

W. W. PRESCOTT 9.00 hour

"The Daily--Matthew 24"

The purpose of the reading of the following scriptures will appear as we proceed:

Daniel 9:25-27; (Reading): "Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks: it shall be built again, with street and moat even in troublous times. And after the three score and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war; desolations are determined. And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one, that maketh desolate; and even unto the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate." (Revised Version)

The last part of the 27th chapter I would like to emphasize as it is given in the Revised version: "and upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate; and even unto the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate."

It is evident from the 24th of Matthew that our Lord had in mind the Book of Daniel--not simply the general correspondence, but some definite event in that book, for he says "Let him that readeth understand."

Now when we read the 24th chapter of Matthew we find that a very dark, gloomy picture is presented. It is a way through a dark chapter, although the end is brighter. But the way through is rather a dark experience. It appears to me that the 24th chapter of Matthew--that is to say, that portion that deals with this dark experience foretold--is a further explanation of this latter part of the 9th chapter of Daniel, as it is found in the Lord's teaching. The Lord bases his teaching upon the Old Testament Scriptures, and here gives us a fuller and more complete view of some of the things bound up in the Old Testament.

Now take this portion of the 9th chapter of Daniel. Observe first the 24th verse: "Seventy weeks ~~xxxx~~ are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal^{up} the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy." That is a definite time given. Then he goes on and gives the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem; and the prophecy comprehends the time from the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem until the full end is made of Jerusalem. But he speaks of the destruction of the city and the sanctuary. "The end thereof shall be with a flood." I want you to notice this word "end" in this connection, because we shall meet it in the 24th chapter. "The end shall be with a flood." Then in the 27th verses we have these words: "and even unto the full end, and that determined shall be poured out upon the desolate."

I want to call especial attention to the ~~fx~~ thought

that that Daniel prophesies the end of the city and the sanctuary; that it should be with a flood; that even unto the full end, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate. Now that is a picture of the end of the Jewish nation, the end of the city and the sanctuary, the full end.

Let us read Isaiah ~~ix~~ 10:20-23: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that emote them; but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God. For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return: the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness. For the Lord God of hosts shall make a consumption, even determined, in the midst of all the land." Now here ~~xxxx~~ you see again the picture of the full end. You must remember that this whole prophetic field is one field, and these different prophets contributed to that whole picture under the direction of the One Mind and One Spirit. And you see here that it is the same idea that is presented as in the 22nd verse "For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return; the consumption decreed shall overflow with righteousness. For the Lord God of hosts shall make a consumption, even determined, in the midst of all the land."

That is what Daniel said: "overflowing with righteousness." It is a peculiar expression in connection with that idea of destruction. And when we bear in mind that it is the righteousness of God that is evidences in the judgment as well as in

the
salvation--that ~~it~~ is a picture this prophet brings to us--
we may sum up Isaiah's ~~promises~~ promises in three words--

Righteousness, Judgment, Remnant. And the righteousness is revealed just as much in the destruction as in the salvation. It is because of the righteousness of God that the judgment comes. It is a revelation of the righteous judgment of God. It is a revelation of his righteousness in salvation. And so this end determined is overflowing with righteousness.

Now again, Isaiah 28:14-22: "Wherefore hear the word of the Lord, ye scornful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem. Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves: Therefore thus saith the Lord, God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste. Judgment also will I lay to the line, and righteousness to the plummet: and the hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the waters shall overflow the hiding place. And your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it. From the time that it goeth forth it shall take you: for morning by morning shall it pass over, by day and by night: and it shall be a vexation only to understand the report. For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. For the Lord shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange

ask work; and bring to pass his act, his strange act. Now therefore be ye not mockers, lest your bands be made strong: for I have heard from the Lord God of hosts a consumption, even determined upon the whole earth."

Now in these Scriptures we have a double picture. You can see the idea of the end of Jerusalem is blended with the final judgment and the end of all things. That is the foundation of the principle of interpretation in Matthew 24. It is true in this case as as in all Bible study that we are not to import into the Scripture our ideas of the language, but we are to remember this principles of interpretation; that we are to take the whole field of prophecy and form our view of interpretation upon the voices of the prophets as a whole.

Now Isaiah who spoke before Daniel, speaks about the full end, a destruction and a remnant; and he carries it even beyond the Jews, and speaks of it as the destruction of the whole earth. Daniel takes it up and speaks of the full end with an overflowing flood, using the same language (the word overwhelming having the same force) He uses it specifically with reference to the end of the Sanctuary and the city of Jerusalem. Our Lord takes up the same general field about the end, and he combines both views in his prophecy. Then the Lord gives a further view from that which is given in Isaiah: that it has to do not simply with the end of the Jewish people and their nation, but the end of the world.

Now let us see a further picture. Nahum 1:6-9

"Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger? His fury is poured out like fire, and

the rocks are thrown down by him. The Lord is good, a strong hold in the day of trouble; and he knoweth them that trust in him. But with an overrunning flood he will make an utter end of the place thereof, and darkness shall pursue his enemies. What do ye imagine against the Lord? he will make an utter end; affliction shall not rise up the second time."

The prophecy of Nahum was given in the 7th century (at least for a time) contemporary with Jeremiah. His picture is a controversy against Nineveh, the capital of Assyria--the enemy of Jerusalem. In the 8th verse, speaking of this indignation--this fierceness of God's wrath--he mentions it as an "overrunning flood". That is the same picture: "an overflowing flood" "he will make a full end." The next verse says "He will make an utter end; affliction shall not rise up a second time." The end of Assyria --his enemies-- is a limited picture of the final destruction the Lord will bring upon his enemies the wicked at the end of the world.

Now when our Lord takes up his prophecy--when they asked him when would be the end of the world--he takes up this double picture. That is the basis upon which this prophecy rests--the picture that the prophets give us in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and those other prophets where you see them speaking of an end of the enemy of the Lord.

Now let us read Revelation 1:1-3: "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John. Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of

this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand."

958

This prophecy is very specifically spoken of as the "Revelation of Jesus Christ" God gave it to him, and he acknowledges the Father as the source of it. But he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John. And in a very general sense this prophecy is a prophecy of our day.

Now Revelation 22:16 : "~~xxxxxxx~~ "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches." I have been struck with the parallel between the statement in Matthew 24:3 ("As he sat upon the mount of Olives the disciples came unto him and said 'tell us when shall these things be.')" and the verse 16 of Rev. 22: "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches." The disciples came to him privately and asked him when these things should be and when the end of the world would occur; and he told them. The revelation was for the church, his believers, his disciples; then they could give it to the world. But he told it to the believers.

Now I want to call attention to a specific point of the parallel: Matthew 24:14 "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." Now this was a very definite prophecy of something that was to mark the coming of the end. That end is primarily (in point of time) referred to by the prophet Daniel: the "full end" "that determined shall come." Secondly, the end that is referred to by Isaiah and by Nahum as the end when the judgments shall come that will bring about the final end of sin.

6th

Now read the ~~xxth~~ verse of Revelation 14: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people. . . . (14th verse) And I looked, and behold a white ~~xxsidx~~ cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle." In Revelation 14:6-14 we are dealing simply with the greater fulfillment of that prophecy. And when that final proclamation of the gospel is made to every nation, kindred tongue and people, then you see the Lord coming in the clouds, just as Matthew 24 ends.

From ~~xxixxx~~ these considerations I think it is clear that the prophecy of Matthew 24 ~~xxxxxxx~~ is a continuous prophecy. It is evident Christ is answering the question of his disciples concerning the destruction of the temple. It is quite easy to think that when he said (speaking about the temple) "there shall not be left one stone upon another" that they must have thought he meant the end of the world. So they said, "When shall ~~be~~ these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world." He answered them by carrying them right down through, first, to the very things ~~xxx~~ he had been speaking of in the 23rd chapter. Let us turn to this chapter and see where they have been mentioned. Here you have a sevenfold woe upon the people of that generation. The fullness of woe in a sevenfold utterance against the people of that day. Now see how it closes (32 verse) "Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell." That is the most

severe language we find in the scriptures perhaps dealing with the situation at that time. Now it goes on: "Behold your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

"O, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them ~~xxxxx~~ which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. ~~xx~~ Behold your house is left unto you desolate." The temple was the center of the nation religiously. Their whole history depended upon ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ the temple and its worship. When they recognized the presence of Christ in the ~~xxx~~ worship of the temple they were preserved from their enemies; but when they left him out of the account and turned their religion into mere formalism, legalism and ceremonialism as a means of salvation in itself, they shut him out from the temple, ~~xxx~~ and then no matter about the architectural glory and embellishment of the temple it was a desolate house, because the glory of the Lord was not there. If they had not shut out from their worship the Christ whom these things all represented, they would not have rejected him when he appeared in the temple of his body.

