

Eld. A. O. East

*At Bible Inquirer
Council after last Gen. Conf.
(furnished by Eld. Sardis)*

4. ELDER SPICER'S PRESENTATION.

SUGGESTIVE NOTES ON THE STUDY
OF THE TIME OF THE FIFTH AND SIXTH TRUMPETS
OF REVELATION 9

ADVENT SOURCE COLLECTION
General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists
WASHINGTON, D.C.

No. 3164

The first four trumpets (of Revelation 8) deal evidently with special attacks upon the Roman Empire of the West under Alaric, Genseric, Attila, and the extinction of the waning imperial power under Odoacer (476), and the doing away with the senatorial power at Rome under the Greek administration following the overthrow of the Ostrogoths. The eighth chapter then closes with the announcement that the three trumpets to follow are woe trumpets.

The next great onslaught upon the Empire was that of the Saracens, the Mohammedan invasion. In the very times when the events comprehended under the fourth trumpet were closing with the disappearance of the power of the Roman senate and the old Roman judicial administration in the West, Mahomet appeared in the East. The symbols and imagery of the fifth trumpet (Rev. 9) picture graphically this Saracen invasion of the Roman Empire. Under the impulse of the religion of Mahomet, the Moslem hordes poured out of the Arabian desert like locusts upon the earth.

Sir. Wm. Muir, the historian of the Saracens, says:--

"Like swarms from the hive, or flights of locusts darkening the land, tribe after tribe issued forth."--The Caliphate, page. 44.

Their commission as a scourge under the prophecy was not to kill or overthrow the empire, apparently, but to torment it and to hurt it. In verse 5, the time was given as five months, and again, in verse 10, describing still the tormenting and hurting work of the Saracens, it is declared that "their power was to hurt men five months."

The picture of the prophecy suggests swift whirlwind campaigning by multitudes of cavalry, and attacks stopping short of absolute overthrow of the empire,

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

whose headquarters were now at Constantinople, in the East. The prophecy declares that these Saracens "had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit." Certainly this describes well the sovereignty of the Mohammedan Caliphs, who, within the first century of the Saracen history were, as Gibbon says, "the most potent and absolute monarchs of the globe." (ch. 51:49). The Caliph was not only a king, but the vicegerent of Mahomet, and so pontiff of this false religion, which was surely launched from the bottomless pit or abyss as truly as ever the strange infidel outbreak of the French Revolution was launched from "the abyss." (Rev. 11) Mohammedanism places pagan people yet further beyond the reach of the gospel than they were in native heathenism, as all the history of missions testifies. Following the description of this attack and the five months' tormenting, the prophecy says (verse 12), "One woe is past; and, behold, there comes two woes more hereafter."

Within the history of the Saracen attack, then, must be found the five months, or one hundred fifty year period specially singled out by the prophecy. To what part of the history of the Saracenic power does this period of one hundred fifty years of tormenting power, most aptly apply? Sure it is that the early Saracen rule was the period of its most brilliant conquests. Possibly the five months is named in symbolic prophecy, out of the long period of the rule of the Saracens, because of the fact that five months, it is said, was the general period of the swarming, devastating life of the literal locust, from May to September, as they poured out from the Arabian desert upon Syria. "As soon as they settle and begin to lay their eggs they die, and are no more taken notice of by men." (Habershon)

A book recently published by our British Union house, called "The Eastern Question," says of this prophetic period:--

"Looking at the broad facts of Saracenic history, we have no difficulty in seeing that a period of one hundred and fifty years includes its era of conquest

and power to hurt. It was in the year 622 that the Mohammedan era began, and it was seven years later, in A.D. 629, that the Saracens began war with the Eastern empire. One hundred and fifty years from that time bring us to A.D. 779. In 762 Bagdad was made the capital of the caliphate, and from that time the principal ambition of the caliphs was not to effect conquest, but to surround themselves with luxury.

"Every art of the architect and the designer, or the artist in stone, of the painter and builder, was made tributary to the grandeur of a city which was intended to embody something of the magnificence of a dynasty that counted its wealth by the hundred millions, and hesitated at no outlay that would make a display.'--Gilman's Story of the Saracens, page 357.

"In the year 779 Muhammed Al Mahdi was on the throne of Bagdad, and concerning this caliph we read:

"Before the first year of his reign had closed Mahdi determined to make a pilgrimage to Mecca, and his arrangements were of the most luxurious description. Tents were carried to protect the prince and his suite from the sun, and many camels bore freight of snow from Korassan to cool the air still more; every means was taken to guard against all weariness of the flesh, and to ensure the enjoyment of the long journey.'--Id., page 361.

"The prophecy had declared that the scorpions should hurt for a period of five months. When the limit of one hundred and fifty actual years is reached from the beginning of hostilities against the Eastern empire, we find the historian saying: 'The former desire for conquest had now given place to the love of luxury.' Id., page 363."--"The Eastern Question," pp. 19, 20.

Roughly speaking, this term from 629 to 779 does, it must be acknowledged, cover the time of the greatest vigor in the Moslem attack. Therefore the author of this book, "The Eastern Question," again says:--

"Although we may not be able to put our finger on any particular event about the year 779, that stands out as a landmark to define the conclusion of the one hundred and fifty years, we are quite safe in saying that at that time the five months of torment have manifestly come to a close. With their termination by the year 779, the first woe is passed."-- page 20.

At the same time, while 629 gives a very fair starting date, in that then the Saracens had their first conflict (a minor one) with the Eastern empire, the year 779 brings, apparently, no decisive event to terminate the period. Considering a number of events in the early development of the Mohammedan power, Elliott, in his "horae Apocalypticae," decides in favor of the period 612 to 762 as affording a one hundred and fifty year term covering the time of greatest Saracen conquest, and beginning and ending with events really decisive in the development of Islam.

It was in the year 612 that Mahomet made his public announcement of his commission, and with a few followers gathered about him "threw off all reserve" (Irving's Life), announcing himself openly as "a prophet sent by God to put an end to idolatry." Elliott says:--

"In the circumstances of this public opening of his mission, A.D. 612, there was then for the first time expressed that principle of propagating his false religion by violence and with the sword, which made his followers a woe to all the countries near them, and was specially a declaration of war on Christendom."

Vol. 1, p. 428.

Of this date 612 the Schaaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says:--

"Three years of preaching gained him about fifty followers, and then (612) he began to teach in public, using a house opposite the Kaaba." --

Art. Mohammed.

The one hundred fifty years from this date end in 762, when the new dynasty of Caliphs, the Abbassides, removed the seat of the Saracen empire from Damascus, in Syria, to the river Tigris, and founded Bagdad, as Elliott says,--

"Beyond the old Roman Euphratean frontier. It was in the year 762 that Almanzor there laid its foundation; and thither the government and head of the locusts took its flight far eastward, away from Christendom."--Elliott,
Vol. 1, p. 432.

Noting this removal of the Saracen capital to Bagdad, Gibbon says:--

"In this city of peace, amidst the riches of the East, the Abbassides soon disdained the abstinence and frugality of the first Caliphs, and aspired to emulate the magnificence of the Persian kings."-- Ch. 52:11.

"The luxury of the Caliphs, so useless to their private happiness, relaxed the nerves and terminated the progress of the Arabian empire. . . . War was no longer the passion of the Saracens."-- Ch. 52:12.

And the Saracens began to lose control, and a new race to appear.

Muir says:--

"Before long the Caliphs drew their body-guard entirely from the Turks about the Oxus. . . Before long these began to overshadow the noble Arab chieftains; and so we soon find the imperial forces officered almost entirely by Turcomans."
--("The Caliphate," page 431.)

The "Historians' History of the World" (Vol.8, p. 209) says of the Caliph Al-Mansur's transfer of the capital:--

"Thus he founded Bagdad (762), which was destined to eclipse all other cities of the Orient. . . The people of the East regarded with satisfaction this change of capital (which brought the seat of government nearer to themselves; but the inhabitants of Spain and Maghreb, already discontented with their isolated situation which made them in a way mere tributary provinces, were only awaiting

a favorable opportunity to declare their independence."

A Mohammedan author, Ameer Ali, says of the change of capital:--

"The seat of government is removed from Syria to Irak; the Syrians lose the monopoly of influence and power they had hitherto possessed, and the tide of power is divided from the West to the East. But the unity of the Caliphate was gone for ever." (History of the Saracens, page 208) He adds, from a French author: "The age of conquest had passed; that of civilization had commenced."

The scorpion power of the Saracens to sting and hurt the empire was waning, and the seat of their government was taken beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire.

This term, therefore, from 612 to 762, seems to be bounded at the beginning and ending by decisive events that mark the flowing and ebbing of the tide of the Saracenic invasion. Closing the prophecy concerning the Saracens, the Scripture says (verse 12) :--

"One woe is past; and behold, there come two woes more hereafter."

The ever-diminishing power of the Saracen Caliphate continued at Bagdad until the conflicts and overturnings by the Moguls and the Turks, the latter growing into power in the region of the Euphrates in the eleventh century and onward. The sounding of the sixth trumpet loosed the four angels bound in the great river Euphrates, and from all the four quarters of that region came a Turkish invasion of the empire.

E. A. Freeman says of these overturnings:--

"The blow which seemed the most crushing of all, the overthrow of the Caliphate by the Moguls (1258), was part of a chain of events which brought on the stage a Mohammedan power more terrible than all that had gone before it. We have now come to the time of the first appearance of the Ottoman Turks." (Ottoman Power, page 98.)

Under the second woe the attack was not merely to hurt but to kill. This suggests the utter overthrow of the one remaining portion of the old Roman empire, the eastern "third part." Verse 15 says: "And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men."

The recent work, "Eastern Question," issued by our London house, deals with the 391 years as follows:--

"We have seen that it was not until 1453 (the fall of Constantinople" that the four angels proved to be entirely loosed and free to put an end to the Eastern empire. Up till that time some obstacle had always arisen between the Turks and the object of their long-cherished ambitions. The actual loosing of the angels, however, preceded the taking of Constantinople by four years.

"When the last emperor ascended the ill-fated throne, the empire formally put itself under the foot of the Sultan. Constantine, the brother of John VI, was in Sparta when the throne became vacant, and inasmuch as Constantine had recently taken part in hostilities against the Sultan, Murad II, it was thought doubtful that Murad would consent to acknowledge him as emperor, and some were in favor of crowning Demetrius, a younger brother. So before Constantine could be formally proclaimed emperor, Murad was approached to know if he would consent to Constantine's wearing the crown. It was not until Murad gave his consent that the imperial insignia were sent to Constantine in Sparta, and the ceremony of coronation was performed there, the 6th of January, 1449.

"The arguments of the Prince Demetrius' partisans were based not so much on personal as on public grounds -- the political interest of the State. At last a compromise was made: an embassy was to be sent at once to the Sultan to ask him, Would he acknowledge Despot Constantine as emperor or not? This course was perhaps the only one to prevent civil war, or eventually an attack on the part of the Turks, but it shows more than anything else the growing weakness of the empire, and the failing sense of dignity.' - Constantine, Last Emperor of the Greeks, by Chedomi Mijatovich, page 84.

"Clearly, the independence of the eastern empire was now gone; its king was in the fullest sense but a nominee of the Sultan, and when Mohammed, on his accession to the sultanate in 1451, determined at once to proceed with the long-deferred acquisition of Constantinople, the result was hardly in doubt a moment."

-- pp. 25, 26.

Thus this work reckons the 391 years from January 6, 1449, ending in early 1840, in the "midst of the negotiations going on between the Great Powers of Europe as to how the Turkish Empire could be preserved." etc.

This preserves the years 1449-1840 for the 391-year period, but dropping out the August 11 date. But if we must re-study the question of the prophetic periods of 150 years and 391 years, is it not worth while to give study to the question as to whether the dates 1449-1840 are really the decisive ones in the history? Josiah Litch fixed upon 1449 as the beginning of the period by taking the 150 years that the prophecy assigned to the Saracens under the first woe and applying it to Othman and the Turks under the second woe. And the basis of this computation was Gibbon's error of July 27, 1299. Litch understood also that John VI, next to the last emperor, died in 1449. But he died in 1448 (Oct. 3); and it was in 1448 that the people of Constantinople "formally proclaimed" Constantine emperor, and it was in 1448 that the Sultan gave his consent to this succession. And a review of the events preceding 1448 seem to minimize the decisive significance of this act of taking counsel with the Sultan as to the succession to the throne of Constantinople. For years the emperors had acknowledged themselves vassals of the Sultan. A few dates will illustrate:--

1381 - Emperor John V, obtained the support of the Sultan Murad to regain his throne, from which his own son was trying to keep him. "In the year 1381, he concluded a treaty with the Sultan Murad, acknowledging himself again a vassal and tributary of the Ottoman Empire." (Finlay's "Hist. Greece," Vol. 3, page 466.)

