christ's return. They were disappointed that they could not make a liar out of God, and God was true to his Word.

### The Day of Atonement in 1844 according to Jewish Encyclopedia?

"The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia" 1939 vol. 2, lists holidays, feasts and fasts as follows for September:

**September (Tishri)**

- 1 Rosh Hashanah (New Year)
- 2 Second Day of Rosh Hashanah
- 10 Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement)**
- 25 Hanukah
- Tishri I Sept. 14, 1844**
- Heshvan I Oct. 14, 1844
- Kislev I Nov. 12, 1844
- Tebeth Dec. 11, 1844

From the above data from the *"The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia"* 1939 Vol. 2, the first day of Tishri begins on September 14<sup>th</sup> of our calendar. Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement) begins 10 days later, Tuesday September 24, 1844. Using the Biblical and Jewish reckoning, the day begins at evening or sunset. The Day of Atonement would begin the evening of Monday September 23, 1844 and not October 22, as claimed by Ellen G. White.

**Calendar September 1844**

		0	1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	0	1
2	<b>3</b>	4	5	6	7	8
9	0					

**Verification of the Day of Atonement in 1844:**

Purdue University Professor Susan Prohofskey, Director of the Hillel Foundation. Purdue University is a State University in West Lafayette, Indiana. In 1992 Professor Prohofskey researched the Day of Atonement in 1844 on a computer program called "Inter Luach" (Hebrew for Lunar Calendar). Her findings were that the September 23, 1844 was the Day of Atonement. She also stated that, "the Day of Atonement never came as late as the month of October."

*"Will October 22, 1844 Bear Investigation?"*

**By E.S. Ballenger**

"Oct. 22, 1844 has been a crucial time with SDAs since their pioneers fixed upon it for the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ; and they still stand tenaciously for this date in spite of all facts to the contrary. The Day of Atonement fell on Sept. 23, in 1844 instead of Oct. 22. This can be easily demonstrated by consulting any Jewish almanac of that time, or any orthodox Jewish authority. They celebrate the Day of Atonement in 1844 on Sept. 23.

The defenders of the creed declare that while the orthodox Jews may have celebrated the Day of Atonement on Sept. 23, the Karaite Jews observed it on Oct 22. We have made careful investigation, and we find that this is a false claim. The leading Karaite rabbi of Cairo, Egypt, Youseff Ibrahim Marzork, in reply to an inquiry as to the day on which they celebrated the atonement in 1844, wrote:

"As to the dates of the Passover and Yom Kippur they are the following:

"According to the Karaite Jews in the year 1843 the Yom Kippur is on Wednesday the 4<sup>th</sup> October, and just the same date according to the Rabbinical." **"In the year 1844 it is on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> September for the Karaite and Rabbinical."**

If being ignorant of the movement of Christ from the holy to the most holy was such a great sin that their prayers were answered by the devil how about Mrs. White and her followers who continued to

pray just the same as these condemned people did for a month after Christ made His move. If Christ made this transfer on the Day of Atonement in 1844, then He moved on Sept. 23, that is, twenty-nine days before Mrs. White and her followers knew that he had moved. If the other group who continued to direct their prayers to the same place between Sept. 23 and Oct. 22?

Yes, this extremely ridiculous; but you cannot escape the fact that according to S.D.A. teachings, either Mrs. White was mistaken in claiming that one class of people were praying to the devil, or else she and her followers were praying to the same devil for a month after Sept. 23, the Day of Atonement in 1844." *The Gathering Call* by E.S. Ballenger, May-June 1941, pp. 14-15.

**Did Ellen G. White and her followers pray to Satan for a month as claimed by Pastor E. S. Ballenger? Ellen G. White answers:**

Chapter "End of The 2300 Days" "I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne; they did not know that Jesus had left it. Satan appeared to be on the throne, trying to carry on the work of God. I saw them look up to the throne, and pray, "Father give us Thy Spirit." Satan would then breath on them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but now sweet love, joy and peace. Satans object was to keep them deceived and to draw back and deceive Gods children." *Early Writings*, p. 56.