Therefore their house was left desolate, and his going out of the temple that day was the sign of ~~xxx~~ of the departure of the glory of God from them.

Luke 19:41-- "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou

at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace!
but now they are hid from thine eyes " It was not for lack of
revelation that they did not know the time of ^{his} ~~their~~ visitation.

The very definite time had been revealed; the definite place
of his birth had been revealed. The whole life ~~xxxx~~ can be
traced of Jesus in the Scriptures before his advent. But it
was because they knew not the Scriptures after all
that they ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{knew not} the Messiah, and rejected him when he came.

Now the cause of the downfall of the city of Jerusalem and the
downfall of their sanctuary, was that they knew not the time of the
coming of Him who was the glory of the temple. The downfall of
the world, the end of the world, the end of all things will come
because the people in this generation know not the time of their
visitation in the second advent. The prophecies concerning the
first Advent were perverted, misapplied. The whole idea of
the first advent was perverted, and perverted by the men of that
day to make themselves the center, ~~af~~ in stead of to glorify Him.
They wanted to make the Messiah serve them instead of their
serving Him. This was absolutely contrary to the principles of
his Kingdom. Such a perversion made them reject the Lord when he came
in spite of the revelation he made of himself in his works while
on earth. And because they rejected him that brought an end to
their sanctuary and city. Very definitely was this referred to when
the high priest said at the ~~skam~~ climax of his mighty works,
when he raised Lazarus from the dead, which should have convinced
them he was the Messiah. All the people were drawn after him,
and left the ~~xxxxxx~~ ceremonial worship of the nation. The elders
saw they were losing their hold on the people, and they were

determined to put him to death. It was then that the high priest uttered that prophecy, that "it was expedient that one ~~xxx~~ die for the people"; and their carrying out the plan to put him to death was the very thing that brought the "full end" "and that determined", and the Romans came and took away their place. The Romans made an end of their city and sanctuary because they rejected Him who was the glory of the sanctuary; because they had perverted all the scriptures relating to Christ in order to make him serve to exalt them rather than they should be his servants and exalt him. They purposed to use him for temporal glory rather than to have him use them for spiritual glory.

The same picture is before us today: the effort to reform the world and make it straight without Christ; the effort to establish a government upon earth that shall reveal the kingdom of God upon earth, and leave Christ out of the account. We are facing exactly the same picture that they faced at that time.

Now because of that, Christ's prophecy in the 24th chapter of Matthew serves a double purpose. It was directed right to that time, and in answer to that question about "these things," namely, the sevenfold woes of the 23rd chapter which he said was to come upon this generation. But that generation was a picture of the last generation. The generation mentioned in the 23rd chapter is a picture of the generation mentioned in the 24th chapter. That is ~~xxx~~ why I feel we must put these two chapters together because here is where we get the spirit of interpretation.

The same sign of the end is to be given in this generation: the preaching of the ~~xxxxxx~~ gospel ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ of the kingdom. Therefore one of the greatest signs for this generation, is this message to the world (amens): "And this

gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a testimony unto all nations, and then shall the end come." Now that had a definite application after the first advent, when as Paul records in the first chapter of the Epistle to the ~~xxxxxx~~ Colossians the gospel had been preached to every creature under heaven. It was down in the generation whose fathers stood up and said, "His blood be upon us and on our children."--the generation upon whom these fearful woes fell--that this gospel was to be preached. Before the curse was to fall they were to be given individually an opportunity to accept the gospel, although they were doomed as a nation. And when you think of the destruction of Jerusalem, when you think of the experiences through which they passed --how they ate their children in the straitness of the siege--our minds almost revolt from such a picture. But they had called this down upon themselves: "His blood be upon us and upon our children. But before that curse was carried out they and their children had the gospel of the kingdom preached to them.

Therefore I say that inasmuch as Christ had gone through this list of signs, pressing right down through what happened to the final sign, the preaching of the gospel to the world--because he would not bring these fearful woes upon the people who had called the judgment upon themselves, until the children had the gospel preached to them--so this gospel of the kingdom must be preached to every creature in this generation that they may individually be given an opportunity to escape the punishments that are to come upon the wicked at the end of the world.

After the intermission, during which the pictures of the delegates were taken, Prof. J. N. Anderson was called upon to present his part of the discussion of the seven trumpets. He presented his paper as follows:

AN INQUIRY INTO THE INTEGRITY OF THE DATE OF JULY 27, 1299.

In common with the leaders of the 44 movement we hold that the five months period of Rev. 9:5, amounting to 150 literal years, began July 27, 1299. Then as now that interpretation was made to rest on the statement of Edward Gibbon, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," in which he says, "It was on the twenty-seventh of July, in the year 1299 of the Christian era, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia." Othman was the founder of the Ottoman Empire, and this is the date and this the event that mark the beginning of the power that is now all but extinct.

Recent research on the part of some has led to the conclusion that Gibbon is in error in regard to this date, and that therefore his statement cannot be made to support the interpretation we have given the verse in question. This question of the integrity of the historian Gibbon is the real crux of the whole matter historically, as regards the subject of the seven trumpets. And it is to the discussion of this point that your attention is now invited. The facts that I am now about to submit to you are not the result of my own study, ~~my~~ but of one of our advanced students in Union College who prepared a paper on the beginnings of the Ottoman Empire. This paper was ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ prepared for the class in Revelation, but in collaboration with the heads of three departments of the college who serve as the library committee.

I shall read only that part of the paper that bears directly on

the point of the founding of the Ottoman Empire, since it is here that our problem lies.

A FEW STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE ORIGIN

AND

EARLY HISTORY OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

"Who were the people that took upon themselves the name of Osman, their chief, and whom we must, from the moment of their first encounters with the Byzantines, clearly distinguished from the other groups of Anatolian Turks that had gathered around other leaders? Did they, at the beginning of Osman's career, have any distinct national consciousness? Did they have any past? Did they start the foundation of a state with a definite goal before them? Was there any other cause for their amazing growth and success than the mere fact that they had the most fortunate geographical position on the confines of a decaying empire?"--H. A. Gibbons, page 19.

~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ This is a much disputed question that has not been settled nor agreed upon by the different historians. The main trouble is the lack of substantial evidence. Gibbons says, "There are no Ottoman sources to which the historian may go for the origin of the Ottoman people and royal house or for their history during the fourteenth century. They have no written record of the period before the capture of Constantinople."--H. A. Gibbons, page 18.

[At this point Professor Anderson explained that Herbert Adams Gibbons is a present-day writer, and that his book is entitled "The Foundations of the Ottoman Empire," put out after four ~~xxx~~ years' residence in Constantinople, during which time he gathered a large amount of valuable information. The book is published by The Century Company, of New York.]

It is thought by some that Osman was a prince of royal blood. By others that he was the son of a Tartar shepherd, called Zich. Still others that he began his career as a vassal of Alaeddin III., Sultan of Iconium (Konia). But a widely accepted theory of Osman's immediate ancestors is given by Neshri, and related by Gibbons. It reads as follows: "In the year of the Hegira 616, 'because there was no more rest to be found in all Persia' for the Turks who had been forced out of the Khorassan by the approach of Djenghiz Khan, 'all the wandering Turks, fifty thousand families, followed their leader, Soleiman Shah, and set out for Rum. Then it was Alaeddin I., son of Kai Kosrew, the builder of Konia, entered upon the rule of Rum. These fifty thousand nomad families journeyed several years in the neighborhood of Erzerum and Erzindjian, changing from winter to summer quarters and plundering the unbelievers who lived there. But . . . finally . . . Soleiman Shah marched again towards his homeland, with the intention of passing through the district of Aleppo. As they came to the neighborhood of Djaber, they wanted to venture across the Euphrates. ~~Sax~~ Soleiman Shah drove his horse into the river to seek a ford. The bank was rocky, so the horse slipped and fell into the river with ~~Sax~~ Soleiman Shah. His end was regarded as a warning (decision) of ~~ax~~ destiny: it appeared to be the command of God. . . . A part of these Turks remained to dwell there. . . . There was adivision among the followers of Soleiman Shah. Some of them, who now carry the name of Turcomans of Syria, went into the wilderness. Others went toward Rum, and became ancestors of the nomad tribes who still wander in Rum.