"Best remembered among the tribulations of John is the siege of

Philadelphia. . . . Murad, wishing to subdue it, compelled John V and his son Manuel to march in person against the last Christian stronghold in Asia. The Emperor submitted to the degradation, and Philadelphia surrendered when it saw the imperial banner hoisted among the horse-tails of the Turkish pashas above the camp of the besiegers. The humiliation of the empire could go no further."

(Oman, "Byzantine Europe, page. 338)

1389 - Bayesid became Sultan and renewed the 1381 treaty. When John V began to strengthen the walls of Constantinople the Sultan ordered him to level to the ground all that he had put up; and the Emperor tore it down.

1391 - John V died and his son Manuel, serving with the Turkish forces, left secretly to assume the throne. For going thus secretly without counsel, the Sultan treated him as a rebellious vassal and threatened to put another on the throne. But "he accepted the submission of Manuel and the Greek emperor again appeared as a vassal at the Sublime Porte." Finlay, "Byzantine and Greek Empires," Vol. 2, p. 587) "Manuel also engaged to pay the Sultan an annual tribute."

1425 - 1448 -- Reign of John VI. "He never forgot that he was a vassal of the Ottoman Empire." (Finlay)

1448 -- When John VI died, Constantinople chose his brother Constantine his successor. He was in Sparta, in Greece. "As he had been recently engaged in hostilities with the Sultan, it was doubtful whether Murad would acknowledge him as emperor, and Demetrius (a brother who had formerly tried to get the throne from John, securing Turkish troops for the purpose) availed himself of these doubts to make another attempt to occupy the throne." But Demetrius failed, as Constantine was the choice of the people:--

"He was, therefore, formally proclaimed emperor, and the consent of the Sultan having been obtained to his assumption of the imperial title, a deputation was sent to the Peloponnesus to carry him the insignia of empire. The ceremony of his coronation was performed at Sparta in the month of January, 1449. (Finlay,

"Hist. Greece," Vol. 3, pp. 497, 497) ?

The incident of securing the Sultan's consent hardly seems to stand out from other and even more formal acknowledgements of vassalage to the Turk. And it occurs in 1448. Besides this, Constantine was really less of a vassal to the Turk than his predecessors: "A prince whose heroism throws a sunset glory on the close of the long-clouded series of the Byzantine annals," (Historians' Hist. of the World, Vol. 24, p. 327)

If we were looking at the history alone, what event would we take as really marking the end of the Eastern empire and the full succession of the Turkish power? In interpreting the fourth trumpet of Revelation 8, marking the end of the Western imperial line, we do not take the earlier incidents of the shameful setting up and putting down of the last "puppet" emperors by the barbarian chiefs, but we pass directly to the act of Odoacer that extinguished for ever the line of western emperors, in 476. That seems to follow a sound principle of interpretation. Applying the same principle to the similar decay of the eastern imperial power we would naturally look to the stroke that ended the line of eastern emperors, the fall of Constantinople, May 29, 1453.

Every historian takes that as the decisive point in the history:--

Lord John Russell: "With the fall of Constantinople was extinguished for ever the last vestige of the majesty of Rome." (Singleton's "Turkay and the Balkan States," p. 10)

Oman: "All Europe knew that the end was come of the longest tale of empire that Christendom has yet seen." ("Byzantine Europe," p. 350)

Hutton: "The age-long fight which the imperial east had waged over barbarism was over. The city of the Caesars and the Church was in the hands of the infidel." ("Constantinople," p. 150.)

In the re-study of the period of 391 years, it would seem worth while to at least consider this really decisive event of 1453 in its bearing upon the full loosing or setting up of the Turkish power as a scourge to eastern Christendom. The 391 years, measured from 1453, end in 1844. About 1810 (or earlier) Buck's "Theological Dictionary," under "Mahomedanism" said:--

"Of things yet to come it is difficult to say anything with precision. We have, however, some reason to believe, from the aspect of Scripture prophecy, that, triumphant as this sect has been, it shall at last come to nought. As it arose as a scourge to Christendom about the time that Antichrist obtained a temporal dominion, so it is not improbable but they will have their downfall nearly at the same period. The ninth chapter of Revelations seems to refer wholly to this imposture: 'The four angels were loosed,' says the prediction, 15th verse, 'which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men.' This period, in the language of prophecy, makes 39; years, which, being added to the year when the four angels were loosed, will bring us down to 1844, or thereabouts for the final destruction of the Mahometan empire. It must be confessed, however, that though the event is certain, the exact time cannot be easily ascertained."

Habershorn's "Historical Exposition of the Apocalypse," (page 194) issued in 1841, says:--

"It is not extravagant to believe that that fall may take place at the termination of the period, as set forth in this prophecy; and which termination, reckoning 391 years, ('the hour, and the day, and the month, and the year') from the fall of Constantinople on the 29th of May 1453, will happen in June, 1844."

But the prophetic period was not to reach to the end of this power, but to mark a special period of its persecuting supremacy -- "to slay the third part of men." Under the law of the Koran, Christianity was to be but tolerated under stigma, while to turn from Islam to Christianity was death. "Whosoever changes his religion, kill him with the sword." (Highes' Dictionary of Islam" under "Apostacy") And this was the rule up to 1844. In that year in which began the full hour of the last message that was to go to every nation and people, Moslems as well as others, there was a most remarkable reversal of Islamic position. In this "Daybreak in Turkey," Barson says: "The year 1844 is memorable in Turkey."

The facts, most briefly put, are as follows: In the "Memoirs" of Sir Stratford Canning, British ambassador to Turkey, there is this note under date "August, 1843": "A painful incident, the execution of an individual on religious grounds, brought on a most important change in the practice, if not in the principles of the Sultan's government." An Armenian, who had become a Moslem, turned back to Christianity, and was publicly executed in a chief street of Constantinople, and his body exposed for three days, advertising the law of Islam. Canning took it up by order of his government, also the French ambassador, by order of France, joined by others. Rifat Pasha, the Foreign Minister, answered for the Sultan: --

"The Porte, he said, not only could not alter a divine law, but could not risk her character as a Mussulman Power even by a written reply to the remonstrances of the five powers led by the British ambassador." (Lane-Poole's "Life of Canning." Vol. 2, page 91.)

"Meanwhile another religious execution took place at Brusa, this time of a Greek, (Dec. 1843), followed by similar protests from the five ambassadors." The Turkish minister still declared:--

"A law prescribed by God himself was not to be set aside by any human power.' The Sultan, he said, might risk his throne in the attempt." (Id.)

It was a crisis in the history of the sword of Islam. Council after council was held.

The situation became so intense that France called off its ambassador, and Canning's government was ready to accept the offer of the Porte to settle matters in a confidential, compromising way. But Canning said in his "Memoirs," "Too much was at stake for me to be held back." He wrote Lord Aberdeen, the premier, Feb. 29,

"There is in truth, no lasting security against the recurrence of the barbarous practice except in a real surrender of the principle." (Id. p. 94.)

He felt upon him the impersative burden to bring the power of Islam to surrender that age-long principle. He is counted in Turkish déplomac his tory as the "Great Elchi" (ambassador), and this contest is referred to as marking the great personal power he wielded over Turkey; but he himself always felt that only God could have done the thing accomplished. Lane-Poole says:--

"On the 14th of March, 1844, Rifat Pasha presented a note containing the following promise:--

"'As the law does not admit of any change being made in the enactments regarding the punishment of apostates, the Sublime Porte will take effacacious measures, the measures which are possible, in order that the executions of Christians who, having become Mussulmans, return to Christianity, shall not take place.'

"

"This was refused as inadequate, and as reasserting a bad principle; and on the 21st, after other essays, which were contested word by word, the Pasha dispatched the final assurance referred to in the preceding extract from the Memoirs:--

"'The Sublime Porte engages to take effectual measures to prevent henceforward the execution and putting to death of the Christian who is an apostate.'" (Id. p.96)

This was to be confirmed orally by the Sultan. Then followed the interview, March 23, 1844. Canning gives the account in his "Memoirs";--

"My audience followed, and Addu-l-Mejid, performed his promise to the letter. He added that he was the first Sultan who had ever made such a concession, and was glad that the lot of receiving it had fallen on me. I replied that I hoped he would allow me to be the first Christian ambassador to kiss a Sultan's hand. "No --no" he exclaimed, and at the same time shook me by the hand most cordially. Thus ended this redoubtable negotiation." (Id., page 96.)

Before this interview, Canning had sent a note to the Turkish minister, putting on record the meaning of the declaration, and clinching its widest application. The note was:--

"The official declaration communicated by his Excellency, the Minister for Foreign Affairs shall be transmitted to the British Government, who will understand with satisfaction that the Sublime Porte, in taking effectual measures to prevent henceforward the execution and putting to death of any Christians, an apostate from Islamism, relinquishes for ever a principle inconsistent with its friendly professions; and the further assurances to be given at the ambassadors' audience of the Sultan, in the sende of the instruction presented in copy to the Porte on the 9th ultimo, will fully satisfy the British Government that Christianity is not to be insulted in his Highness' Empire, nor any one professing it to be treated as a criminal, or persecuted on that account." (Id., footnote.)

Lane-Poole says:--

"The acceptance of course vastly extended the meaning as the ambassador intended it should, and Rifat Pasha dedinitely refused to receive it. But Canning was not to be denied. Before his audience of the Sultan on the following day, he encountered the Foreign Minister and presented the note to him once more. Rifat put his hands behind his back. Then the Great Elchi (ambassador) advancing in his wrath literally thrust the paper upon the Pasha. The audience set the seal to the whole, and a revolution in Islam was thus peacefully accomplished." (Id., p.97)

It was indeed a revolution in Islam. Speaking of it, Barton says in his "Daybreak in Turkey" p. 251,-

"Two days later, Abdul Mejid, in a conference with Sir Stratford, gave assurance 'that henceforward neither shall Christianity be insulted in my dominions, nor shall Christianity be insulted in my dominions, nor shall Christians be in any way persecuted for their religion.' The giver of these pledges was not only sultan of Turkey, but he was also the caliph of the Mohammedan world. The year 1844 is memorable in Turkey and among Mohammedans for this record of concessions in the interests of religious liberty in Turkey, and for all races, including Moslems."

Dr. Goodell, American missionary, (who was then in Turkey) says that Canning.--

"declared that the giving of such a pledge by the Sultan seemed to him little less than a miracle, and that God alone could have brought it to pass." (Forty years in the Turkish Empire. p. 292.)

Canning wrote his brother on January 14 1845:--

"Our last result belongs to the deceased year. It was a great one, but little understood beyond the veil. It reads innocently -- "Renegades from Islamism to be no more put to death."-- Yet was it the first dagger-thrust into the side of the false prophet and his creed. Such wounds may widen but they never close. . . . Whenever we meet again . . . I will tell you how marvelously and providentially the whole affair was carried through." (Lane-Poole's "Life," Vol. 2, page 135.)

Whatever weight may be given to events of other years in the study of this 391 year period, during which in some special sense the Turkish power was "to slay," it is certainly striking that just 391 years after the fall of Constantinople and the Eastern empire and the full supremacy there of the Turkish power wielding the sword of Islam, there should come this remarkable surrender and reversal of the law of Islam's sword, in 1844. At any rate, 1844 is the "memorable" year in latter-day Turkish history, so far as concerns the legal Moslem attitude toward Christianity. The ninth of Revelation closes with this prophetic period of the second woe. If that period closes with the providential opening of the door of missions to the Moslem world in 1844, how closely connected in thought is the theme of chapter 10, which opens with the angel declaring "time no longer" and announcing the finishing of the gospel work at the next step in God's plan.

N. B. -- Again it should be stated that the presentation of these considerations at this time is not as a thesis to be argued for, but rather as a suggestion of evidences to be weighed in studying the matter. When we find an error as to a statement of historical fact, it may be promptly dropped; but arriving at an interpretation of a historical prophecy calls for careful study and weighing of all the evidence so as to find just where the outline of the prophetic picture appears in the history.