1. Would Jesus allow Satan to sit on his throne and answer the prayers of those that were asking in faith, even if they were unaware of where his throne was? The Bible believing Christians always knew Jesus was on the throne with the Father in the Most Holy.
2. Ellen G. White was a month late on the true date September 23. Therefore she and her followers was praying to Satan in the same way she accused others of doing by believing the Day of Atonement came on October 22.
3. Can you believe that Jesus would allow Satan to answer the prayers of those that come to him in faith? Especially in light of the fact that Ellen G. White, Wm. Miller and all their followers were essentially calling God a liar. They claimed they know the MONTH, DAY AND YEAR , of Christs return in 1843 as well as in 1844 with their time settings. But Jesus said, "No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. Mat 24:36 (NIV)
4. William Miller was an honest man as he renounced his 1843/1844 errors. Wm. Miller and his followers started preaching the gospel to the world after the disappointment, thus proclaiming the door was open to the world for salvation and was having conversion to Christ. This caused a split between the Millerites and Ellen G. White and her followers as they were teaching the door of salvation was closed to the world. Ellen G. White did not wake up to the fact that the door of mercy to the world was never closed till 1851.
5. From 1844-1851 the Whites and the Adventists would only preach to the Millerites who would not accept the closed-door doctrine. When the Adventists gave up on the false shut door doctrine they then began preaching salvation to others.

**"Samuel S. Snow Inventor of the October 22, 1844 Fiasco."**

**From the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia Volume 10, p. 1357.**

**"SNOW, SAMUEL S.** (1806-1870). A Congregationalist, then a skeptic, later a Millerite minister; initiator of the "seventh-month movement." Beginning with an article written Feb. 16, 1843, he emphasized the tenth day of the Jewish seventh month, *Tishri*, the Jewish Day of Atonement, as the true ending date of the prophetic 2300 years. Later he set forth the specific *day* as Oct. 22, 1844, our calendar equivalent of the tenth day of the seventh month in that year according to the old Karaite Jewish calendar. At first there was but little interest or response, but when Snow preached on July 21 in the large Boston Tabernacle on the text, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh [on the tenth day of the seventh month]; go ye out to meet him," some began to be roused."

Then soon after, at a large camp meeting held at Exeter, New Hampshire, Aug. 12-17, Snow's presentation was whole heartedly received. But the prominent leaders elsewhere regarded his message with marked reserve. Nevertheless, the "seventh month" message spread with seemingly irresistible power.

Snow published the *True Midnight Cry* (four pages), at Haverhill, Massachusetts, on Aug. 22. It was filled with brief but convincing arguments. His preaching of the definite time was soon taken up by hundreds of Milletite preachers, while Snow himself lectured continuously throughout the East. One by one the outstanding leaders joined in the swelling chorus.

In common with all Adventists, Snow was deeply disappointed in the failure of the Bridegroom to descend from heaven on Oct. 22. For a brief time he questioned as to whether a mistake had been made in the prophetic reckoning of the year.

However, he soon began to preach strange doctrines, and published a paper, the *Jubilee Standard*, from March to August, 1845. Sharp conflicts developed between him and the Millerites, as he went on into extreme fanaticism and finally proclaimed himself to be Elijah the prophet. He soon separated himself from Adventism in every form." *The Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* vol. 10, p. 1357

"Atonement, Day of, Ancient and Modern Observance"

Source: "Atonement, Day of," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 190,191.

[p. 190] Atonement, Day of (Heb. Yom Kippur): Solemn fast day observed on Tishri 10, described in Lev. 23:32 as a "Sabbath of solemn rest" ... *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Students Source Book*, vol. 9, p. 61.

From the above data from Jewish sources, the Seventh-day Adventist Church is aware that the Day of Atonement fell on September 23, 1844, but continues with the false date of October 22, 1844 to prop up their prophet Ellen G. White. There is no way Tishri 10 can come in October.

### White Estate Denies September 23, 1844 Date

In a letter to Mr. Paul Gordon Director of the White Estate, dated June 20, 1994. I asked, "did Satan answer EGWs prayers for thirty days? Do you believe that Ellen White was mistaken on the Day of Atonement in 1844? It was not Oct. 22, but Sept. 23, 1844 reported Susan Prohofsky, Purdue University Director of the Hillel Foundation, who researched the Day of Atonement on the computer program called, INTER LAUCH."

**Mr. Gordons reply:** "I have no particular confidence in the professor you have quoted. There is abundant evidence that this would contradict her claim. I would not hang my belief of September 23 on the words of a single professor."