'Soleiman Shah at his death left four sons: Sonkur Tigin, Gundogdu, Ertogrul, the champion of the faith, and Dondar. Some of the Turks followed these four brothers, turned themselves again in

the direction of Rum, and came to the . . . source of the Euphrates. While Ertogrul and Dunder remained there with about four hundred nomad families, the two other brothers turned back again to their homes.' Ertogrul marched farther into Rum, and settled near Angora at the foot of Karadjadagh. From there he wandered to Sultan Oejoenu.

Neshri now tells a story which is repeated by later Ottoman historians as a fact. Neshri says that he heard this from a ~~fixated~~ "trustworthy" man, who had heard it from the stirrup-holder of Orkhan, who, in turn, had heard it from his father and his grandfather. This is worthy of mention, for it is one of the very few instances where an Oriental historian has taken the trouble to connect his facts with what might be termed an original source:

'As Ertogrul, with about four hundred men, was marching to Rum, Sultan Alaeddin was engaged in a fight with some of his enemies. As they drew near, they found that the Tartars were on the point of beating Sultan Alaeddin. Now Ertogrul had several hundred excellent companions with him. He spoke to them: "Friends, we come straight upon a battle. We carry swords at our sides. To flee like woman and resume our journey is not manly. We must help one of the two. Shall we aid those who are winning or those who are losing?" Then they said unto him, "It will be difficult to aid the losers. Our people are weak in number, and the victors are strong!" Ertogrul replied, "This is not the speech of bold men. The manly part is to aid the vanquished. The prophet says that he shall come to the helpless in time of need. Were men to make a thousand pilgrimages, he finds not the reward that comes to him when at the right moment he turns aside affliction from the helpless!" Thereupon Ertogrul

and his followers immediately grasped their swords, and fell upon the Tartars . . . and drove them in flight. When the Sultan saw this he came to meet Ertogrul, who dismounted, and kissed the Sultan's hand. Whereupon Alaeddin gave him a splendid robe of honour and many gifts for his companions. Then gave he to the people of Ertogrul a country by name of Sugut for winter and the mountain range of Dumanij for summer residence. From this decidee one rightly that the champion of the faith, Osman, was born at Sugut. Then was Karadja Hissar, like Biledjik, not yet captured, but was subject to Sultan Alaeddin. These were three districts.'

Some time later, Ertogrul, acting as commander of the advance guard of Alaeddin's army, defeated a force of Greeks and their Tartar mercenaries, in a three day's battle, and pursued them as far as the Hellespont. Ertogrul's force consisted of four hundred and forty-four horsemen, which he commanded in person. After this battle Alaeddin bestowed upon Ertogrul as fief the district of Eski Sheir, comprising Sugut on the north, and Karadja Hissar on the south, of Eski Sheir. Karadja Hissar was reported captured after an elaborate siege and assault by Ertogrul when he first came into the country. But it is again mentioned as one of the first conquests of Osman from the Christians after his father's death. None of the Ottoman historians records any progress of conquest during the long years of Ertogrul's peaceable existence. When he died, in 1286, Osman was thirty years old. He gave to his son less than the Ottoman historians claim was his actual grant from Alaeddin I. If their own records of Osman's conquests ~~xxx~~ after 1289 are correct, we must believe that his tribe possessed only Sugut and a portion of the mountain range lying directly west. When Ertogrul died, they had

no other village--not even a small mountain castle."--H. A. Gibbons,
pages 19-22;

(Von Hammer and Creasy practically tell the same story.)

Osman or Othman is regarded as the founder of the Ottoman Empire. He became the ruler or emir of his tribe at the death of his father in 1288. He and his people were still a part of the Seljukian Empire: Von Hammer says that Alaeddin III. gave him a portion of territory which bordered on the Byzantine Empire. Osman is called the "frontier defender." (Von Hammer, p. 71.) From this time we see Osman organizing his band, and making raiding expeditions. There is one tradition that should be mentioned here that might serve to explain why this aggressive policy was adopted by this small people.

"Osman once passed the night in the home of a pious Moslem. Before he went to sleep his host entered the room, and placed on a shelf a book, of which Osman asked the title. 'It is the Koran,' he responded. 'What is its object?' again asked Osman. 'The Koran,' his host explained, 'is the word of God, given to the world through his prophet Mohammed.' Osman took the book and began to read. He remained standing, and read all night. Towards morning he fell asleep exhausted. An angel appeared to him and said, 'Since thou hast read my eternal word with so great respect, thy children and the children of thy children shall be honored from generation to generation.'

In Itburnu, a village not far from Wski Sheir, and also not far from Sugut, lived a Moslem oadi, who dispensed justice and legal advice to those of his faith in that neighborhood. He had a daughter Malkhatun, whose hand was demanded in marriage by Osman. But the Sheik Edebali, for a period of two years persisted in refusing to give his consent to this union. Finally, Osman, when sleeping one night in the home of Edebali, had a dream.

He saw himself lying beside the sheik. A moon arose out of the breast of Edeballi, and, when it had become full, descended and hid itself in his breast. Then from his own loine there began to arise a tree which, as it grew, became greener and more beautiful, and covered with the shadow of its branches the whole world. Beneath the tree he saw four mountain ranges, the Caucasus, the Atlas, the Tarsus, and the Balkans. From the roots of the tree issued forth the Tigris, the Euphrates, the Nile, and the Danube, covered with vessels like the sea. The fields were full of harvests, and the mountains were crowned with thick forests. In the valleys everywhere were cities, whose golden domes were invariably ~~xxxxxxx~~ surmounted by a crescent, and from whose countless minarets sounded forth the call to prayer, that mingled itself with the chattering of birds upon the branches of the tree. The leaves of the tree began to lengthen out into sword blades. Then came a wind that pointed the leaves towards the city of Constantinople, which, situated at the junction of two seas and of two continents, seemed like a diamond mounted between two ^peaphires and two emeralds, and appeared thue to form the precious stones of the ring of a vast dominion which embraced the entire world. As Osman was putting on the ring he awoke.

When this dream was told Edeballi, he interpreted it as a sign from God that he should give his daughter to Osman in order that these wonderful things might be brought about for the glory of the true faith. So the marriage was arranged.--H. A. Gibbons, pp.23,24.

This dream is given by Von Hammer on page 67, and by Creasy on pages 6 and 7.

Gibbone thinks that Osman and his tribe, when they settled at Sugut, must have been pagans.

"It was the conversion of Osman and his tribe which gave birth to the Osmanli people, because it welded into one race the various elements living in the northwestern corner of Asia Minor. The new faith gave them a raison d'etre. This conversion, and not the disappearance of the Seljuks of Konia, is the explanation of the activity of Osman after 1290, as in sharp contrast with the preceding fifty years of easy, slothful existence at Sugut.

Ertogrul and Osman, village chieftain at Sugut, had lived the life of a simple, pastoral folk, with no ambition beyond the horizon of their little village. No record exists of any battle fought, or any conquest made. Turks had already made their appearance in raids against the coast cities of Asia Minor, upon the islands of the Aegean Sea, and even in the Balkan Peninsula. But they were not the Turks of Osman. Until the students of the later Byzantine Empire, and of the Italian commercial cities in their relations with the Levant, make a clear distinction between Turk and Osmanli, there will always be confusion upon this point. Ertogrul had about four hundred fighting men. There is no reason to believe that Osman had more. His relations with his neighbors were those of perfect amity. There is no question of believer and unbeliever.

Suddenly we find Osman attacking his neighbors and capturing their castles. During the decade from 1290 to 1300 he extends his boundaries until he comes in contact with the Byzantines. His four hundred warriors grow to four thousands. We begin to hear of a people called, not Turks, but Osmanlis, after a leader whose own name first appears at the same time as that of his people. They are foes of Greeks and Tartars alike. They are definitely allied to Islam. They possess a missionary spirit and a desire to proselytize such as one always finds in new converts. Their unity among themselves, and their

distinctively different character from that of the other Turks of Asia Minor, becomes, during the first sixty years of the fourteenth century, so marked that Europe is forced to recognize them as a nation. Being more in the presence of Europe than other groups of Asia Minor, the Europeans begin to call them simply Turks, and to take them as representing all the Turks of Anatolia.