NOTES ON SOME YEARS OF EUROPEAN INTERVENTION

IN TURKISH AFFAIRS BETWEEN

1827 and 1856

From the point of view of the progress of the work of God in the earth, the event of 1844, opening the Moslem door, seems on the face, at least, more signal and striking than any event of 1840. In fact, it seems difficult to make 1840 stand out so conspicuously as one would like in marking the termination of a prophetic period. To Josiah Litch the convention of the Powers in 1840 and their intervention to maintain the Sultan seemed decisive, as he expected the result would be the

speedy fall of Turkey. But looking at it in relation to events before and after, it does not stand out so prominently in the history.

For years before and years after combinations of the Powers intervened in Turkish affairs, sometimes in favor of the Sultan, with his consent, and sometimes against him without consent. For example:--

1827 -- "In July, 1827, England, France, and Russia signed a treaty of London, by which they bound themselves to compel the Turk, by force, if it should be needful, to acknowledge the freedom of Greece." (Freeman's "Ottoman Power" page 183). The powers sunk the entire Turkish fleet in their handling of the matter, and of this interference with Turkey's affairs the famous Metternich said: "For Europe the event of October 20 began a new era."

1829 -- Treaty between Russia and Turkey. "Wellington declared that the Turkish Power in Europe no longer existed, and that this being so, it was absurd to talk of bolstering it up. In any case, since the Russian occupation of the principalities made Turkey to all intents and purposes a province of Russia, the integrity of the Ottoman Empire was no longer of supreme importance to England." (Phillips' "Modern Europe," p. 165.)

1833 -- "On July 8, 1833, was signed the famous treaty of Unkiar Skellisi, which, under the form of an offensive and defensive alliance between Russia and the Ottoman Empire, virtually in the words of Count Nesselrode himself, legalized for the future the armed intervention of Russia in Turkish affairs. . . . In France and England the news of the conclusion of this treaty roused immense excitement. Palmerston declared that it placed Turkey under Russian vassalage, and that, as far as England was concerned, it had no existence." (Id. p. 216.)

1840. -- "On July 3, 1840, without the knowledge of the French ambassador, was signed the convention of London, by which the four Powers, Russia, Austria, Prussia, and England, undertook to protect the Sultan against Mehemet Ali" (whose cause against the Sultan was being championed by France.) (Id. P. 228).

1841. -- "Mohammed Ali, by the treaty of 1841, was confined to his Egyptian possessions, under the suzerainty of the Sultan, the integrity and independence of whose empire was now placed formally under the guarantee of the Great Powers. The treaty of 1841 was a new and vital departure: Turkey was for the first time placed in a state of tutelage." (Turkey) Lane-Pool.)

1856. -- (after Crimean War) "The war was ended by the treaty of Paris in 1856. The terms of that treaty are well worth studying. By its seventh article, the powers which signed it, France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia, and Sardinia, declared that the Sublime Porte, - that is, the Turk, was admitted to partake in the advantages of public law and the European concert To admit the Turk was to give an European recognition to a power which is not and never can be European."

"In the same spirit and powers further engaged to respect the 'independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire,'" (Freeman, "Ottoman Power in Europe," pp 195, 196.)

Extracts read by Professor Benson. No. 3124

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS; VOL. 29, PART 2.

No. 116.

Colonel Hodges to Viscount Palmerston . - - (Received September 9).

(Extract)

Alexandria, August 17, 1840.

On the 11th instant, Rifat Bey, bearer of the demands of the Sublime Porte, reached Alexandria,. The general object of his mission soon began to be known in the city, and as the French and Russian Consuls-General had within a few days officially cautioned the merchants and residents of their respective nations, I felt that the time was now arrived to follow that example. I therefore addressed to Mr. Consul Larking the enclosed dispatch of the 11th instant, which produced the three subsequent public letters of the 12th, 14th, and 15th of August, all of which I have the honor to submit to your perusal.

Inclosure 1 in Number 116.

Colonel Hodges to Mr. Consul Larking.

(Circular)

Alexandria, August 11, 1840.

Sir,

THE resolutions which have been taken by four of the Great European Powers for the pacification of the East, the arrival this morning of a special Envoy from the Sublime Porte, and the inflexible demeanour assumed by Mehemet Ali, have inspired some doubts as to the continuance of friendly relations with the Pasha.

Inclosure 1 in Number 117.

Colonel Hodges to Viscount Ponsonby

(Extract)

Alexandria, August, 16, 1840.

On the 11th of August, Rifat Bey reached this port, and was subjected to six days' quarantine, which expire this morning. He has been lodged very commodiously in the Pasha's sea baths. Both in conjunction with my Colleagues, and alone, I have had with his Excellency several protracted and confidential interviews. We are all gratified by the very judicious choice of the Sublime Porte, whose Envoy displays those rare qualities which render him perfectly equal to the difficult mission with which he is entrusted.

Inclosure 2 in Number 117.

Colonel Hodges to Viscount Ponsoby.

(Extract)

Alexandria, August 16, 1840.

ON the arrival of Rifat Bey in Alexandria, Mehemet Ali was absent from thence on a tour of the Delta.

The Pasha returned to this city on the afternoon of the 14th instant. The same evening he was visited by the French Consul-General.

Early this morning, Rifat Bey was liberated from quarantine, and at half-past eight o'clock, A. M., he had his first audience of the Pasha. This was private, as had been arranged between Rifat Bey and the Consuls-General of the Four Powers.

It appears that the reception of the Sultan's Envoy was anything but gracious or favorable; but the results of that interview are fully related by Rifat Bey himself, in Minutes which I have now the honor to inclose.

Discouraged by his want of success, Rifat Bey at first proposed an immediate return to Constantinople; but, in conjunction with my Colleagues, I represented to him the propriety of awaiting the expiration of the first and second periods of ten days specified in the Convention, and at the termination of which it will be proper to make new and formal summonses of compliance. With these suggestions Rifat Bey has fully concurred, to console him for his recent check.

Inclosure 3 in No. 117 (Translation)

Report of the Interview between Rifat Bey and Mehemet Ali.

THIS day, Sunday, at 2 o'clock, Turkish time, His Excellency, Rifat Bey proceeded to Mehemet Ali, at his express invitation, accompanied by the individuals attached to his person, and the result of the Interview which took place between them is contained in the following lines:

No. 130.

Colonel Hodges to Viscount Palmerston -- (Received September 9)

Alexandria, August 26, 1840.

My Lord,

I HAVE the honor to enclose, for the information of your Lordship, the minute of an interview which took place this morning between Mehemet Ali and his Excellency Rifat Bey, the special Envoy from the Sublime Porte, who was accompanied by the Consuls-General of the Four Powers parties to the Convention of the 15th of July.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) G. Lloyd Hodges.

Inclosure in Number 130.

Minute of an interview on the 26th of August, between Mehemet Ali and Rifat Bey, accompanied by the Consuls-General of the Four Powers, on the expiration of the first term of ten days.

No. 190

Colonel Hodges to Viscount Palmerston. - (Received October 6.)

Alexandria, September 6, 1840.

My Lord,

YESTERDAY morning his Excellency Rifat Bey, together with the Consuls-General of the Four Powers parties to the Convention of the 15th of July, waited on Mehemet Ali in order to receive his final reply to the demands of the Sublime Porte, the Pasha being confined to his room by a painful indisposition, gave his official answer through the medium of his Minister, Sami Bey.

The details of our interview are contained in the Minute I have the honor to inclose, and of which the original was yesterday forwarded to his Excellency Viscount Ponsonby, at Constantinople. The hasty departure of His Excellency Rifat Bey, and the consequent want of his signature, prevent my forwarding to your Lordship a duplicate instead of a copy.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) G. Lloyd Hodges.

Inclosure in No. 190 (Translation)

Minute of the interview which took place on the 5th September, between Sami Bey and Rifat Bey, accompanied by the Consuls-General of the Four Powers.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS, VOLUME 29, PART I.

No. 616.

(Translation)

SEPARATE ACT

Annexed to the Convention concluded at London on the 15th of July, 1840, between the Courts of Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, on the one part, and the Sublime Ottoman Porte, on the other.

HIS Highness the Sultan intends to grant, and to cause to be notified to Mehemet Ali, the conditions of the arrangement hereinafter detailed:-

2.

If within the space of ten days, fixed above, Mehemet Ali should not accept the above-mentioned arrangement, the Sultan will then withdraw the offer of the life administration of the Pashalic of Acre; but His Highness will still consent to grant Mehemet Ali, for himself and for his descendants in the direct line, the administration of the Pashalic of Egypt, provided such offer be accepted within the space of the ten days next following; that is to say, within a period of twenty days to be reckoned from the day on which the communication shall have been made to him; and provided that in this case also, he places in the hands of the agent of the Sultan, the necessary instructions to his military and naval Commanders, to withdraw immediately within the limits, and into the ports of the Pashalic of Egypt.

Professor Prescott's translation of Gibbon's sources.

In the interpretation of the fifth trumpet of Revelation 9, we have stated that the 150 years commenced on the 27th day of July, 1299. As authority for this statement, we have quoted the following passage from Gibbon: "It was on the 27th day of July, in the year 1299 of the Christian era, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia; and the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose some foresight of the rapid and destructive growth of the monster." As his authority for this statement, Gibbon refers to the Greek Historian Pachymer. Referring to Pachymer, we find that the 25th chapter of the 4th book of his "History of Affairs from the Time of Adronicus Palaeologus" opens with the following statement:-

"On the 27th day of the month of July, in the neighborhood of Bapheum (this place is near the renowned Nicomedia), Atman with his men totaling the number of many thousands, unexpectedly appearing and making a sudden attack - but it would be better to recount this whole matter from its beginnings."

It will be observed that, although the day of the month is mentioned in this statement, there is no reference to the year in which the event occurred. This lack is supplied in a chronological Table of Contents appended to this history by Possinus, who translated this history from the Greek into Latin. In this chronological outline under the year 1299, we find the following paragraph:

"Atman the satrap of the Persians, called by others Ottoman, the founder of the house now reigning among the Turks, grows strong in power by uniting to himself numerous bands of ferocious robbers from Paphlagonia." Lib. 4, Cap. 25.

As this reference is to the book and chapter already referred to, which gives the month and day of the invasion of the territory near Nicomedia, it seems altogether likely that Gibbon jumped to a conclusion that this battle was in the year 1299. but going on further in this chronological outline, we find under the year 1301 the following paragraph:-

"About this time Atman, or Ottoman, assumed the royal name, and later having captured Prusa, placed the seat of his kingdom there. Dying later, as the Arabian chronologer Aliannabius narrates, in the year of the Hegira 726 (this is in the year of Christ about 1327), he left his son Urchan heir of the kingdom established in the recently captured city of Prusa. Pachymer mentioned the besieging of Prusa Book 5, Chapter 21, page 296, and the capture Book 7, Chapter 27."

Still further on in this chronological outline, under the year 1302 we find the following matter:-

"While the Hetaeriarque Muzzalo, leader of the Roman forces in Bithynie was striving to withstand Atman who was devastating the whole neighborhood, he was worsted, owing to the disgraceful, half-heartedness and cowardly despair of the Roman soldiers who fought without spirit, and in a manner to evidence their degeneracy. With great difficulty and by the brave assistance of the Alahi, he (Muzzalo) succeeded in withdrawing the remnants of his shattered army within the walls of Nicomedia. This defeat took place on the 27th day of the month of July in the neighborhood of Bapheum near Nicomedia." Lib. 4, Cap. 25.

It will be observed that the reference at the end of this statement is to the same book and chapter where description is given of the invasion of Nicomedia, but here it is definitely stated that this defeat took place on the 27th day of the month of July, and this, according to Possinus, would be in the year 1302.

In Baron von Hammer's "History of the Ottoman Kingdom," Vol. 1, page 74, we find the following statement:-

"Through the simultaneous conquest of these three strongholds in the last year of the seventh century of the Hegira, and the thirteenth of the Christian reckoning, the power of Osman, as ruler, was firmly grounded, and as at the same time the empire of the Seljuks fell in ruins, from this year dates the independent rulership of the family of Osman."

The date in the margin opposite this statement is 1299.