**Readers notice:** Mr. Gordon offers only that there is abundant evidence to contradict the professor's claim. Mr. Gordon offers not one shred of evidence that the professor is in error nor does he offer any data to show October 22 is accurate. The Seventh-day Adventist Church has yet to offer proof that October 22, was the Karaite date, for the Day of Atonement or that it was different than the Orthodox Jewish date.

#### L.E. Froom

Froom tries to justify the late October 22 date in Exhibit E and F, p. 792, *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*. But Froom offers no documents to show that the Karaites held a different date than the Rabbinical Jews.

#### Conclusion:

1. It is proven from Jewish sources that the Day of Atonement was September 23, 1844.
2. S. Snow first used the true Rabbinical Day of Atonement, then changed the date to October 22, 1844 date as the Day of Atonement. His claim that October 22 was the Karaite's Day of Atonement is unfounded.
3. The October 22 date has never been proven as a Day of Atonement for the Karaite Jews by Ellen G. White, S. Snow, Leroy Froom or the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
4. Ellen G. White was wrong in putting her prophetic stamp of approval on a false date as well as all the other false teachings dealing with the October 22, 1844 date.
5. Seventh-day Adventists are the only ones that hold to these non-Biblical teachings. Namely that Jesus and the Father was in the Holy place for 1,800 years, moving into the Most Holy place in 1844 where Jesus then began an Investigative Judgment of blotting out sins and to see who was worthy of heaven.
6. What Ellen G. White failed to see was, God already knew who were righteous by naming some of them in Hebrews 11. These Godly saints were judged worthy by God, before 1844, and proves that God does not need Ellen's false non-Biblical Investigative Judgment to determine who is going to be saved. This non-Biblical teaching proves Ellen G. White is a false prophet.

## A Counter-Argument by Bob Pickle.

An interesting site dealing with the Karaite dating for Yom Kippur, October 22, 1844 is by Bob Pickle at <http://www.pickle-publishing.com/papers/karaite-reckoning-1844.htm> . He defends the traditional SDA dating using an interesting source. SPELL HIS ARGUMENT OUT AND REBUTT IT.

### *Karaite Reckoning vs. Rabbanite Reckoning*

## Was October 22 the Right Date, or Was It September 23?

by Bob Pickle

### The Problem

A number of critics today question the conclusions of Millerites in 1844 that the Jewish Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) that year would occur on October 22. Indeed, the present author perhaps 15 years ago perused an 1844 almanac in the Auburn University library, and discovered that it listed September 23 as the date for Yom Kippur. But that is to be expected.

Millerites in 1844 used the reckoning of Karaite Judaism to come up with the date of October 22. Karaism typically kept their feasts a month later than other Jews. However, the critics claim that the Karaites were no longer using their special form of reckoning in 1844. Is this true? And even if it were true, what would be the correct date for Yom Kippur in 1844, biblically speaking?

We begin by discussing the reasons behind the differences of the Karaite Jewish calendar.

### Of Karaism and Calendars

Toward the end of the 8th century AD, a back-to-the-bible movement in Judaism arose in opposition to Rabbanite Judaism. It is called Karaism (or Caraim). The Rabbanites followed the traditions of the Talmud in addition to the Scriptures, but the Karaites abandoned all such traditions and went just by Scripture. This necessitated differing from other Jews in the manner in which they kept their calendar, and this meant that they often kept their festivals in different months than other Jews.

The Julian and Gregorian Calendars are solar calendars. They are tied to the number of days that it takes for the earth to revolve about the sun. Moslems, on the other hand, have a lunar calendar, one that is tied to the number of days that it takes for the moon to revolve around the earth.

While the earth revolves around the sun once every 365.242199 days, the moon revolves around the earth once every 29.530588 days. In a lunar calendar, about half the months are 29 and about half are 30 days long. 12 of such months would add up to about 354 days, about 11 days short of a solar year.

The Julian and Gregorian calendars keep in time with the seasons though an intercalary day (Feb. 29) every 4th year, commonly called a leap year. The Gregorian calendar skips three of these every 400 years, and is thus more accurate than the Julian calendar.

The Islamic calendar uses no intercalation. Thus it falls behind the seasons 11 additional days every year. After 33 years or so, their months have rotated through the seasons until they are back to where they were before.