. . . One of the principal tasks of this book is to correct the fundamental misconception of the foundation of the Ottoman Empire, which has persisted to this day. It seems to be a pretty generally accepted idea that the Osmanlis were a Turkish Mâslem race, who invaded Asia Minor, and, having established themselves there, pushed on into Europe and over through the Byzantine Empire. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The Osmanlis were masters of the whole Balkan peninsula before they had subjugated Asia Minor as far as Konia!

Osman and his people have no history until they come in contact with the Byzantines. The Ottoman chroniclers, and the Byzantine and European historians who have followed them, give at some length the early conquests of Osman. But the accounts are fantastical, obscure and frequently contradictory. It is the story of a village chieftain, who succeeded in imposing his authority upon his neighbors over an increasingly wider area, until a small state was formed. But it is not the same story as that of the other emirs who built up independent states in the old Seljuk provinces. For Osman founded his principality in territory contiguous to Constantinople, and by attacking and conquering the last fragments of the Byzantine possessions along and in the hinterland of the Bosphorus and the Sea of Marmora. Osman's opponents were all Christians. Had he attacked

his Turkish neighbors first, had he gone south and east instead of north and west, in building up his state, there would never have been a new race born to change the history of the world."--H. A. Gibbons, pages 29-32.

The beginning of the fourteenth century dates the beginning of a new area [?] for the Ottoman tribe. In 1300 Ottoman controlled a small territory whose four corners were: "Southeast, Eski Sheir; southwest, the eastern end of Mt. Olympus; northeast, the junction of the Kara Su and the Sangarius; northwest, Yeni Sheir. In 1299 Osman took up his residence in Yeni Sheir."--H. A. Gibbons, page 32.

Yeni Sheir was on the frontier between the Ottoman territory and the Byzantine Empire. At the beginning of the fourteenth century we find the territory of the Byzantines reduced to a small portion in the northwest corner of Asia Minor. They "retained Philadelphia, Brusa, Nicaea, Nicomedia, and the districts in which these cities were located--a narrow strip along the Hellespont, the Sea of Marmora, and the Bosphorus. Asia Minor, without even a semblance of centralized authority, was to him who could gain and who could hold."--H. A. Gibbons, page 13.

A few statements will be noted in regard to the rulership of Osman and the independent sovereignty of his people. "Durch die gleich zeitige Eroberung dieser drey Schloesser in letzten Jahre des siebenten Jahrhunderts der Hidschret, und des dreyzehnten der christlichen Zeitrechnung, war wurde die Macht Osmans als herrscher erst fest gegrundet, und da zugleich das Reich der Seldschuken in Truemer zerfiel, schreibt sich von diesen Jahre die ~~unabhängige~~ unabhängige Herrschaft der Familie Osman's her."--Von Hammer, p. 74.

(Osman captured these three castles in the last year of the seventh century of the Hegira, and the last year of the thirteenth century of the Christian era. This victory was the blow that put a final end to the tottering Seljukian Empire, and at the same time established Osman as the ruler of his people. The Osman family date their independent rulership from this year.)

"So klein begann dasselbe mit dem vorletzten Jahre des dreyzehnten Jahrhunderts der christlichen Zeitrechnung; anderthalb Jahrhunderte verflossen, bis es durch die Eroberung Constantimpe erst vollkommen fest gegründet ward."--Von Hammer, page 75.

(In the preceding paragraph Von Hammer describes the Ottoman possessions as scarcely a day's journey in length. The translation of the above statement follows: So small was its beginning in the last year of the thirteenth century of the Christian era, one and a half centuries went by, till, through the capture of Constantinople it became thoroughly and fully established.)

H. A. Gibbons says, "In 1299 Osman took up his residence in Yeni Sneir."

"Das Osmanische Reich war mit Unbeginn des drenzehnten Jahrhunderts christlicher Zeitrechnung, d. i. des achten der Hildschret (7) gegründet, die Geschichte aber der unmittelbaren Altvorden Osman's, des Grunders, hebt mit der seines Grossvaters Suleiman, un mit der Auswanderung seines Stammes von Osten nach Westen, gleichzeitig mit Dschengif-Cahn, fast ein ganzes Jahrhundert fruher, an."--Von Hammer, page 81. (The Ottoman Empire was founded in the beginning of the thirteen year hundred, fourteenth century, or the beginning of the eighth century of the Hegira. The story of the immediate ancestors of Osman, the founder, began with his grandfather Suleiman, with the

emigration of his tribe from the east to the west, contemporary with Daohengis-Chan, almost a century earlier.)

H. A. Gibbons gives the date of this emigration in the year 616 of the Hegira or A. D. 1219.--H. A. Gibbons, page 19, note.

Nelson's encyclopedia gives the date of the independent power of the Ottoman Empire as 1301.

Creasy says Von Hammer divides the history of the Ottomans into five divisions. In regard to the first period he makes the following quotation, "The first period consists of a hundred and fifty years of rapid growth, from the assumption of independent sovereignty by Othman to the consolidation of the European and Asiatic conquests of his house by the taking of Constantinople."--Gibbon's Rome, page 226, Vol. 6.

The first battle between the Ottomans and the Greeks took place 1301. Edward Gibbon makes the following statement: "It was on the twenty-seventh of July, in the year 1299 of the Christian era, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia."--(H. A. Gibbons, page 34) He quotes Pachymeres as his authority. H. A. Gibbons, in quoting the same author, puts the date of the same battle in 1301. His statement follows: "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 two thousand 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 mid-summer, just before the gathering of the harvests. In a pitched battle, the unarmoured horsemen of Osman charged so speedily and so impetuously that they broke through the heavy line of their opponents.

BPF

32

7-17

and the Greek commander's retreat was covered only by the opportune arrival of Slavic mercenaries. The Osmanlis were too few in number to follow up this victory."--H.A. Gibbons, page 34.

To explain the reason of this discrepancy between the two historians the following letter is cited:

5518 Dorchester Ave.,

Chicago, March 15, 1919.

State Library of Nebraska, Lincoln,

Gentlemen:

The Librarian of the University of Chicago has referred to me the attached letter. The following is the result of the investigation:

Pachymeres (De Andronico Palaeologo, Bk. IV, Chap. 35) recounts the defeat of the Romans fighting for the Greek Emperor Andronicus by the "Persians" i. e. the Ottomans near Nicomedia and dated it July 27. The year is not given, as the system of dating used by us was not yet introduced into Greece from the Western (Roman) empire. The chronology employed by Gibbon and other recent writers on the period is based on a Latin work, Chronologus, by Petrus Possinus, a Jesuit scholar writing at Rome about 1650. He constructed a chronological table for the events chronicled by Pachymeres, using as evidence eclipses of the sun or moon described by the historian and dated by astronomers, Arabian and Ottoman records, which were dated from the Hegira, or documents written by the Latins dated by the Christian system.

The date of the event in question is inferred from the following circumstances: Possinus was able to establish by a Latin document that Andronicus formed an alliance with the Roman general Ronzerius in the last months of 1392. Surmising that he was driven to this by a series of reverses, one of the last of which was the defeat by the

"Persians" (Ottomans) under Atman on July 27, Possinus placed this event in 1302. H. A. Gibbons in his 1916 edition of the "Foundation of the Ottoman Empire" evidently preferred to put it back to 1301. The earlier editions (works) give 1299, the year in which Possinus put the assembling by Atman of the marauders who later won the battle referred to. The authority of Possinus thus points rather to 1301 than to 1299 for the battle near Nix Nicodemia (?).

Edward Gibbon in writing the work seems to have thought it more probable that the battle immediately followed the collection of the force than that it was the immediate occasion of the alliance between Andronicus and Ronzerius. I should be inclined to agree with the 1916 edition and place the battle in 1301 or even in 1302.

Hoping this will satisfy your inquirer, I am

Yours truly,

John W. Taylor,
Dept. of Greek, University of Chicago.

By the way of summary the following quotations are subjoined.