Again in the same book, page 79, we find the following matter:-

"By this Ali Umurbeg, the Lord of Kastemuni, one of the ten princes who had divided among themselves the Seljuk empire, was persuaded to break the peace that had been made with the Grecian Emperor; and stronger yet was the enticement for the more powerful Osman (Pachymeres II, B. LV, Buch 24, E. S. 230). Near Kojunhissar (the Bapheum of Pachymeres) in the neighborhood of Nicomedia, came the first conflict between Osman and Muzalo, the Hetaeriarque, that is, the commandant of the Byzantine bodyguard; and the defeat of the Greeks was the more fatal, as it left a free field for the incursions of Osman, and it was just in the time of the harvest."

The marginal date opposite this statement is 1301.

It is plain that the statement last quoted from von Hammer refers to the same battle as is declared by Pachymer to have occurred on the 27th day of July, and which is placed in the year 1302 by his Latin translator Possinus in his chronological outline.

In explanation of the disagreement between von Hammer and Possinus as to the year of this Battle, it may be stated that the original authorities used the lunar year in their reckoning, and the battle near Nicomedia, according to these authorities, occurred in the 701st year of the Hégira, the starting point of the Mohammedan chronology, A. D. 622. It is evident that in changing the lunar chronology into the solar chronology, there is opportunity for slight variation, and that von Hammer makes the 701st year to correspond to 1301 A. D., while Possinus places it in 1302.

As to the authority of von Hammer's history, the following quotation from the preface to the "History of the Ottoman Turk," by Sir Edward S. Creasy, will be pertinent:-

"Von Hammer's history of the Ottoman Empire will always be the standard European book on this subject. That history was the result of the labors of thirty years, during which von Hammer explored in addition to the authorities which his predecessors had made use of, the numerous works of the Turkish and other Oriental writers of the Ottoman history, and the other rich sources of intelligence which are to be found in the archives of Venice, Austria, and the other states that have been

involved in relations of hostility or amity with the Sublime Porte. Von Hammer's long residence in the East and his familiarity with the institutions, habits, as well as with the literature of the Turks, give an additional attractiveness and value to his volumes. His learning is as accurate as it is varied; his honesty and candour are unquestioned, and his history is certainly one of the productions of the first half of our century."

The following extract will give you von Hammer's view of the accuracy of Gibbon:-

"Who would believe, even that Gibbon himself the only historian of the first period of the Ottoman monarchy, who joins extensive knowledge of the sources and lofty criticism to sublime style and wonderful correctness of judgment, that Gibbon has committed some inexcusable mistakes which he would have avoided by consulting even superficially the Byzantines in the course of this history and particularly in earlier books. It seems to me more than once necessary to correct the philological, chronological, and geographical errors of the European readers, my predecessors, in order not to appear to sanction them by my silence."

Having now referred to Pachymer, the original authority from which Gibbon drew his information, and having consulted von Hammer, whose "History of the Ottoman Kingdom" is regarded as the most reliable work upon this subject, we are compelled to conclude that the invasion by Othman to which Gibbon refers, did not occur upon the 27th day of July, 1299, but that it occurred in the 701st year after the Hegira, which would be in 1301 or 1302. It therefore follows that we shall be unable hereafter to say that the 150 years of the fifth trumpet began on the 27th day of July, 1299.

From

HERTSLET'S MAP OF EUROPE BY TREATIES.

July 15, 1840.

IN THE NAME OF THE MOST MERCIFUL GOD.

His Highness, the Sultan, having addressed himself to their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary and Bohemia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of All the Russians, to ask their support and assistance in the case in which he finds himself placed by reason of the hostile proceedings of Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt, - difficulties which threaten with danger the Integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and the Independence of the Sultan's throne, - their said Majesties, moved by the sincere friendship which subsists between them and the Sultan; animated by the desire of maintaining the Integrity and Independence of the Ottoman Empire as a security for the peace of Europe; faithful to the engagement which they contracted by the Collective Note presented to the Porte by their representatives at Constantinople, on the 27th of July 1839; Note (Translation) The undersigned have this morning received instructions from their respective Governments, in virtue of which they have the honor to inform the Sublime Porte that the five great powers, have come to an understanding on the Eastern Question, and to prevail on her to suspend all definite determination without their cooperation.

Constantinople, 27th of July, 1839.

Baron de Strummer

Baron Roussin

Posonby

Comte de Koenigmarck

A Bonteneff

"and desirous moreover, to prevent the effusion of the hostilities which have recently broke out in Syria between the Authorities of the Pasha of Egypt and the subjects of the Sultan; their said Majesties and His Highness the Sultan have resolved, for the aforesaid purposes to conclude together a Convention, and they have therefore named as their Plenipotentaries, that is to say:

Her Majesty, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Honorable Henry John, Viscount Palmerston, Baron Temple, a Peer of Ireland, a member of Her Britannic Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honorable Order of Bath, a Member of Parliament, and the Principle Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs:

His Majesty King of Prussia, the Sieur Henry Williams, Baron de Sülow, his Chamberlain, Actual Privy Councillor, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Her Britannic Majesty, etc.,

His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary and Bohemia, the Sieur Philip, Baron de Neumann, his Aulick Councillor and his Plenipotentiary to her Britannic Majesty, etc.;

His Majesty, Emperor of all the Russians, the Sieur Philip, Baron de Brunnow, his Privy Councillor, etc.;

And His Majesty the Most Noble, Most Powerful, and Most Magnificent Sultan Abdul-Medjid, Emperor of the Ottomans, Chekib Effendi, decorated with the Nichan Iftihar of the first class, Beyhkdgi of the Imperial Divan, Honorary Councillor of the Department of Foreign affairs, His Ambassador Extraordinary to Her Britannic Majesty; -

Who, having reciprocally communicated to each other their Full Powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon and signed the following articles:

Arrangement in favor of Mehemet Ali.

His Highness the Sultan having come to an agreement with their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary and Bohemia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of all the Russians, as to the conditions of the arrangement which it is the intention of His Highness to grant to Mehemet Ali, conditions which are specified in the separate Act hereunto annexed, their Majesties engage to act in perfect accord and to unite their efforts in order to determine Mehemet Ali to conform to that arrangement;

each of the High Contracting Parties reserving to itself to cooperate for that purpose, according to the means of action which each may have at his disposal.

Measures to be adopted in case of refusal by Mehemet,

Ali. Naval Assistance by Great Britain to Turkey.

Art. II

If the Pasha of Egypt should refuse to accept the above measure, which will be communicated to him by the Sultan, with the concurrence of their aforesaid Majesties engaged to take at the request of the Sultan, measures concerted and settled between them in order to carry that arrangement into effect. In the meanwhile, the Sultan having requested his said allies to unite, and to assist him to cut off the communications by sea between Egypt and Syria, and to prevent the transport of troops, horses, arms, and warlike stores of all kinds from one province to another, their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and the Emperor of Austria, the King of Hungary and Bohemia, engage to go immediately, to that effect the necessary orders to their Naval Commanders in the Mediterranean. Their said Majesties further engage that the Naval Commanders of their squadrons shall, according to means at their command, afford in the name of the Alliance, all the support and assistance in their power to those subjects of the Sultan who may manifest their fidelity and allegiance to their Sovereign.

Defense of Constantinople by Allied

Powers against Mehemet Ali.

Art. III

If Mehemet Ali, after having refused to submit to the conditions of the arrangements above mentioned, shall direct his land or sea forces against Constantinople, the High Contracting Parties which on the express demand of the Sultan, addressed to the representatives at Constantinople, agree in such case to comply with the request of the Sovereign, and to prevent any advance on His Throne by means of cooperation agreed upon by mutual consent, for the purpose of plugging the two straits of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, as well as the capital of the Ottoman Empire, in security against all aggression.

Allied Forces to withdraw at Request of Sultan.

It is further agreed that the forces which, in virtue of such concert may be sent as aforesaid, shall there remain employed as long as their presence shall be required by the Sultan; and when His Highness shall deem their presence no longer necessary, the said forces shall simultaneously withdraw, and shall return to the Black sea and to the Mediterranean respectively.

ANNEX -- Separate Act to the Convention of 15th July, 1840.

Conditions imposed on Mehemet Ali. Withdrawal of Egyptian Troops from Arabia, Candia, etc.

The Sultan, however, in making these offers, attaches thereto the condition that Mehemet Ali shall accept them within the space of ten days after the communication thereof shall have been made to him at Alexandria by an agent of His Highness; and that Mehemet Ali shall at the same time place in the hands of that agent the necessary instructions to the Commanders of his sea and land forces to withdraw immediately from Arabia, and from all the Holy Cities which are therein from all other parts of the Ottoman Empire which are not comprised within the limits of Egypt, and within those of the Pashalic of Acre, as above defined.

Time within which Mehemet Ali is to accept Arrangement.

2. If within the space of ten days, fixed as above, Mehemet Ali should not accept the above mentioned arrangement, the Sultan will then withdraw the offer of the life administration of the Pashalic of Acre; but His Highness will still consent to grant to Mehemet Ali, for himself and for his descendants in the direct line, the administration of the Pashalic of Egypt, provided such offer be accepted within the space of the ten days next following, that is to say, within a period of twenty days, to be reckoned from the day on which the communication shall have been made to him; and provided that in this case also, he places in the hands of the agent of the Sultan, the necessary instructions to his military and naval commanders to withdraw immediately within the limits, and into the ports of the Pashalic of Egypt.

Tributes to be Paid to the Sultan.

3. The annual tribute to be paid to the Sultan by Mehemet Ali, shall be proportioned to the greater or less amount of territory of which the latter may obtain the administration, according as he accepts the first or the second alternative.

Mehemet Ali to deliver up the Turkish Fleet

4. It is, moreover, expressly understood that, in the first as in the second alternative, Mehemet, Ali (before the expiration of the specified period of 10 or of 20 days), shall be bound to deliver up the Turkish Fleet, with the whole of its crews and equipments, into the hands of the Turkish agent who shall be charged to receive the same. The commanders of the allied squadrons shall be present at such deliver

Offers to be withdrawn if not accepted within 20 days.

7. If, at the expiration of the of the period of 20 days after the communication shall have been made (according to the stipulation of Sec. 2) to him, Mehemet Ali shall not accede to the proposed arrangement and shall not accept the hereditary Pashalic of Egypt, the Sultan will consider himself at liberty to withdraw that offer, and to follow, in consequence, such ulterior course as his own interests and the counsels of his Allies may suggest to him.

Separate Act to form part of the Convention of 15th of July 1840.

8. The present Separate Act shall have the same force and validity as if it were inserted, word for word, in the Convention of this date

Done in London, the 15th/_{day} of July, in the year of Our Lord, 1840.

- (L. S.) Palmerston
- (L. S.) Neumann
- (L. S.) Bulow
- (L. S.) Brunnow
- (L. S.) Chekbb.

The arrival of Rifat Bey and Mr. Alison in the Bair-Tahir steamer from Constantinople, on the 11th instant, with the ultimatum of the Four Powers, produced a great sensation here. The Pasha was absent at Damietta (it was believed on purpose to be out of the way at the moment when all eyes would naturally be turned on his, to read the fate of Egypt in their expression), and speculation was left to indulge itself at leisure; for all other occupation amongst the commercial portion of the inhabitants was virtually at an end. Next day, (the 12th) Her Britannic Majesty's consul, Mr. J. W. Larking, called together the British merchants, residents, etc., and communicated to them the contents of a circular letter he had received from the Consul-General, Colonel Hodges, conveying in general but guarded terms, an intimation of the present critical state of things and pretty strongly hinting the necessity of preparing for the worst. This circular letter of advice was far from satisfying the deep interest and anxiety manifested by the numbers assembled to receive it, and in consequence, several leading questions were put to the Consul which, can be well imagined, were more easily asked than answered. As the subject is a very important one, and as the proceedings which immediately took place will probably be referred to, as involving a matter of serious reference, at a future day, I shall occupy the time of my readers by describing the desultory and unsatisfactory conference which occurred at that meeting, and shall proceed at once to lay before them the documents which contains the entire animus of the matter in debate, which was the result of the meeting convened next day, the 13th, by Mr. Consul Larking to receive in a proper and business like way the states representatives and prompted inquirers of the British residents at Alexandria, on the topics that all felt to be vitally important. I will add, that I never witnessed more equanimity, or heard fewer words wasted, than at this (second) meeting, in which (the first surprise being past) a number of men of Business met to demand the full information and efficient protection in the foreign land at the hands of the representatives of their own executive government.