The Jewish calendar uses an intercalary month. In a leap year, which occurs about 7 times every 19 years, the 12th month Adar is followed by a second Adar, and this postpones the beginning of the first month of Nisan till the following month.

Moslems and Karaites begin their months when the new crescent moon is first visible. This may occur, weather permitting, 18 hours or more after the astronomical new moon. Sightings are attempted soon after sunset. If the new crescent is large

enough, and is far enough away from the setting sun, and at the right angle, then it will be seen and the new month will be declared to have begun.

The Bible specifies that the Passover must be celebrated during the first month. It also specifies that on the morrow after the sabbath after the Passover (differing interpretations identify this as either a Sunday or the 16th of Nisan), a sheaf of ripe barley was to be waved before the Lord (Lev. 23:10-12). Up until the 2nd century AD, Rabbanite Judaism added their intercalary months in such a way that there was always ripe barley for Passover. After that point, they relied solely on mathematical calculations tied to the equinox, and totally disregarded whether the barley was ripe or not. Thus they were not following the Scriptures in the matter of when to begin their years.

When Karaism arose, it reverted back to the original way of calculating the beginning of the year. You can read more about this matter at [www.karaite-korner.org](http://www.karaite-korner.org). Particularly interesting are [Abib \(Barley\)](#), [Abib FAQ](#), and [Ancient Abib Reports](#).

#### October 22, Karaism, and Snow

Beginning in the summer of 1844, Millerites in general, though not William Miller himself, became convinced that Christ would return on October 22 of that year, what was considered the Day of Atonement by Karaite reckoning. This idea was first presented by Samuel S. Snow. Critics today deny that the Karaites were still using their special reckoning in 1844. Thus, it is claimed, this Millerite date, and the subsequent date used by Seventh-day Adventists for the beginning of the antitypical Day of Atonement, is flawed.

A key piece of evidence that is used is this quote, written in 1860:

And for some time now the quest for the Abib has been abandoned even in the Land of Israel and they [the inhabitants of Israel] intercalate years using the above mentioned system [i.e. the 19 year Rabbinic cycle] like we do outside of Israel, [this is] against the legal decision of the Rav [i.e. Baschyatchi] and the Hachamim [mentioned in the above quoted passage of Aderet Eliyahu] perhaps in order to unite with all the communities and so that we will not have a disagreement between them and us in fixing the year. (From "Gefen Ha'Aderet", Shlomoh ben Afedah Hacoheh, Israel 1987, pp.22-23 (written in 1860) [translation from the Hebrew by Nehemia Gordon, square brackets added by translator for clarity.]

That Karaites afar from Palestine were using Rabbanite reckoning long before 1844 is indeed true. And at some point prior to 1860, apparently even Karaites in Palestine were as well. But how long before 1860? The history is difficult to trace back from our day.

As late as 1641 we learn from a Karaite pilgrim from the Crimea that the Karaites of the Middle East still followed the Biblical calendar and that in that year they celebrated all the holidays one month after the Rabbanites. (*Karaite Korner Newsletter* #6: Biblical Holidays 1999)

For now, we will say that at some point between 1641 and 1860, Karaites in Palestine started using Rabbanite reckoning. Yet regardless of what the Karaites were or were not doing in 1844, what was the true date for the Day of Atonement, biblically speaking? The question is difficult to answer without detailed crop reports from that year, but we know what the barley crops are like in recent years, thanks to Karaite leader Nehemia Gordon.

#### Yom Kippur, 1999

In 1999 his newsletter declared:

According to the Abib (barley) and the New Moon the Biblical Feasts and Holidays in 1999 fall out on the following dates:

October 11, 1999 Yom Teruah (Day of Shouting)

October 20, 1999 Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement)

October 25, 1999 Hag HaSukkot (Feast of Booths)

November 1, 1999 Shemini Atzeret (*Ibid.*)

October 20 is awfully close to October 22. But the average Jew kept the Yom Kippur in 1999 a whole month earlier.

Concocted by Snow?