"One of them, Othman, proclaimed himself independent at the end of the thirteenth century, and took the title of Sultan, or padishah."--Catholic Ency. Vol. XV, Sub. "Turkish."

"Osman captured three castles in the last year of the seventh century of the Hegira, and the last year of the thirteenth century of the Christian century. This victory was the blow that put a final end to the tottering Seljukian Empire, and at the same time established Osman as the ruler of his people. The Osman family date their independent rulership from this year."--Von Hammer, page 74.

(Ger. ed.)

Gibbons says, "In 1300 he (Osman) had succeeded in submitting to his authority a part of ancient Phrygia Epictetus and Bithynia, whose four corners were: southeast, Eski Sheir; southwest, the eastern end of Mount Olympus; northeast, the junction of the Kara Su and the Sangarius; northwest, Yeni Sheir. In 1299 Osman took up his residence in Yeni Sheir. This was the outpost of his principality, in a position of extreme importance, about half way between Brusa and Nicaea."

In his chronological tables, under the main heading: Important events in the First Century of Ottoman History, Gibbons lists the first events as follows: 1299--Osman, Turkish emir in the valley of Kara Su, makes Yeni Sheir, between Brusa and Nicaea, his residence.

BOLDMAN: It seems to me, as our time is getting short, we would economize time by letting Brother Prescott continue the presentation. I therefore move that we invite him to continue his presentation.

Seconded.

PRESCOTT: I cannot agree to that because one presentation a day and all the discussion on it, is all I can stand.

E.R. PALMER: I wish to bring before the Convention,---. I don't want to take much of your time but I want to apologize at least for the rather radical thing that we did during the war period in dealing with "Bible Readings" and perhaps that will get one point before us in a little more concrete form.

I don't know that we have had much difficulty over this question of the United States in Prophecy, although it is well known that there has been some embarrassment in presenting the question outside of the United States, especially, and some of our brethren here in the United States have felt that we limited the scope subject too much to this country and that the second beast of Revelation 13 should be given a greater scope. And I notice it is referred to here in this convention as apostate Protestantism laying hold primarily of the Government of the United States and reaching out to all the governments of the earth the same as the Papacy did back there ~~xxxxx~~ as represented in the first part of the chapter.

When we got into the war, we found ourselves in some embarrassment over this chapter in "Bible Readings". Our agents were selling it extensively and the authorities were very active in looking up matter that we were publishing to see if we didn't belong in the penitentiary with the leaders of another denomination that had just previously been examined and the same men ^{who} were instrumental ^{under}

the Government in putting the leaders of the Russellite movement in the penitentiary, came to our headquarters to see where we belonged, whether ~~was~~ inside or out, and I was so unfortunate as to be the first one looked up by them, although this question didn't come before them through our office first. The Southern Publishing Assn., got into difficulty over the matter and the Government asked them to submit "Bible Readings" for examination and it was examined by the local attorney and sent up here to Washington.

We thought it was an important matter for we had so many agents working on this book, and we put the matter into the hands of our attorney, Mr. Hogan, and he took the matter up very thoroughly and very carefully with the Department of Justice. It seemed that there was an impression on the part of leading men, beginning with the attorney there in Nashville, that our presentation of this subject was an attack upon the United States Government. Some of our brethren will remember when the hearing was given before the Senate Committee here in Washington, that Mrs. Craft stood up before the Senators and declared that we were a disloyal people as a whole because we represented the United States Government as a two-horned hog; and while they didn't give serious consideration to her charge, yet that seemed to be rather the impression of these men who were looking up our literature during the time of the war.

This led us to much earnest study as to what we should do in handling many of our books, and we took up that chapter in "Bible Readings" and we changed the first four questions, or rather the notes to these questions, so as to give a little different slant to the subject. Not having any mind to sacrifice the truth

CLR

35

7-17

at all in order to smooth our way with the Government, but really to bring the chapter into harmony with the convictions of our editors and the General Conference Committee, a thing which we wouldn't have felt quite free to do without further counsel or consideration in such a meeting as this.

So we made changes in this chapter, but with the unanimous vote of the Book Committee, and our Board, and the minority members of the General Conference Committee. And I have been surprised, but there has been no protest that has come to us since that time. I thought perhaps you brethren would know better whether it is being protested against.

I hardly know how to get this matter before you as you haven't the books, except by reading these four questions and the notes as they were in the first edition, and then follow it by the reading of the revised to see whether that meets your mind,-- whether it was a proper thing for us to do.

The title, is "The United States in Prophecy", sub-title, "Making an Image to the Beast." Changed in the revision, the title is "Making an Image to the Beast", sub-title, "The Prophecy of Revelation 13"

PRESCOTT: You don't put in the heading, "The United States in Prophecy" then?

PALMER: No, we changed it so it does not appear in the title. I want to say we submitted this to ~~the~~ our attorney, and through him to the Department of Justice, and they appreciated very much our effort to change the phraseology.

PRESCOTT: Was the book, "United States in Prophecy" protested against?

PALMER: Not that I know of. It was dead on our shelves and not being sold at that time. They got after books that were being sold throughout the country.

[Elder Palmer then read the first four questions and their answers and notes in the old and in the revised edition, pointing out the changes made].

The discussion that followed Brother Palmer's explanation of the changes made in "Bible Readings" turned largely onto the papacy and apostate protestantism, along lines that had been covered before quite largely.

Elder Daniells asked if we might not find some word to substitute for the word "apostate" when referring to present-day Protestantism. He thought it was a pretty hard term to use. Several suggestions were made, as follows: Neo-Protestantism, lapsed Protestantism, modern Protestantism, and backslidden Protestantism.

On the question of the symbols; Professor Lacey said he had always said that the two horns do not mean anything especially.

Professor Prescott said he still maintained that the beast is a symbol of a definite power with a definite location, that he thought it would involve a somewhat inconsistent application of the principle if we shift from a definite power to a principle that is manifested in an organized headship.

Elder Daniells said that is about the way he feels about the new view of the king of the north and the king of the south.

PRES COTT: I say the difference between the Papacy--it is an organization with a definite head which had definite territory--it is just as much as Pagan Rome and the others. You see the difference between that and Protestantism. You do not say "papalism" but when you say "Protestantism" then you have gone into the principle that certainly had its birth in Europe in the Reformation. That does not head up in any definite organization where you can put your finger on it and say, "It is located here."

PALMER: I would look upon the matter something like this. Protestantism is something definite enough so that it joins hands with the Papacy and Spiritualism in a threefold combination in the last great acts of the world's history--the history of the church. It makes an image to the Papacy. I do not know as that would involve its being like the Papacy in its organization, for it is different in its appearance, ~~as it is introduced~~ as a beast. But it was to do something in the course of its career that would be similar to what the Papacy did; though I hardly think that would involve the necessity of its arising in a similar mechanical form. But Protestantism simply develops into a form of organization sufficiently definite so that it has a hand and can reach across the gulf as a person--as one of the three-- and can grasp the hand of the Papacy. All excepting the first page of the chapter (six and a half pages) are divided on the United States Government doing this thing or appearing to do it. But every line of the chapter from the point where I read on, shows how the different bodies of protestants are organizing themselves into definite combinations where they can work as one body holding certain principles. It seems to me in these various organizations

like the Federated Council of Protestant Churches, that the Protestants are coming into a position where they can speak with authority as protestants, and not as separate churches. 985

PRESCOTT: May I ask Brother Palmer just there, who makes the image of the Beast according to the prophecy?

PALMER: I will speak with considerable reservation. I think it would be Protestantism with the aid of the civil power. It lays hold of the civil power, and forces it to make laws in harmony with its will, just as the Papacy used the civil power to persecute.

BOWEN: It is not the image of the beast until it grasps that governmental power.

WAKEHAM: I simply stated in my paper that it was Protestants in control of the government of the United States, just as the leopard beast represents the Papacy in control of the civil powers.

But now as far as the question raised about preaching this outside of this country is concerned: I preached it a good many times over in England and never had any trouble. In fact, they always seemed to like the idea that it was the United States that was getting into this trouble.

Now as to the other question as to the horn representing a principle, my statement yesterday was that a horn primarily signified power. The Old Testament gives the origin of that. David said, "Exalt my horn". The horn comes from the idea of the power in the horns of the animals. And so the primary idea of the horn is power. Now we say the word power often to represent a government--ecclesiastical or civil power. I really think if we do that, we will have to revise not only Great Controversy but Volume 5 of the Testimonies as well, for over and over again is the

statement "Our country", "The United States" "This nation".