September 7, 1840

Page 4, Column 4.

We have received by express, letters from our correspondents in Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria and Malta

Note of Rifat Bey

His Highness promises to grant to Mehamet Ali, and to be possessed by him and his descendants, in direct line, the administration of the Pashalic of Egypt, and His Highness, moreover, promises to grant to Mehemet Ali during his life-time, with the title of Pasha of Acre, and the command of the fortress of St. Jean d'Acre, the administration of the Southern part of Syria, the extent of which is to be limited by the following boundary line:-

"This line, leaving cape Ras-el-Nakhora, on the Mediterranean Coast, will extend directly thence to the mouth of the River Scillan, the northern extremity of Lake Tiberiaz, will run along the western bank of the Dead Sea, continue thence in a straight line, to the Red Sea, ending at the northern point of the Gulf of Akaba, and following thence the western coast of the Gulf of Akaba and the eastern bank of the gulf of Suez as far as Suez.

However, the Sultan in making these offers, requires that Mehemet Ali shall accept them in the space of ten days after receiving communication thereof at Alexandria through an agent of His Highness, and that Mehemet Ali shall at the same time deposit in the hands of this agent the necessary instructions for the commanders of his land and sea forces, to return immediately from Arabia and from all the Holy cities therein situated, from the island of Cadia, the district of Adana, and from all the other parts of the empire not included in the limits of Egypt and of the Pashalic of Acre as above defined."

September 7, 1840

page 3, column 2,3.
Pasha's cause, and really regards him as the liberator of his people, and the protector of the vast region over which he rules solely with the view of bestowing on

it all the benefits of civilization and independence. These Journals compare his cause with that of Greece, and on that ground they claim for him the sympathies of all the liberals, reformers, and the revolutionary spirits. But this view is completely erroneous and speedily disappears in the presence of facts. In all that he has hitherto done, Mehemet Ali has had no other object than the gratification of his own ambition. The people have never had any interest in his success; he subjects them to every sacrifice in pursuit of his personal designs. The people are therefore not with him, and there is indeed only the cry of malediction against his frightful tyranny from the depopulated kingdoms of Kordefan and Sennar and Mount Taurus. As to the parallel which some seek to draw between his revolt and the Greek insurrection, it can by no means be drawn, for never was there less analogy between two political events. In Greece the nation rose in a mass, flew spontaneously to arms, and the people choosing for themselves leaders, maintained a sanguinary contest for ten years. In Egypt, it is the Pasha alone who, in furtherance of his plans and ambitions, has forced the people by the most cruel tyranny to support a war which they do not understand, and in which they have no interest. Let Mehemet Ali replace his sword in the scabbard and it will immediately be seen that the people of Egypt and Syria have no inclination to combat for the purpose of withdrawing themselves from the Sultan's authority...

"I have abstained, as will be perceived, from touching on the political question, and have confined myself to an impartial appreciation of the actual position of Mehemet Ali; for at the moment of crises no means of enlightening public opinion should be neglected. However, I cannot close this article without frankly saying what I think of the conduct which Mehemet Ali will observe. In my opinion he knows his position too well and is too prudent to stake his all upon the present game. He will be on his guard against any rash movement of his son, and will be far from encouraging him to march upon Constantinople, especially when the blockade shall have cut off all communication between his army in Syria and Alexandria; for the army constantly requires reinforcements and succors, and

Ibrahim always needs the counsels of his father. Ibrahim, then, will be directed to fortify himself in Syria, and await the chances of events. I do not say that Mehemet will submit willingly to the ultimatum of the allies. He will probably protest against it; but when convinced by an energetic administration that he has no longer mere talk and empty threats to deal with -- when he sees that the allied cabinets have resolved in a final settlement -- when he finds himself militarily separated from Syria, where he will have to dread insurrections, as he will also have to fear hostile movements on the frontier of Upper Egypt, and the revolt of the sailors of the Turkish fleet -- he will then become more tractable and will be glad to seek through the mediation of France, some pretext which may afford him an excuse for yielding, and serve as a cover to his mortified self-esteem.

Alexandria, Thursday, Aug. 20, 1840

The Pasha is still "inflexible," and even "something more." On Monday he gave audience to Rifat Bey officially, and received the ultimatum of the four powers with his usual sang froid, declaring that he had no other answer than that he had already given, and that if the envoy pleased he would give it to him in writing at moment. This was of course declined, as the "ten days of grave" had yet to run their eventful race. In the evening the Pasha rode to Signor Gibassi's garden where he was soon joined by the consuls of the four Powers, with whom he held a very free and decided tone. They at the outset endeavored to impress him with the serious consequences that would in all probability result from his placing himself in a hostile position against the great Powers of Europe, and urged him to consider not only the risk, the expense, and the destructiveness and horrors attendant on the contest, but the folly of entering into such a war. "Gentlemen," said Mehemet Ali, "I know I am a poor feeble old man, surrounded by powerful enemies and boast of few resources. I am not therefore such a fool as to dream of making war upon them. It is for you to reflect upon the dangers and

horrors of warfare, I rest content with what God has given me, and seek for no more. But as providence has protected me hitherto amidst every danger, I shall not tremble now, for my trust in God and the goodness of my cause is as great as ever." As no impression whatever could be made upon him, the Consuls retired; and thus Monday passed.

The next morning a courier arrived at the harem with dispatches from Beyrout, bringing intelligence that the English squadron with 6,000 Albanians, 10,000 English musketry and artillery, etc., on board, were arrived on the coast of Syria, and about to land these formidable supplies to rekindle the insurrection. The effect of this news has been to aggravate the embittered quarrel beyond all possibility of amicable settlement. The Pasha is "wroth to a degree." His remonstrances to Rifet Bey and the four Consuls are energetic even to rudeness, and he characterizes in terms un pen forte the singular style of diplomacy which sends an ambassador with proposals and an allowance of ten days to consider them, having two days previously sent off men and materials to recommence the war. Rifet Bey seems to think it a capital hit, and tells the Pasha, "That's the way they do things in Europe!" The Pasha replies, "There is no man in Europe who would do such a barefaced trick but Lord Posenby!"

September 11, 1840

Page 5, Column 2.

On the morning of the 25th . . . On being waited on by Count Medem, who paid his visit unaccompanied by any person, he said:*

"I recognize the superiority and the greatness of the powers. I would have yielded to one of them singly, but I will not to the four united together. There is always a becoming way of doing things. But before I arrived in Alexandria the Consuls were endeavoring to excite alarm in the kingdom. They wanted to make the soldiers revolt. They have brought a fleet here in great haste, not knowing what my answer would be. Finally, they wished to annihilate, to extinguish me, but Mehemet Ali is not in a humor to be extinguished, even for the

gratification of the worthy Consuls. They lately said that they intended to go away; now it seems they shall remain here."

Such are the sentiments of Mehemet Ali. Those who wish to deal with him as if he were a mere commonplace man, have no right idea of his character, unfortunately much blood will be shed.

On the morning of the 26th, the Austrian, Russian, English, and Prussian Consuls again presented themselves to Mehemet Ali . . . The interval of ten days having elapsed since Rifet Bey had announced to him the treaty signed in London on the 15th of July . . . He said, "I know why you are come here, gentlemen, but I have already told you my mind on this business, and I have no other answer to give."

On the English Consul wishing to engage him in conversation, he said, "I beg you will not speak to me any more on the subject." He then bade them adieu, wishing each a good voyage.

THE SIXTH TRUMPET.

With particular reference to the hour, day, month, and year.

It is natural for us to be interested in the man who is willing to risk something. The account of Josiah Litch, in fixing the time for the downfall of the Turkish Independence as stated in Great Controversy, page 334, has always been of great interest to me in the study of the development of Advent history. It was my good fortune several years ago, to pick up a copy of his work entitled, "The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ," about 1843, published in Boston in 1838. On page 157 of that work occurs the following statement:

"When will this power be overthrown? According to the calculations already made, that the five months ended 1449, the hour, fifteen days; the day, one year; the month thirty years; and the year, three hundred and sixty years; in all three hundred and ninety one years and fifteen days, will end in A. D. 1849, sometime in the month of August. The prophecy is the most remarkable and definite, (even descending to the days) of any in the Bible, relating to these great events. It is singular as the record of the time when the empire rose. The facts are now before the reader, and he must take what disposition of them he thinks best. The sixth woe yet continues, and will till the great river Euphrates is dried up, and the seventh trumpet sounds."

The subject has always been an interesting one with me, and as I have presented the matter to my classes, and have placed in their hands the little book published two years before the events transpired. About two years ago when I first began my work in Washington, I went down to the Congressional Library in order to verify the statements which we make in some of our books in regard to August 11, 1840.

My intention was to refer my classes to the file of the "Times" in order that they might see the certainty of these matters for themselves. To my surprise I did not find the matter as I had anticipated. Instead I found the following state-

ment in the "Times" of September 4, page 4, col. 6, "That Rifet Bey reached Alexandria August 11, 1840. I also found in the same issue of September 7, page 3, col. 2,3, that Mehemet Ali was absent from the city and did not return till the 15th of August and the documents were placed in his hands on the 16th. To make sure that this was correct I read in the issue of September 11, page 5, column 2, the following in regard to the policy of Mehemet Ali:

"On the morning of the 25th, M. Larking and Colonel Hodges waited on the viceroy that they might advise him to yield as the period of ten days were about passed and the treaty was about to expire, but they found the viceroy fixed in his resolution to resist. To one of them he said; "I recognize the greatness and the superiority of the powers. I would have yielded to one of them single, but I will not to the four united. There is always a becoming way of doing things."

On the 26th, the consuls called again, the ten days having elapsed.

In connection with my further study of the matter, my attention was called to the fact that Gibbon gave July 27, 1299, according to the Julian calendar, commonly called the old style, whereas calculations for August 11, were based on the Gregorian calendar or the new style, bringing in the difference of eleven days. This did not simplify matters. In my further study of the question I came across the following statement of the German Historian, Von Hamer.

"Who would believe, even that Gibbon himself the only historian of the first period of the Ottoman monarchy, who joins extensive knowledge of the source and lofty criticism to sublime style and wonderful correctness of judgment, that Gibbon had committed some inexcusable mistakes which he would have avoided by consulting even superficially, the Bysantenes in the course of this history and particularly in earlier books. It seems to me more than once necessary to correct the phylological, chronological, and geographical errors of the European writers, my predecessors, in order not to appear to sanction them by my silence."

He (Osman) defeated for the first time near Koyounhissar in the vicinity of Nicomedia, Muzzlo, the Hetaeriarque or commander of the guards of the empower of Byzantium, and the defeat 701-1301 was all the more disastrous to the Greeks that it left the field open for the incursions of Osman at the harvest time (July 27)."

Note found at the end of the volume.

Gibbon says that the battle took place in the year 1299 but without holding any authority according to chronological tables of Hodji-Khalfa and other Ottoman sources. It should be in 1301 according to chronology of Pachymeres, published by Passinus, it should be 1302; the translation, which by the way, is perfected and agrees with the reckoning of Hodji-Khalfa, for the year 701 of the Hedgira closes only in the month of August 1301.

Vol. II, Page 329.

He (Pyrantzes) wrote a history of the facts which he had been an eye-witness; the accounts of this author on the affairs of Greece are perfectly accurate.....He must be our principle guide in the brief exposition of this portion of our history.

Note 13, page 502.

In 1449 he was sent for the fifth time to the court of Mourad.

As to Von Hammer's authority as historian of this period, I read, the following statement from page 6 of the preface to the history of the Ottoman Turk, by Sir Edward Creasey:

"Von Hammer's history of the Ottoman Empire will always be the standard European book on this subject. That history was the result of the labors of thirty years, during which Von Hammer explored in addition to the authorities which his predecessors had made use of, the numerous works of the Turkish and other Oriental writers of the Ottoman history, and the other rich sources of intelligence which are to be found in the archives of Venice, Austria, and other states that have been in-

volved in relations of hostility or amity with the Sublime Porte. Von Hammer's long residence in the East and his familiarity with the institutions, habits, as well as with the literature of the Turks, give an additional attractiveness and value to his volumes. His learning is as accurate as it is varied; his honesty and candour are unquestioned, and his history is certainly one of the productions of the first half of our century."