Back to the Millerites of 1844. Some critics have claimed that Samuel Snow concocted the idea of Yom Kippur being in October so that he would have longer for his message to take effect. This is not true, for Millerites were well aware of Karaite reckoning before Snow came around with his message the summer of 1844:

Now there is a dispute between the Rabinical, and the Caraites Jews, as to the correct time of commencing the year. . . . The Caraites Jews on the contrary, still adhere to the letter of the Mosaic, and commence with the new moon nearest the barley harvest in Judea; and which is one moon later than the Rabinical year. The Jewish year of A D 1843, as the Caraites reckon it in accordance with the Mosaic law, therefore commenced this year with the new moon on the 29th of April, and the Jewish year 1844, will commence with the new moon in next April, when 1843 and the 2300 days, according to their computation, will expire. (*Signs of the Times*; June 21, 1843; p. 123)

While Miller himself never espoused such dating, principal Millerite leaders did. Thus the idea of using Karaite reckoning wasn't something concocted by Snow. Notice also that if the Jewish year of 1844 began with the new moon of April, Yom Kippur, a little over six months later, would land on October 22, not September 23.

In a discussion of the 70 weeks of Daniel 9, we read:

In an "Economical Calendar" of Palestine, which has been prepared with the greatest care, is the following remark under the month commencing with the new moon of April. "Wheat, zeo or spelt and barley ripen." (*Signs of the Times*; Dec. 5, 1843; p. 134)

In this article is a good bit of material dealing with the Karaite form of reckoning. Much of this was repeated, with some additions, in the March 20, 1844, issue, after the *Signs* had changed its name to the *Advent Herald and Signs of the Time Reporter*. But the *Signs* a.k.a. *Advent Herald* wasn't the first journal to publish comments along these lines:

In an article on the Jewish year, published in the Cry of April 27, 1843, Bro. Whiting says: "The rabbinical calculation makes the first day of Nisan commence with the new moon *nearest* the day on which the sun enters Aries, on the vernal equinox. It ought, however, to be observed, that the Caraites Jews maintain that the rabbins have changed the Calendar, so that, to present the first fruits on the 16th of Nisan would be impossible if the time is reckoned according to the rabbinical calculations, since barley is not in the ear at Jerusalem till a month later. **The accounts of many travelers confirm the position of the Caraites.** (*The Midnight Cry*; Oct. 11, 1844; p. 117) (bold added)

So well over a year before Snow got going, Millerites were talking about Karaite reckoning, and even claiming that "many travelers" to Israel had confirmed the fact that the barley is not ripe for Passover the way the Rabbanites calculate the beginning of the year.

Mr. E. S. Calman

Now we need to investigate the question of what were the Karaites doing in 1844. We have the testimony of Shlomoh ben Afedah Hacoheh that long before 1860 the Karaites of Palestine has given up their form of reckoning the commencement of the year. This must be balanced with the following, from an article which was quoted in part by the Dec. 5, 1843, issue of *Signs* and the March 20, 1844, issue of *Advent Herald*:

The following is a communication from Mr. Calman, written as long ago as 1836 . . . . (*American Biblical Repository*, April 1840, p. 398)

This Mr. Calman was a converted Jewish Rabbi who at the time of writing was about to return to Jerusalem from Beirut where he was recovering his health. Before going to Beirut:

Having left England, under the patronage of a few private individuals, as a missionary to the Jews in the East, he had proceeded first to Baghdad and then to Jerusalem. (p. 400)

Calman's article is critiquing a book written by a Ridley Herschell, with which he differs on some points.

You must not, for a moment, suppose that I mean to charge Mr. H. with falsehood. Far from it; for I must acknowledge that before I became acquainted with the Judaism of the East, or rather, before I had thoroughly looked into the state of religion and morals among them, in consequence of my labors here for the benefit of their souls, my own views were nearly like those of Mr. H. (p. 410)

Judging from his learning, and his personal acquaintance with Jewish affairs in the Middle East, one would think that Mr. Calman should know what he is talking about.