LONGACRE: In answer to a question Professor Prescott asked as to who made the Image to the Beast, I will read this statement: "The image is made by the two-horned beast, and is the image to the first beast." The two-horned beast is the one that makes the image. Speaking of the United States, it says: "The application of the symbol admits no question. One nation, and only one, meets the specification of this prophecy. It points unmistakably to the United States of America."

PALMER: I wish to state this in connection with Great Controversy and the Testimonies. I believe we found them in perfect harmony(that is the changed view), and we did not intend to go against the Spirit of Prophecy. We all agreed that the thing was solid and it was in harmony with the Testimonies. I see nothing in what Brother Longacre has read or spoken that is contrary to what is stated in this reading. The United States is made the power that we used by Protestantism to do this thing, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ but it is used as the "whip" by Protestantism, the same as we have always taught.

WILKINSON: I would like to bring a little emphasis into the idea that Brother Palmer read : that starting from the United States, it becomes a world-wide movement in its influence. If the thing starts here and sends a tremendous wave over all countries, then I think the Papacy is going to decline in its strength; for those who hold the ~~xxxx~~ new view of the King of the North being the Papacy cannot admit of their being two tremendous waves started; and therefore we must go back to the old view.

LACEY: I think this is Protestantism outside of the United States. I feel that if the prophecy speaks of this beast arising out of the sea, it could have its application in the United States. I have no hesitancy in using this term, and had no difficulty about it in preaching it in England and elsewhere. But I do not believe that brings limits the persecution to the United States. It goes over the wide world. I believe that this symbol includes the United States primarily. As there is American Roman Catholicism, so there is American Protestantism as vested here in the United States.

PRESCOTT: There is one question in the minds of some that really vitiates the whole question ~~sixth~~ that was brought out in the paper read this morning, and other papers that may be presented on the same line. May I state the question?

PRESCOTT: 2-1 It is simply this. That is, that our interpretation of the fifth trumpet of Revelation 9, in harmony with the view that has been held by Protestantism for centuries, is that this is a symbol of the Saracens, the rise and work of the Saracens, but on the basis of the paper this morning, and any other discussion of the same thought, we take the time that in the prophecy belongs to the Saracens and give it to the Ottomans. Now it is of little value to me to try to establish any date with reference to the Ottoman empire, when I am dealing with a symbol applied to the Saracen power. It appears to me an inconsistency to take a symbol and saying this belongs to the Saracens that had their rise in Arabia, Mohammed was their leader, and that they applied the instruction that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, nor any green thing, nor any tree, but only such men as had not the seal of God on their foreheads. Then we attempt to take that fifth month period from the period of the rise and work of the Saracens, and carry it forward to the very end of the thirteenth century, centuries after the Saracens had ceased to be an aggressive power at all. So I don't see that I can get much out of the matter if it is presented in that way. Now if we are to apply the time for the fifth trumpet to the Ottoman empire, let's apply the symbol to the Ottoman empire. But so long as we apply the symbol to the Saracens, how can we carry the period describing their work five or six centuries after they ceased to be an aggressive power? Until that is out of the way, any paper that attempts to establish dates with regard to the Ottoman empire doesn't help me any about the matter.

WAKEHAM: I have not been able to see how we could interpose a great interregnum of six hundred years between the fourth and fifth verses of chapter 9, when there is nothing in the prophecy to indicate that. It seems to me that we are presenting a false exegesis, interposing a great hiatus of six hundred years between one verse and the next, when there is absolutely nothing there to indicate it. The two reasons usually given are absolutely without historical confirmation. I have not been able to find any history that will substantiate the statement made so much, that there was no king over the Mohammadians until the time of Othman. Gibbon says, "By the end of the first century of the Hejira, the Saracen Caliphs were the most absolute and powerful monarchs on the face of the globe." Now with that statement and others of similar character I don't see how anyone can maintain there was no king over the Mohammadians until the end of the thirteenth century. The second reason is that the Mohammedan world was never united under one head until the time of Othman. When as a matter of fact the only time there it was under one head was under the Saracen Caliphs. Freeman's history has for the heading of his first chapter, "The Undivided Caliph" in the seventh and eighth chapters.

PRESCOTT: Perhaps I could explain how this came around. In looking up the difficulty, I found this, that previous to 1844 in the exposition of this prophecy both symbols, the locust symbol and the later symbol were given to the Ottoman Empire, and that there was no effort to separate them or show that anything happened at the close of this 160 years, or at the begin-

ning of the hour, day, month, and year period. The two were added together and made 541 years and five days, and reckoned from July 27, 1299, right straight on. Well now, that was inconsistent in itself, because it gave the time to the symbol interpreting both ~~power~~ symbols of one power, and gave both periods of time to one power. When Thoughts on Revelation was written a separation was made of the first symbol, taking it to represent the Saracens, yet the time was still all given to the Ottoman power, and that is where we find ourselves. I think we should separate the time as we have done the symbols and give the time to the power that we interpret as fulfilling the symbol, therefore give it the five months or 150 years to the Saracens during their period of actual aggressive power as tormentors.

That application of the period to the symbol gets away from two difficulties. First, it gets us away from what appears to be a very strange inconsistency of applying a symbol to some power, and the time period of that to another power. And second, it gets away from the necessity of establishing a date that has been discredited. Lay aside everything else and ask yourself, Now how you are going to establish a definite day for the beginning of this period. The paper this morning I suppose was seeking for evidence for 1299. Now grant any weight to the historical evidence submitted that you please, yet you haven't established a day. We must find a definite day to date from if we are to take a prophecy and interpret it as meaning so many years and so many days. It must have a day to commence it, and it must have a day to end it, otherwise we don't have any proper interpretation or application of the prophecy.

Now the day July 27 1299 is absolutely discredited. I had the original Greek history out of the Congressional library for quite a long time, and went over the whole matter. It is a history in Greek with a parallel column translated into Latin, and accompanied by a chronological table, and the author put that event that Gibbon refers to as occurring in 1302.

Von Hamer puts it in 1301. Somebody else in 1300, I believe. From my standpoint it doesn't make any difference which it is, and there is no occasion to attempt to prove which it is, because just so long as we interpret the symbols as applying to the Saracens, we certainly must give the time to the Saracens and not to the Ottoman power, and what was presented this morning was simply to show in a general way the beginning of the Ottoman power here at the end of the 13th century. But the same authority said that from these small beginnings rose a power that was established in 1453. Now we don't date our interpretation of the prophecy of the Roman power from 754 B.C., and yet Rome had its beginning in 754. Now all I ask for is that we shall be consistent with ourselves so that when we stand up before an audience or appear in print we don't expose ourselves any longer to that shocking inconsistency of applying the symbols to two powers, and then turn right around and give the time that belongs right in that prophecy and date it five centuries at least after the power has ceased to be aggressive as a tormentary

Before 1844 in William Miller's lectures he gives both symbols to the Ottoman power. He adds the periods together, makes 514 years and 15 days date from July 27, 1299 and follows it straight through. Now when you go further you say we will start from July 27, 1299 and we come to 1449. What happened

then? We must have something on a day . What happened July 27, 1449, that both marked the ending of one period and the beginning of another, because you must not begin the next day. That is, when we are trying to arrive at August 11, 1840 you can't say this period ends July 27, 1449, and the next began July 28. You have got to make them lap one day or else you are thrown out when you get to the end. That question must be answered. What marked the close of the 150 years on July 27, 1449. What event on that day marked the beginning of the next period. What marked the close of the next period? Until that is out of the way I don't see that we shall be helped very much by any papers seeking to establish a date for something relating to the Ottoman Empire.

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

PRESCOTT: According to the best light I can get, and I am not alone -- I suppose it is more or less known here that this whole matter came up several years ago, and the Review and Herald Board appointed a committee to study the question. This committee was composed of F. M. Wilcox, Chairman, W. A. Spicer, M. E. Kern, C. S. Longacre, C. L. Benson, S. M. Butler, and myself. We took up this question, went into it quite thoroughly, and that committee, which I think you will regard as not a very extreme or wild committee, came to the conclusion that we could not apply this 150 years beginning July 27, 1299, for the double reason, first, it didn't belong to that power, and second, the date itself could not be established . Then there were further things brought in, so that all the committee came to the conclusion that there was not sufficient evidence to establish the

date August 11, 1840. Therefore it was recommended that since it was too large a question for us, it be presented to the General Conference Committee in Council. The board adopted the recommendation presented. Brother Spicer was to present one phase, Brother Benson another, and I was to present a third phase.