It is not to be wondered at if we find Gibbon is not entirely accurate in every point of his presentation of my theme. He had outlined for himself that he would write the history covering the four great periods of the Roman Empire, the barbarian invasions and the development of their kingdoms, the Eastern Empire and the Mohammedian both in Saracen and Turkish development. While he may have had superior knowledge for his task, we do not believe that he was Divinely inspired in the same, and it is certain that no other writer since his time has undertaken to write on so extensive a period.

Von Hammer had access to certain documents not available to Gibbon, and in addition, Gibbon's presentation of the subject. I will say in the language of Keith, found in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Volume 1, page 329:

"We have no quarrel with Gibbon, he flags in testimony to the truth of prophecy, only where he fails in position. I do not think it wise for us to ignore the testimony of such an authority, whatever weight he may be willing to give it, we must say that his statements of the case cannot be ignored by the careful student of history.

Connecting, as our custom is, the 150 years of Revelation 9:5,10 with the period of Verse 15, it appears to me that we are not only involving the question of historical accuracy, but that of prepared exergisis of the task.

As Brother Wakman clearly presented yesterday, there is no good reason for connecting that time period with the incoming of the Turks, when very clearly there was a 150 years period of war and desolation under the early Caliphs, terminating in the founding of Bagdad in 762. As to the kingly powers of Mohammed and his succes-

sors, the Saliphs, I quote from Sir William Muir, Annals of the Early Caliphs, p.7.

With Mohammed ceased the theocratic power which as a prophet he had exercised, but the kingly function of all Islam descended to his successors. On the close of that period of the same work, page 450. Thus with the rise of the Abbasides the uniting of the Caliphate came to an end, never after either in theory or in fact was there a successor to the prophet acknowledged as such over all Islam.

The name of Caliph, however it might survive in the Abbiside lineage or be assumed by less legitimate purposes, had now altogether lost its virtues and its significance. Bagdad, answering to its proud name of Dar al Salam, became for a time the capital of the world and the center of luxury and emporium of commerce and seat of learning."

The supremacy of the Turks over the eastern empire resulting in the killing of it politically, was established, according to Gibbon's, Chapter 67, paragraph 13, in the year 1449:

"The funeral of the late emporer 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 the father's reign. But this empress-mother the senate and the soldiers, the clergy and the 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 the absent brother. An ambassador, the historian Phranza, was immediately despatched to the court of Adrianople. Amorath received him in honor and dismissed him with gifts; but the gracious approbation of the Turkish Sultan announced his supramacy 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 Morea, escaped the encounter of a Turkish squadron, enjoyed the acclamations of his subjects,

celebrated the festival of the new reign, and exhausted by his donatives, the treasure, or rather the indigence of the state."

Calculating the time on the scale for symbolic prophecy, the year is 360 years, and the month thirty years, and the day one year, gives us 391 years. This added to the date 1449, brings us down into the year 1840. During that year the arrangements began. In 1839 by the Convention of July 27 and was brought to the termination July 15.

The object of that conference is clearly stated in the Preamble to the treaty, found in Hertzsleff's Map of Europe, page 1009.

IN THE NAME OF THE MOST MERCIFUL GOD.

His Highness, the Sultan having addressed himself to their Majesties the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Emperor of Austria, King of Hungary and Bohemia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of All the Russias, to ask their support and assistance in the difficulties in which he finds himself placed by reason of the hostile proceedings of Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt, - difficulties which threaten with danger the Integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and the Independence of the Sultan's Throne, - Their said Majesties, moved by the sincere friendship which subsists between them and the Sultan; animated by the desire of maintaining the Integrity and Independence of the Ottoman Empire as a security for the Peace of Europe; faithful to the engagement which they contracted by the Collective Note presented to the Porte by their respective Government representatives at Constantinopæ, on the 27th of July, 1839; -- and desirous, moreover, to prevent the effusion of blood which would be occasioned by a continuance of the hostilities which have recently broken out in Syria between the authorities of the Pasha of Egypt and the subjects of the Sultan; their said Majesties and His Highness the Sultan have resolved, for the aforesaid purposes, to conclude together a Convention and they have therefore named as their Plenipotentiaries, that is to say

**(Translation). The undersigned have this morning received instructions from their respective Governments, in virtue of which they have the honor to inform the Sublime Porte that the five great Powers have come to an understanding on the Eastern Question, and to prevail upon her to suspend all definite determination without their cooperation.

Constantinople, 27th July 1839.

Baron de Sturmer

Bonsonby.

A. Bouteneff.

Baron Roussin

Comte de Koenigsmarch.

When the Sultan allowed his ambassadors to sign that document in his behalf, he clearly, by that act signed away the Turkish independence, and from the signing of that document till the present time that power has been maintained solely by the forbearance of the great nations in order to preserve a balance of the powers.

In regard to the short period and whether that should be a longer time, there is some difference of opinion. The expression means seasons as well as hour, and as we find in John 5:35, where it is stated of John the Baptist that: "He was a burning and shining light; and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light."

In this development of the subject it appears to me that we have the supremacy decline and loss of independence by the Turkish nation as a landmark in prophecy. Indicating to us clearly the great fact that the sixth trumpet closes in the year 1840.

In presenting these few observations I have sought to present the matter

as developed in my study of the subject. I submit them to you for your consideration. I do not say that the last word has been said on the question, and any further light you have to present on this subject will be greatly appreciated.

The dates as well as the events are striking. It was not only the decline of the people that gave free scope to the "Germans". In the year 1911, after the storm and stress of the Revolution, and the procedure lost their path such as Greece or Palestine. A martial and military alliance prevailed along the coast which had a long tradition in the world's history. The death of Caesar, which removed the military influence and destroyed the negotiations of the future, took place on the 15th of May, 1914, and after that time the decline of the people gave free scope to the rise and progress of the "Germans". It was on the 17th of July in the year 1914 (approximately speaking after 1914) of the Christian era that the "Germans" first invaded the territory of Palestine.

On pages 1 and 2 of the above report, you will find a list of names about this particular date.

and now as to the activities of the "Germans". I have to say that they were organized, but to make the year 1914, the year of the "Germans", I must go back to the time when the "Germans" first entered Palestine.

The Invasion of the "Germans" to Palestine.

The "Germans", who were called "Germans" and who had crossed by a special route, were received "Germans" with the most honored and the best of the "Germans" which was the "Germans" in that country, without a home, and as a reward for his valor, the "Germans" gave to him the noble title of "Germans". The "Germans" was a hardhearted man who took his chief source of support.

In 1914, the "Germans" was of "Germans" and "Germans" and the next year, leaving "Germans" and of the "Germans" "Germans" to watch the "Germans" called "Germans" in 1914 "Germans".

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

in the Question By H. H. Balts. ms

The Ottoman Empire and dynasty began in 1301, possibly in 1302, instead of in the summer of 1299. Here is a statement of Keith, in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of 1832, pp 313-14, as follows:

"Of the loosing of the four Sultanies, Gibbon speaks as freely as of the first investure of the Turkish Sultan in his high office over the moslem world.

The dates as well as the facts are striking. It was not solely the decline of the moguls that gave free scope to the Othomans. In the year 1291, Acre was stormed and taken by the Mamelukes. And the crusaders lost their last inch of ground in Palestine. "A mournful and solitary silence prevailed along the coast which had so long resounded with the world's debate. The death of Cazan, which removed the salutary control that checked the depredations of the Turks, took place on the 21st of May, 1301, and from that time" the decline of the Moguls gave free scope to the rise and progress of the Othoman empire. And it was on the 27th of July in the year 1301 (erroneously stated by Gibbon 1299)" of the Christian era that Othoman first invaded the territory of Niccomedia."

(On pages 2 and 3 of Sorenson's paper, you will see what he says about this particular date.)

And now as to the beginning of the Othoman Empire, I know you are well acquainted, but to make the year 1299, the more prominent, I must go back to the time when Ertoghrul, Othman's father first entered Anatocha.

The Beginning of the Othoman Empire.

Near Kay-Jubad, the Seljuk Sultan of Iconium was one day hard pressed by a Mongol army, when suddenly Ertoghrul, with his men appeared and won the day for the Sultan. Ertoghrul, as that time was a stranger in that country, without a home, and as a reward for his valor, the Sultan gave to him the castle Eskischehr for residence. Ertoghrul was a herdsman and his flocks his chief source of support.

In 1288, Orkhan the son of Othoman was born and Ertoghrul died the same year, leaving Orthman head of the clan and lord of Eskischehr, to which the sllajk sultan added in 1289 Karajarhisar.

Lane Pool says when writing about this period, "There had been a time when the clansmen were content to feed their flocks on the hillside, to gather their honey, and weave their carpets, and lead the simple unambitious life of the shepherd: but soon they left these familiar paths for new and daring ascents. One by one they reduced the smaller chieftains of the province to obedience: One after the other they captured the outlying forts of the Greek Empire, till their power extended to Jenishehr, and they were thus almost within sight of Brusa and Nicaia, The two chief cities of the Greeks in Asia. The acquisition of so important a situation as Yenishahr was the result of craft outwitting craft. A wedding at Bilejik in 1299 was selected as a rendezvous for a number of Othmans' rivals who plotted to capture him and put an end to his power. - Lane Pool "Turkey" p. 15.

Up to the very time of this wedding, Othman drove his herds in summer into the mountains. But before doing so, it was his custom to bring his valuables in security in the Castle of Bilejik (or Belakoma in the German). There was an understanding between the owner of the Castle Bilejik and Othman that women must bring and store those goods. And according to their old custom this was done on that eventful day of the wedding. Othman warned of conspiracy by Koese Michal, the father of the bride-to-be, was a true friend of Othman. Othman arranged and planned with forty of his best and most daring men to dress and act as women, bring the goods to and store them in the castle Bilejik where the wedding was to be, and at a given sign when given, strike and kill and capture Othman's enemies. When they brought their goods they brought their weapons also. They carried their plans to success and that very day Othman took possession of the following three castles: Beljik, where the wedding was to be; the Castle Jarhiszar, and the Castle Ainegol. This event marks the beginning of the Othoman Empire. This was in the summer of the year 1299.

Othman pretended, and made his rivals believe, before the wedding, that it was his plan that from this wedding feast he would go with his herds into the mountains to spend the summer. Of this same event, von Hammer-Purgstall says in vol. 1, p. 74. This author has four large volumes on the Othoman Empire.

Es fiel in seine Hände zu selber Zeit, als sich Torghudalp des Schlosses Ainegal bemädigtigte, Durch die gleichzeitige Eroberung dieser 3 Schlösser im letzten Jahre des siebenten Jahrhunderts der Hidschret, und des 13ten der Christlichen Zeitrechnung, wurde die macht Osmans als Herrshher erst fest gegründet, und da Zugleich das Reich der Seldschucken in Trümmer zerfiel Schweibt sich von diesem Jahre die unabhängige Herrschaft der Familie Osmans her.

Translation of the Above.

At the time when Othman took possession of the Castle Belikoma (Belijik) and Jarhissar Torghudalp took possession of the Castle Ainegal, the capture of these three castles in the last year of the seventh century of the Hedgira, and the last year of the 13th century of the Christian era, established the power and reign of Othman firmly. The same year the reign of the Seljukes came to an end. And the independent reign of the family of Othman was established in this year, and is counted from this year.

The same author, Volume 1, page 75.

"So Klein began dasselbl mit dem vorletzten Yahredes dreizetmten Jahrhunderts der Christlichen Zeitrechnung."

Translation.

So small was the beginning of the Othoman Empire in the last year of the 13th century of the Christian era.

Redenbachers Weltgeschichte, p. 7447.

Osman breitete seine Herrschaft weit uber die noch græechischen Besitzungen in Asian aus und namte sich 1299 Sultan.

Translation.

Othman extended his reign and dominion far out over Greek territory in Asia, and called himself Sultan in the year 1299.