#### One Month Too Early

Notice carefully what the very first point he covers is, in the lengthy remainder of his article:

I will begin by stating one fact of great importance, of which I was totally ignorant before I came to this country, which will prove that the *seasons of the festivals*, appointed by God for the Jewish nation, have been annulled and subverted by the oral law of the Scribes and Pharisees, which is now the ritual of the Jews. (p. 411)

Mr. Calman considers the issue of "great importance," and learned of it only since arriving in the Palestine. What immediately follows is a short description of the biblical requirement that the year begin when the barley is in a certain stage of ripeness. Then he says:

But, at present, the Jews in the Holy Land have not the least regard to this season appointed and identified by Jehovah, but follow the rules prescribed in the oral law, namely, by adding a month to every second or third year, and thus making the lunar year correspond with the solar. And when the 15th day of Nisan (*nisan*), according to this computation, arrives, they begin to celebrate the above-mentioned feast, although the *chedesh haabib* may have passed, or not yet come. In general the proper season occurs after they have celebrated it a whole month, which is just reversing the command in the law, which directs that the *chedesh haabib* precede the festival, and not the festival the *chedesh haabib*. Nothing like ears of green corn have I seen around Jerusalem at the celebration of this feast. (pp. 411, 412) (Hebrew transliterated)

Mr. Calman has thus informed us that "in general," Jews around 1836 were keeping their feasts one month too early. Therefore, just this point makes a good case for October 22 being the correct date for Yom Kippur in 1844, regardless of what the Karaites were doing.

Especially is this so when one considers the range of dates in which Rabbanite Jews were celebrating Yom Kippur at that time. Between 1800 and 1844, the earliest date for Yom Kippur was September 14 in 1842, and the latest date was October 14 in 1815. If "in general" the Rabbanite dates were a month too early, then certainly September 23, 1844, falling in the first third of this range of dates, should have been a month too early.

#### Karaites in Palestine

. . . regardless of what the Karaites were doing. But what were they doing?

The Caraites observe it later than the Rabbinical, for they are guided by *Abib*, *abib*, and they charge the latter with eating leavened bread during that feast. I think, myself, that the charge is well founded. If this feast of unleavened bread is not celebrated in its season, every successive festival is dislocated from its appropriate

period, since the month Abib, *abib*, is laid down in the law of God as the epoch from which every other is to follow. (p. 412) (Hebrew transliterated)

Though the Karaites of Palestine may have abandoned their form of reckoning by 1860, they were still at it in 1836. So says a knowledgeable former Rabbi who was there at the time. Thus it is entirely possible that they were still at it in 1844.

#### Conclusion

The case the critics have made today against the idea that October 22 was the correct date for Yom Kippur in 1844 has vaporized.

The idea that Snow concocted the idea of using Karaite reckoning is utterly false, as can be seen from contemporary documents.

Generally speaking, Jews in Palestine at that time were keeping the feasts a month too early, for they were starting their years so early that there was not enough time for the barley to ripen before Passover.

While the Karaite Jews in Palestine were likewise keeping the feasts too early in 1860, they were not in 1836, leaving open the possibility that they were also not in 1844.

Karaite records of what they were doing in other localities are not necessarily helpful, since those afar were using Rabbanite reckoning long before those in Palestine ceased to observe the barley harvests.

Even if the Karaites were using Rabbanite reckoning in 1844, it is still apparent that Rabbanite reckoning was almost without question a month too early that year.

Any continued criticism against the validity of the date of October 22 for Yom Kippur in 1844 is sheer speculation, unless of course someone turns up an 1844 crop report for Palestine. If such a crop report did turn up, and if it showed that the barley had entered the Abib stage by March 20 in those cold, pre-global warming days, then and only then would the matter be settled that September 23 was the true Day of Atonement for that year.

## Dump

### How Shea uses the Babylonian Calendar to justify October 22.

From page 6:

4. He concludes, “The year-day principle appears to have passed both these pragmatic tests in ways that lend further support to its validity.”

But Shea’s praise of the verification of the year-day principle based on its ability to predict future events, as evidenced in the statements of Cressner, has its problems. If we read the same reference Shea uses to find out about Cressner – Froom’s *Prophetic Faith of our Fathers* –we find that like grapeshot, every generation of historicists made their gamut of predictions, sometimes by the dozens, and usually their predictions tried to find a fulfillment of the particular prophecy within the near future of their own time. Given the number of predictions they made, it is not surprising that one prediction in one of these generations would come up with something like what Cressner predicted. If however, we were to examine the percentage of predictions that were not fulfilled, we would find that the majority of predictions and their dates were incorrect. In Assumption 9, a table of historicists’ predictions for the 1260 year period from the evidence in Froom, and shows not only the wide variation of dates, but also how few of them endorsed the paradigm, and that is even historicists who wrote *after* 1798.