We prepared our matter and presented it at the Spring Council, and our papers, working together, set forth these suggestions, not as established orthodoxy, but as suggestions from the Committee for consideration.

PRESCOTT: That the 18 150 years commenced in 612 A.D. when Mohammed made his first public proclamation of his message, and that it ended in 762 at Bagdad when the Saracen as a tormenting power ceased and they waned from that time on. I would like to ask, Brother Chairman, if anyone can explain to us how we shall get by what appears to be an absolute inconsistency in Biblical interpretation.

WILKINSON: Would the assembly here like to withdraw its vote? There have several questions been raised; the question of whether the trumpet is Saracen or Turkish, the question whether it begins in 1299. Even if we can bring in some evidence, and I think we can, very strong evidence, then the question has been raised of July 27 1449 and of August 11, 1840. For one man to take all that up and give a satisfactory presentation in one day, is a little too much, I think, and should prefer to decline, but if it is desired, I shall be very glad to throw my ideas into the melting pot along with the rest and let it stew.

PRESCOTT: I didn't intend, Brother Wilkinson, to lay that burden on you in 45 minutes, but I would like in this hour of discussion on the paper this morning, to have someone deal with this direct point and let all the rest go now and deal with them later. Our published position, and the only one I have known to be published or spoken in this country,--I didn't know about the other matter, and there are other questions also that are printed across the water in a different way than we do here, we are not dealing with that. But will anyone tell us how we shall consistently go on with our official, recognized position that the 5th trumpet indicates the Saracens?

DANIELLS: Let us have a symposium now of one minute speeches from these teachers and hear their explanation.

WIRTH: I can't be done. That is my answer. I agree with Prof. Prescott.

DANIELLS: Then you are through.

LACEY: I have agreed too, substantially, and I think the 150 years applies to the Saracens. I have in my notebook the dates 612 and 762.

WAKEHAM: I taught this very thing six years ago and have held it ever since.

SORENSEN: It is a most perplexing question, I find, because we deal with the past. When it comes to the 11th of Daniel, we are dealing with unfulfilled prophecy, and we might differ, even when we use all the facts available, but when it comes to dealing with past prophecy dealing with past facts, we must have the facts that took place; we are not able to invent events to fit the occasion, and that is the most perplexing thing about the whole proposition. prophetic ~~xxxxxxxx~~ All the dates that have been introduced are out of joint and the events proposed to fit the dates took place on some other day.

M.C. FILCOX: I had the same difficulty for years, but I have also placed the 150 years 612 to 762. It seems to me to be very clear, and that a later date can be established without any regard to the 150 years.

WALDORF: Before I came here, I heard of a new book issued called the history of the Huns. I haven't seen it, but that deals with the question of 1289 etc. It is a good work and worth looking up, but I don't know where to find it.

ANDERSON: It doesn't seem to me that this idea of applying it to the Saracens is so compelling after all. Why should we say it applies to the Saracens? Why shouldn't it apply to the Mohammedans? The idea seems to be that it must refer to the Saracens as distinguished from all the other Mohammedans. Why couldn't it apply to the Mohammedans as a religious movement?

PRESCOTT: You are getting onto the same ground as our two-horned beast going off into an "ism".

DANIELLS: Let's send the King of the North and the two-horned beast together up in a balloon.

FRENCH: It seems to me the phraseology makes it very plain. It has reference to the Eastern division of the Roman Empire. There are tormentors who torment the third part of men, and then destroyers. Their power was to hurt men five months, and they had a king over them. The same ones that tormented men five months had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit, etc. Now the same ones that tormented are the ones that destroyed. Those who tormented five months had a king over them ~~whom~~ whose name was the destroyer, and it is the same power that tormented that finally destroyed. That is true of the Ottoman Turks. For 150 years they tormented Eastern Rome, and they finally destroyed the last vestige of Rome.

INTERMISSION

A.G.DANIELLS: Just a word to get an understanding and a final decision with reference to another point of difference. We have come now to nearly the last day of our discussion. Tomorrow is the last day, and a short day. We have before us the question of having Brother Lacey present his view of the cause of the darkness of May 19, 1780, and I understand it has been voted, has it?

W.E.HOWELL: Yes, yesterday Professor Prescott offered to give one of his hours to Professor Lacey for this question.

A.G.DANIELLS: I lost the connection, I had forgotten it. Well, now, I want to take the liberty of saying just a word about it. I wonder, brethren, if we ought to throw another wild gourd into the pot here?

H.C.LACEY: That is hard on me, Brother Daniels.

A. G. DANIELLS: No, it is on the subject.

H. C. LACEY: You said my view, Brother Daniels, as though I was espousing it in a lonely kind of way. I was not anxious to press it, but I was asked to do it.

A. G. DANIELLS: First of all, I want to say I believe we can plan our conference another year a little better than we planned this one. I believe, brethren, that it is not a good thing to come together with a large number of difficult questions where there is a difference of opinion, so that a major part of the time is given to those differences. I believe it would be better for us in planning another conference to give the major part of the conference to constructive study, the things on which we agree. And then have one or two, perhaps three, questions where there are these difficulties,--
~~xxxxxxx~~ I won't say where we differ, but where these difficulties come in that we have run against in our study,--have only a couple of those, and then assign them months and months before the confer-

ence comes on, and give those who are to present them ample time for careful study and revision and preparation, thorough preparation,--if I may use the word, scholarly preparation,--and deal more thoroughly with history so that we shall have a very clear, strong presentation of two topics where these differences exist, and give time for thorough discussion; but let the rest of the time be given to constructive work.

I thought of touching the doctrine of the second coming of Christ. That doctrine, brethren, could be studied by us for a number of days, I think to great advantage. [Many amen's] that great truth, the event of the ages.

H.C.LACEY: Yes, 1500 verses in the Bible on it.

A. G. DANIELLS: And then the centering of all the lines of prophecy, and where they each one tip in, and then the culmination,-- I tell you, I would like to spend a few days on a strong, really constructive study of that subject. It would help me, and it would help us all.

Then some other themes that we could agree upon, that would be helpful and uplifting and positive and confirming, too, at the same time. I would like to take one or two subjects and each day give it or them a proper time,--not hurried,--and reach some conclusion about it, which I believe we can. That is what I see in the next conference. We did not have time and experience to fix this one, but here we have had a ~~kikika~~ lot of things thrown upon us, and it has made our heads whirl, and I suppose it has brought some depression to some of the brethren,--I am sure it has,--and brought some into the fog bank that others have been sailing through and getting out on the other side where the sun shines. Now, then, will it be wise for us to throw another one in?

C. P. BOLLMAN: Yes!

A. G. DANIELLS: What, you think it would?

C. P. BOLLMAN: I think we ought to quit saying a lot of things that aren't so.

A. G. DANIELLS: But now here are other things, and we could go right on along these lines. I want to say this, brethren, I do not believe it will be best for this teachers' convention to go on discussing differences all through. Can't you take up topics that will be just as helpful to you, and not engender the discussion that comes with these things? Perhaps that is not what you want of the teachers' conference, but is it best to try to settle all of these at one council, or is it best to take a limited number and be thorough and careful with them, and then leave the others over for another time? If presenting it would end the question and settle us all, I would say, let us do it before tomorrow morning; but it doesn't do it. I have not converted you, at all, I have tried hard, and what good has it done? [Laughter]

C. P. BOLLMAN: No, and I have not converted you, either.

A. G. DANIELLS: And what good has it done? It set me to thinking.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I was willing to sacrifice part of my time, so far as that is concerned, and let Brother Lacey have it.

A. G. DANIELLS: This is Thursday afternoon, and we are using up the last hour, and tomorrow is the last day. We have just touched the question of the trumpets, which is very troublesome to many, and I think it would be a great deal better to spend a little time on this than to drop in another subject now.