Zinkeisen has 8 large volumes exclusively on the Othoman Empire. He is an acknowledged authority, From volume 1, page 75, I copied the following:

Auf diese Weise feste Osman, im Jahre 1299 unserer Zeitrechnung oder 699 der Hedschra, zum ersten male jenseit des Tumanidsch festen Fuss. Seitdem, Scheintes, wagte, ihm Niemand mehr die selbständige Herrschaft in dem Gebiete Streitig zu machen. Welches er als Vassall des Sultans der seldschuken so treu bewahrt und durch Seine eigenen Waffen so sehr erweitert hatte. Den bald nach der Zeit, wo er die drei genannten Schloesser erobert hatte, fand auch der letzte Sultan der Seldschuken Alaeddin III unter den Trummern seines vaterlichen Reiches den Untergang. Osman konnte daher kein Bedenken mehr tragen sich seinen Nebenbuhlern gegenüber. So weit seine Waffen reichten, zum unabhängigen Herrn zu erklären, und mit der Würde eines Sultans zugleich die Anszeichen der Herrschergewalt anzunehmen." Zinkeisen, Osmanisches Reich. Volume 1, page 75.

Translation of the above.

After relating the story of the wedding and the subduing of those three castles connected with the story of the wedding Zinkeisen proceeds as follows:

"After this fashion Othman in the year 1299 of the Christian era, or 699 of the Hedgira era established himself for the first time firm on the other side of Tumanidsch. Since that time no one dare to question his independent reign in that territory any longer. Othman from henceforward no longer hesitated to make his rivals understand that as far as his power of arms would reach, he was determined to declare himself an independent ruler with the dignity and power of a Sultan."

Another paragraph on the same page.

"Für jetzt halten wir es als historische thatsache fest, dass das letzte Jahr des siebenten Jahrhunderts der Hedschra, und somit des dseizehnten unserer Zeitrechnung. Schon sehr frühzeitig von einheimischen Chronisten und Geschichtschreibern als die bedeutungsvolle Epoche der Begründung des osmanischen Reiches in Vorder Asien bezeichnet wird. Mit ihr beginnt für unsere Darstellung ein neuer grosser Abschnitt. Denn von jetzt an gewinnt die Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches mit erhöhter Weligeschichtlicher Bedeutung zugleich auch eine festere historische Begründung und ein Selbständiges Gepräge."

Translation of the Above.

For the present we acknowledge it as an historic fact, that the last year of the ⁷13th century of the Hedgira, and the last year of the 13th century of our era, were recognized very early by the native Turkish Historians and writers, as being the eventful epoch of the beginning of the Othoman Empire in Asia. With it begins a new era of great importance.

Vol. 1, pages 78 and 79. This same writer says further, -

"Der Aufstrebende Geist Osmans musste sich jedoch in seinem kleiner Reiche naturlich nur zu bald beengt fuhlen, Sein kuhner Sinn und die Verheissungen Seiner Jugend trieben ihn nach Westen hin. Allein neben der erweiterung lag ihm vor allem die Befestigung Seiner neu begrundeten Herrschaft am Herzen, und ehe er daher wieder zu den Waffen griff, sicherte er sich den Besitz der von ihm besetzten Landschaften dadurch, das er die Getreuesten seiner Genossen in den Vorzuglichsten Stadten und Bergen zu Statthaltern einsetzte. So ubertrag er gleich im ersten Jahre seiner Selbständigen Regierung, 1300 N. Chr. Seinem Sohne Urchan die Statthalterschaft von Karadschahissar und machte ihn somit zum verteidiger der Sudgrenze Seines Reiches: Sein eigener Bruder Gundesalp erhielt stadt und Gebeit von Eskischehr Aighudalp die Burgflecken Trone und Jandhissar. Hassanalp das Schloss Yarihissar, und Torghudalp das von ihm eroberte Ainegol. Biledschik uberliess er mit seinen Einkunften seinem Schwiegervater Edebali zum unterhalte seiner Schuler; Auch wies er dort Seiner Gemahliu und Seinem Yungern Bruder Alaëddin ihre gewohnliche Residenz an. Nachdem er dies alles in Ordnung gebracht hatte. Verlegte er den Sitz des Reiches von Karadschahissar nach Yenischehr. Welches er, gleichsam als Vorkampfer auf der nach Westen fuhrenden Bahn der Eroberung, sich selbst Zur Residenz auserschen hatte. Es sollte fortan die Hauptstadt seins ganzen Reiches Sein."

Translation of the above.

The conquered territory a little kingdom in itself appeared at once too small to Othman's awakened ambitious spirit. The dreams and promises of his youth drove him farther and farther westward. But before undertaking on a larger scale new

and daring conquests, he knew he must first organize and firmly establish and hold the conquered territory already in his possession. To this end he divided the territory in the first year of his independent reign 1300 A. D., among his best and truest relatives and friends as follows:

His son Urchan he gave the Governorship of Karadschahissar, and made him protect the south end and boundary of his Empire. His own brother, Gundesolp, he gave Eskischehr and all the territory belonging to it. Aighudalp he gave Jundhissar and all belonging to it. Hassanalp he gave Jarhissar, and Torghudalp he gave the Sastle Biledschik (Bilejik) with all its income he gave into his father-in-law Edeballi to support himself and his students. This too, was to be the home of his wife and his younger brother, Alaeddin. After this all was well organized and divided he removed the headquarters or capital of his kingdom from Karadschahissar to Jenischehr which was now to be the capital of his kingdom.

Another paragraph from page 81-83.

"Die erste namhafte Eroberung deiser Art, welche Osman nach seiner Niederlassung in Jenischehr machte, war die des befestigten Fleckens Koprihissar, Sudlich Von Jenischehr. Von Koprihissar aus wandte sich Osman dann sogleich nördlich, durchzog ohne widerstand die damals überdies noch durch die Überschwemmungen des Sangaris verheerten Gegenden und gelangte bis in die Nähe von Nicæa und Nikomedia Welchen Mehre Kleinere noch von den Griechen besetzte Burgen gleichsam Zur Vorhut dienten Welche sich alle ohne widerstand ergaben, während Osman selbst seinen Streifzug weiter Nadr Norden hin fortsetzte."

Translation of the above.

The first important capture made after Othman moved to Jenischehr was the castle Koprihissar south of Jenischehr. From Koprihissar, Othman's campaign was northward without much or any resistance, as far north as Nicæa and Nicomedia he went. These have several small castles on the outskirts for protection which all without resistance surrendered and allowed Othman's march to go on further northward.

And on page 83 of this same author we find the following important paragraph:

"Den ersten ernstlichen Widerstand fand er bei dem Bergschlosse Bapheum, bald auch Kujunhissar genannt, unweit Nikomedia, Am 27, Juni 1301 trat ihm hier der Kaiserliche Hateriarch Muzalo mit einem schwachen Heere entgegen, konnte aber nicht widerstehn

"An widerstand war um so weniger mehr zu denken weil das wehrlose Landvolk, noch mit der Ernte beschäftigt auf den Feldern zerstreut war und nicht einmal Zeit hatte sich zu Sammeln Unterdessen durchstreiften Osman's Heerscharen das Land in Allen Richtungen and bemächtigten sich, wo sie nichts anderes fanden, des frisch gemaheten Getreides, welches sie haufenweise ihren Pferden als Futter Vorwarfen."

Translation of the above.

The first determined resistance with which Othman met was by the mountain castle Bapheum or Kujunhissar near Nicomedia. It was on the 27th of June, 1301, when the Imperial commander, Muzalo, with a small and feeble army which could offer no resistance against the mighty forces of Othman, tried to resist him.

And to offer effective resistance was the more difficult, because it was just at the time of the harvest, and the people were all busy and scattered in their fields to gather the harvest.

Note - Instead of the 27th of June, I am sure it ought to be the 27th of July, 1301. It seems to me to be a typical error.

Here is what Von Hammer - Purgstall says on this point in vol. 1, p. 79.

"Bei Kojunhissar (dem Bapheum des Pachymeres) in der Nähe von Nikomedien, kam es zum ersten Treffen zwischen Osman und Muzalo, dem Hetariarden, d. i. dem Befehlshaber der bysantinischen Leibwachen 1301 und die Niederlage der Griechen war so verderblicher als dieselbe den Streifereien Osman's freies Feld liess, und als die Zeit der Ernte."

Translation of the above.

By Kojunhissar (the Bapheum of Pachymeres) near Nicomedia was the first

battle fought between Othman and Muzalo the Hetariarchen, that is to say, the commander of the Byzantine body guard 1301 and the defeat of the Greeks was the more destructive, because they allowed Othman a free hand, and that it hid them just at the time of the harvest.

This now is the point to be settled, was the beginning of the Othoman Empire and dynasty in the summer of 1299 or was it July 27, 1301?

I have thought it worth while to give you both the German and the English, so that you can see for yourself on which date you may settle.

To my mind the above historic facts conclusively prove that the beginning of the Othoman Empire and dynasty was in the summer of the year 1299. The month on which to settle we don't know. If we knew in which month Othman was accustomed to drive his herds to the mountains, we then probably would know the month. I have looked for information on that point, but failed to find it.

Thus all we know on this point is, it was in the summer of 1299, and all historic facts show that the event of that wedding marks the beginning of the Othoman Empire.

Has Gibbon made a mistake in stating July 27, 1299 instead of 1301?

Gibbon points to Pachymer for reference. Pachymeris is a large work, and a copy of it is in the Congressional Library at Washington, D. C. It is written in Old Greek and Old Latin, two columns on each page. I copied from chapter 25 on page 197, that portion giving the date of the month of July 27, and is as follows:

Pachymeris Caput XXV.

Clades Hetaeriarche muzalorisprape Nicomedians.

Μηνὸς καὶ Ἀνδρῆς μεῶνος εἰκοσὴ καὶ ἐβδόμη πρὸς τοῦτον Βορέα Νικομυδῆσαν / Ἐτιμὴν σμάμα τῶν ἀμὲν ἀντὸν εἰς χιλιάδας πλείσας ποσθμενοῖς ἐπισάσ αἰώνος πάλλου μὲν οὖν ἀλλ' ἀναληπτέον τὸν λογὸν ἀρχῆθεν.

X

C M Ensis siguidem Yulii die vicefima septime circa Bapheum (locus hic prope inclytam Nicomediam) Atman cum suis multorum millium numerum explantibus improvise apparens & subito irreuns.

Translation of the above.

In the month of July on the 27th day at about Bapheum (this place is near Nicomedia) Atman with his followers amounting to many thousand in number, appeared unexpectedly and suddenly attacked.

What I have copied is the very beginning of the 25th chapter. I have looked the whole chapter carefully over but have not been able to find the date of the year, probably in some previous chapter is the year given and I wish someone well versed in the Old Greek and Latin would investigate it. All date in Pachymeris is in writing, nothing in Arabic or Roman numbers. Some of the print is difficult to read. If the year could be found in Pachymeris in connection with the July date, we would know if Gibbon is right or wrong. Though I believe Gibbon made a mistake because von Hammer-Purgstall & Zinkeisen are acknowledged to be greater authorities on the history of the Othoman Empire than Gibbon, and they both say the wedding was in the summer of 1299, and the battle of Bapheum in the summer of 1301.

Now as to the position of Elder Sorenson. In his paper as you will see, he claims, or at least he tries to show that the year 1301 is the beginning of the Othoman Empire instead of 1299. He also thinks it is a difficult matter to connect the five months or 150 year period of Revelation 9:5-14 with verse 15. And that the 150 years were fulfilled by the Saracens from the time of the rise of the false prophet, Mohammed, to the founding of the Caliphad at Bagdad. Of course, it is a historic fact that about 150 years were well occupied by the Saracens in extending their dominion at the expense of others. But when we remember that from the rise of Mohammed to the rise of Othman lays a period of 667-667 years. Where then shall we properly apply the 150 years at the beginning or at the end of that long period? It also breaks the prophetic chain of Revelation 9. But does not the 11th verse of that 9th chapter give the key to the solution?--When to begin the count?

Does it not say that they had a king over them whose name is Abaddon and Apollyon?

On this point, and about the name, Von Hammer-Purgstall says in volume 11, page 77.

"Die Namen Kommen Von Himmel, Sage der Koran und deshalb prüft moslin dieselben als gute oder böse Vorbedeutung aus mehr als einem Gesichtspunkte, nicht nur aus dem Historischen, Osman heiszh nach der Bedeutung der arabischen Wurzel der Beinbrecher."

Translation of the above.

Names come from heaven says the Koran, and therefore does Moslin test them to find out if they are good or bad harbingers for more than one reason. Not only because from the historical, but also from the phylological side. The name Othman in the Arabic root means bonebreaker.

Why is Elder Sorensen mistaken on the beginning of the Othoman Empire?

The reason is simply this. There is as far as I know, no English work, except Gibbon, that explains the Turkish history in detail. The most that Sorensen has on this point is from a French work at the Congressional Library, Washington, D. C., and from Keith's SIGNS OF THE TIMES of 1832, which I have given above. And if I mistake not, Brother Lacey, during thattime of the Teachers' Institute translated from that French work, which in turn is a translation of Von Hammer-Purgotall's Work. And it seems he translated only that portion relating to the capture of Bapheum. And that it was on July 27, 1301. And it seems to me that he and Brother Sorensen concluded that that was all that was to it, overlooking the facts in the previous chapters where it is plainly stated that the beginning of the Othoman Empire and Dynasty was in the summer of 1299.

The battle of July 27? 1301 by Bapheum is recorded by Von Hammer-Purgostall, and Zinkeisen as an historic fact that Othman on that day met the Greeks in battle on a larger scale.

Here is a point I cannot understand or harmonize. It is stated by Von Hammer-Purgostall, Zinkeisen and others that the year 1299, of the Christian era, is simultaneous with the year 699 of the Hedgira era.

The Hedgira era began Friday, July 16, 622, see Gibbon, Vol. IV, p 358.

How can we harmonize it? $622 + 699 = 1321$. If you have any light on this point, please inform me.

But now let us take up the 11th of August, 1840 question. What about the real facts in this case? In our D. & R. page 486, Elder Uriah Smith writes as if it were an established historic fact what he states, and it is as follows:

"The Sultan despatched Rifat Bey on a government stramer to Alexandria to communicate the Ultimatum to the pasha. It was put into his (the Pasha's hands) and by him (pasha) taken in charge on the eleventh day of August, 1840."

When Elder A. T. Jones was in his prime he wrote very emphatically in "The Great Nations of Today," page 80-81, saying, "The Ultimatum was put into the hands of Mehemet Ali on August 11, 1840, and in support of his statement, he seems to quote from the London Morning Chronicle of September 18, 1840.

Elder Conradi in his work on the 9th chapter of Revelation, seems to be more discreet in making statements. He quotes from the Hamburger Correspondent of September 8, 1840, saying "Rifat Bey arrived at Alexandria on August 11, 1840, with the ultimatum of the Porte, but is silent as to the deliverance of it to the Pasha.

Where got Elder Smith his positive information from? I do not know.

Where got Elder A. T. Jones his information? I do know. In correspondence with Prof. Magan in 1909 over the Eastern Question. I asked him in one of my letters if A. T. Jones had copied from the papers themselves of 1840. Those things which he had given on the August 11th 1840 question, in "The Great Nations of Today."

The following is Brother Jones' answer to my question.

Omaha, Nebraska, Nov. 12, 1909.

"Your letter reached me here yesterday. Those quotations - Moniteur Othoman,

and London Morning Chronicle, I got from the original pamphlet on the "Seven Trumpets" published by our people away back, and I think it was practically a reprint of the one used in the 1844 movement on that subject, and that one of '44 was written I think by Josiah Litch at the time of the fulfillment of the prophecy in 1840. And the quotations were taken evidently from the papers themselves, just as we would take a news item from a paper today. For this reason I am sure that the quotations never appeared in any book of history nor in any other connection than that of the pamphlet on the seven trumpets as a reprint of the original one of 1840-44. The only way to verify the items would be of course, reference to the papers themselves in London, and when I was there I did not do it. I wish that I had."

(Signed) A. T. Jones.

Well, am glad to say we need not go to London to verify those statements. We can do it in the Congressional Library in Washington, D. C. where I had the privilege of doing so, and the following, I found, -

The "London Times" Friday, September 4, ¹⁸⁴⁰ 1949.

Private Correspondence, Alexandria, August 16.

"The arrival of Rifat Bey and Mr. Alison in the Bair-Tahir steamer from Constantinople on the 11th inst. with the Ultimatum of the four powers, produced a great sensation here. The Pasha was absent at Damietta (it is believed on purpose to be out of the way at the moment when all eyes would naturally be turned on his, to read the fate of Egypt in their expression) and ~~agaculation~~ speculation was left to indulge itself at leisure; for all other occupation amongst the commercial portion of the inhabitants was virtually at an end." - The London Times, September 4, 1840, page 4. col. 6.

"London Times," Saturday, September 5, 1840.

"Alexandria, August 17, 1840. I wrote to you yesterday by the Levant steamer a very long letter, (this writing is from a French correspondent) in which I recounted the events now passing in our city. I acquainted you with the manner in which the Pasha received the alleged envoy of the Porte. Rifat Bey, who is in reality the envoy of the four powers, coalesced against us. The viceroy replied that he would hasten to

forward to the Sultan a letter in reply to the one he had received from him, and then added that he was determined to reject all propositions of adjustment because they were inspired by the interested hatred which Russia and England nurtured against him."

This communication was made to Mehemet Ali in the following manner:

"The consuls representing England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, attired in their richest costumes and preceded and followed by a numerous cortège waited on the Pasha to apprise him of the wishes of their respective courts. The latter, they said, enjoined them to demand the immediate submission of the Pasha to the order of his sovereign the Sultan." The following is the substance of their speech:

"Your Highness is allowed eleven days to consider whether it behooves you or not to accept Egypt and the Pashatic of St. Jean d Acre, the former as an hereditary possession, and the latter merely for life. If, after that period, you do not make known your decision, eleven days more shall be allowed to you to return an answer respecting Egypt, the Pashatic of Acre being placed at the disposal of the sublime Porte. Thus you will have to consider in the second period of eleven days, whether you wish or not to remain Pasha of Egypt. If you come to no decision before the expiration of this delay, the powers parties to the treaty will take such measures as will secure the full rights of the Sultan."

The London Times, Friday, September 4, 1840, page 5, Column 1.

"Alexandria, August 15, 1840. He (Mehemet Ali) appears to have made up his mind which part he will take, but seems to think it beneath his dignity to be in any degree of haste to announce it, and says smilingly to inquiring friends, 'Let us first see what their proposition is. We shall hear it all on Monday.' This afternoon, (Saturday, August 15, 1840) Rifat Bey was admitted to a complimentary interview on obtaining free prat que after his brief purification, but the formal declaration of the four great powers will not be delivered until tomorrow." Tomorrow would be Sunday, August 16, 1840.

The London Times, Monday, September 7, 1840.

"Alexandria, August 16, 1840. A Turkish steamer has arrived in the City from

Constantinople with a Turkish officer, a member of the Council, and several attaches of the four allied powers, bringing the Ultimatum of the Porte and these powers . . .

"His Highness, the Pasha was absent, and returned here yesterday morning, when he was received under salutes from the fleet in the bay. (Yesterday morning is August 15th) Other communications state positively that a blockade is soon expected to take place.

"On the morning of the 16th inst the Ultimatum was communicated to the Pasha and 20 days are given him to decide thereon." London Times, Monday, Sept. 7, 1840, p. 3, col. 3.

Now, what does the London Chronicle say? Here it is.

The Morning Chronicle, London, Monday, September 7, 1840.

"Egypt, Alexandria, August 17, 1840. At length, 'The Eastern Question' seems to have reached a crisis. On the morning of the 11th a steamer of the Sultan arrived here from Constantinople, having on board Rifat Bey, on a special mission to present to the Pasha the ultimatum of the Porte, with the convention signed by the four powers. Although the envoy was not out of quarantine, and of course his communication not made until yesterday (until yesterday = August 16) Yet the object of his mission soon became very generally known here, nor would it be easy to give you an idea of the anxiety and excitement which it created. . . .

"When the envoy of the Sultan has presented the Ultimatum, he waits for ten days, that is, to the 26th for the answer of the pasha. The consuls of the four nations communicating to the pasha the convention signed at London will urge upon him the acceptance of the proposed terms. If rejected at the end of ten days, the second proposition will be made, and if that be rejected at the end of ten days, the four consuls will strike their flags and leave Alexandria....

"It was late on the evening of the 14th when the Pasha returned from an excursion he had been making up the Nile. When informed that a British ship had anchored off the palace, he took immediate precautions, ordering the gunners to remain at the batteries, through the night. In the morning, a transport was despatched with ammunition for Syria. Indeed, everything indicates an intention on the part of the Pasha to meet force by force."

The London Morning Chronicle from September 17 to October 3, 1840 is missing. No answer can be given at the Congressional Library why they are missing.

Elder A. T. Jones in the "Great Nations of Today" page 80 tries to show that the Morning Chronicle of September 18, 1840 was the paper with the proof that the Ultimatum was delivered to the pasha on the 11th of August. But it seems as if all his proof for August 11, 1840 is all his own amending. Does not the above proof it was August 16, 1840, when the Ultimatum was delivered to the Pasha?

A note showing how France separated herself from the other four great powers.

The London Morning Chronicle, Saturday, Oct. 3, 1840.

"The five powers had by the collective note which was presented to the Port on the 27th of July, 1839, by their representatives at Constantinople, declared to the Sultan that their union was assured, and they had requested him to abstain from any direct negotiation with Mehemet Ali, and to make no arrangement with the Pasha without the concurrence of the five powers, and yet her Majesty's government have good reason to believe that for many months past the French representative at Constantinople has with respect to the matters from the other four powers, and has earnestly and repeatedly pressed the Porte to negotiate directly with Mehemet Ali, and to make an arrangement with the Pasha, not only without the concurrence of the other four powers, but under the single mediation of France, and according to the particular views of the French ^{government. In France} therefore that has separated herself from the four powers and not the four powers that have separated themselves from France.

(Signed) Palmerston.

Now as to the sum of the whole matter.

1. The summer of 1299 was the beginning of the Othoman Empire and Dynasty.
2. July 27th? 1301 was the Battle at Bapheum.
3. The connection in 1449 is very simple.
4. July 27, 1839 is an important date as regards Turkish Dependence to the powers of Europe.
5. On August 5th, 1840, Rifat Bey and Mr. Alison were sent on the Government steamer Bair-Tahir from Constantinople to Alexandria, Egypt to deliver the Ultimatum to Mehemet Ali. They arrived on Aug. 11, and were put in quarentine.
6. The Pasha was purposely absent, and returned late on the 14th, which was Friday.
7. Rifat Bey had an audience with the Pasha on Aug. 15, which was Saturday at which it was arranged that the next day, August 16, which was Sunday, Rifat Bey, in company of the representatives of the four great powers, England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, the Ultimatum should be delivered to the Pasha.
8. The Ultimatum was delivered on that very day of August 16, 1840, which was Sunday. It was delivered on that day and no other, according to the London Times of September 7, 1840, and also the London Morning Chronicle of September 7, 1840.

Now what about the question, as from old to new style? The solution is very simple, and is as follows:

5 months, prophetic time	-	150 years
1 year	" "	- 360 "
1 month	" "	- 30 "
1 day	" "	- 1 "
1 hour	" "	- 15 days.
		541 years, 15 days!

These periods ended August 16, 1840. New style - 10 days from old to new style - August 6th, 1840, old style - 541 years - August 6th, 1299, old style - 15 days - July 22, 1299, old style. Was the 22nd of July, 1299, the date of the wedding at the Castle Belakoma?

If there are any points which I have not made clear, inform me and I will try to make it clear.

"In 1301, twelve years after Osman began to form his state, he fought his first battle, and came into direct contact with the Byzantine Empire. At Baphaeon, near Nicomedia, the heterarch Muzalon, with 2000 men, attempted to check a raid the Osmanlis were making into the fertile valley whose products contributed so greatly to the well-being of Nicomedia. It was midsummer, just before the gathering of the harvests. (#3) In a pitched battle, the unarmored horsemen of Osman charged so speedily and so impetuously that they broke through the heavy lines of their opponents, and the Greek commander's retreat was covered only by the opportune arrival of the Slavic mercenaries. The Osmanlis were too few in number to follow up this victory. It is hardly probable that they made any attack on Nicomedia. But they laid waste all the districts into which they ventured to enter."

(#3) Pachymeres, IV. 25, p327, says the battle was fought July 27. Jorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, i. 157, is in error in placing date June 27; Hammer, l.190, and Jorga both give year 1301. Muralt, *Chronographie Byzantine*, II.480, has this battle under 1302.

--The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire by Herbert Adams Gibbons, Ph.D. The Century Co., New York, 1916. (Dr. Gibbons was formerly professor of history at Roberts College, Constantinople) -- p 34.