H. C. LACEY: I am willing to give up the presentation of this question of the dark day.

W. W. PRESCOTT: I would like to arrive at some conclusions as to what we shall say about the trumpets. I have not taught anything about them for some time, but others go on. Our papers go right on asserting this over and over again. Every time any one comes along with an exposition of the trumpets, he makes assertions that some of the rest of us cannot agree with at all. I wish we could come to a place where we would not assert what is not so; and so, Brother Chairman, I think we had better use what little time we have left on that question.

A. G. DANIELLS: That is what I thought, but I do not want to domineer over this conference.

H. C. LACEY: As to the dark day, I think I can state it in two words. The old edition of "Great Controversy" has an extract that says there were no clouds on that day, the stars were shining,--and

I used to emphasize it. When the new edition came out, that extract was eliminated, and the fact that clouds produced the darkness was put in. It said there were clouds everywhere, and there were extensive fires raging over areas near by. It was a sign produced by the Lord and He used this secondary means.

A. G. DANIELLS: Every one here can get the two editions and read the extracts in each. Surely, we can do that and why not let it wait over a week or so.

A. O. TAIT: When Sister White herself, under her own careful supervision, sees fit to change things, we ought that not to be sufficient reason for us to not try to cling to the old view?

A. G. DANIELLS: I think it is perfectly plain. I do not think

the most ardent believer in the inspiration of "Great Controversy" ^{was put} would make war on Sister White on account of what is in the revised edition, under her own supervision.

A. O. TAIT: And isn't that all there is in Brother Lacey's presentation?

(At this point it was voted to defer Professor Lacey's talk to a later period, some time during the Teachers' Conference.)

DANIELLS: Now we can go on with the discussion of the Trumpets.

WIRTH: I should like to recommend that Elliott's "Horas Apocopyticae" be studied in that connection. It seems to me that Elliott proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that it refers to the Saracens.

THOMPSON(G.B.) Is not this the only line of prophecy we have where the kingdom begins on a definite day. All other prophecies begin in a year. This July 26, is very difficult to establish.

F.M.WILCOX: I would suggest that Brother prsscott give a brief outline of the whole ground.

PRES COTT: I am very sorry that all my documents that I have been filing for years over this question, ~~wiax~~ which were in my box of books that I had with me in the Far East, and went astray on coming home, have not yet been received. However, I will give a brief study covering the prophesy.

As the result of the work of that Committee appointed to study this question, we agreed to submit to the Conference for consideration these general views:

That the Fifth Trumpet was applied to the Saracens. That the period of the five months--which was referred to twice--you will observe that. I notice in the last explanation of the five months period it was connected directly with the 11th verse. Now it occurs in the tenth verse of course, but you must note also it occurs in the fifth verse in the direct quotation which we apply to Abubeker, the second one in that Dynasty. So you must not take it away from that absolutely.

But the five months' period applies to the Saracens. That was the most satisfactory time to apply it would be from the dates 612, when Mohammedan made his first public proclamation of his mission as prophet--to 562, when the Saracens by establishing Bagdad, entered upon a period of luxurious ease, in contrast with the aggressive campaigns of the previous time. That the Sixth Trumpet applied to the Ottoman Empire. That the period of time there belonged to the Ottomans. That the time for commencing ~~that~~ that period was 453, when they established themselves as a power by the capture of Constantinople. That was referred to by Mr. Gibbons--that from a small beginning at the end of the 13th century, it was about 150 years to the siege of Constantinople when they were fully established as a power.

Now you then come to the period of the 6th Trumpet, which is that period, as we have read it of "an hour and a day and a month and a year," and which we have been accustomed to interpret as 391 years and fifteen days.

DANIELLS: You have then that the Fifth Trumpet comes down to the 11th verse inclusive?

PRESCOTT: Yes; that is, applying the Scripture.

DANIELLS: So that both of these references of 5 months apply to the same power?

Q PRESCOTT: Yes.

Now as to the question of the 391 years and fifteen days. If we interpret it that way it brings us to the necessity of establishing the prophetic period to a day. As Brother Thompson has suggested, we have no other prophetic period that we attempt to establish to a day, and therefore there is a very serious difficulty when you are dealing with the developments

history, to try to fix things to a day--apart from the question whether the fifth trumpet refers to the Saracens or the Ottomans. The difficulty of fixing any definite day in 1448--No event ^{tormenting} that ~~was~~ occurred that would mark the close of the ~~terminating~~ period and introduces the period of killing--comes in there--and we have to double that period to make it come out to the day we suggest, which expires August 11, 1848, because we must reckon July 27th as the close of the other period and reckon ~~x~~ as the beginning of the new period--or else you do not come out in 1840. This offers some difficulties. ✓

Now the difficulty is just as much on this other view of establishing it, and I do not attempt to establish the day, because I do not find any other prophecy that fixes the date, and I cannot find any even that warrants a day for the beginning and a day for the ending. Therefore I was forced to look into the question of this period, and I became satisfied that it did not ~~require~~ require us to interpret this prophecy to a day. I felt satisfied that this period in the ninth chapter is a day, a month and a year; that the meaning of the text would be "the four angels were loosed that had been prepared for the season, even a day, a month and a year." The word here translated "hour" is used in a large number of instances in the New Testament. Now if you look for the meaning of this word not simply as a dictionary word, but by its use in the New Testament, you will find places where this cannot mean "hour" in the sense of the twenty-fourth part of a day. This I looked up through the Greek Concordance, which is of course the only way you can find these words. I give the following references:

Matthew 14:15; Mark 6:35; Luke 12:53; John 2:4;

John 4:21,23; 5:25, 28; 5:35; 7:30; 8:20; 12:23; 13:1; 16:2,4; 17:1;
Romans 13:11; 2 Cor. 7:8; Philemon 15; Revelation 3:10; 14:7.

Now in these texts this same word is translated by these different words, "Time", "day", "hour", "season". But in all these cases it cannot refer to, and does not refer to, a 1/34 part of a day. It is an indefinite period.

Now I wish to call attention to two special passages.

John 5:35. Christ speaking of John the Baptist says, "He was a burning and a shining light; and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light." For a season. It is not definite as to the time. That is the same word and the same construction.

In Second Corinthians 7:8 you have the same thing.

"For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent: for I perceive that the same epistle hath made you sorry, though it were but for a season."--Referring to a duration of time, an indefinite time and not a fixed period.

F.M. WILCOX: Then "a day, a year an hour" would be in apposition with or explanatory to "season"

PRESCOTT: Yes.

And those who read the Greek text will note that the article used is ~~the~~ used with the word denoting "hour" or "season" while omitted(?) with the other words for day, month, year. That is, "prepared for the season, namely, a day, ~~as~~ a month and a year." the Season is here limited to a definite time, and the definite article is used. In the other cases the definite article is not used.

VOICE: The month and year would be translated the same way as "hour" and day and month"?

PRESCOTT: No. I would translate, "They were prepared for the season." Then ~~definitly~~ define it: "even a day, a month, and a year." The indefinite season now becomes definite in these words, a day a month and a year, --which gives us 391 years.

PRESCOTT: I would translate it, "They were prepared for the season" -- Then defined -- namely, "The hour, even a month, a day, a year." The indefinite season now becomes definite in those terms day, month, year. It would be interpreted and give us the 391 years.

LACEY: A very interesting incident occurred in the University of Nebraska right on this point. We were reading Demosthenes and the head of the Department of Greek pointed out a similar instance exactly in one of the orations of Demosthenes. In that case it is a series of three nouns, and the first noun has the article, then came the other two nouns introduced by the conjunction kai, and these latter two were to be considered as explaining the first. When you have the group, and the first is articulated, that comprises all that follows. We predicate those, put them under it, and they explain it. There is an exactly analogous case with Revelation 9.

PRESCOTT: Now, then, taking it that way, we have no further necessity of establishing a ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ day for the beginning or a day for the close. Beginning with 1453, the siege of Constantinople, 391 years brings us to 1844, of course a notable date with us in our expositions. That is to say, this killing power is limited to that time when this message rises. Just exactly as this message arose, at the close of those periods assigned in Daniel, 1260 days, 1290 days, 2300 days. At the end of those periods this message arose. At the end of this period, now, this message would rise in the same way, and these powers that were to hinder, to stand in the way of the gospel till 1844 would mark the end of that limitation. Then you ask me, what happened in 1844 that would in any way fulfill this

prophecy. That remarkable edict of toleration issued by the Mohammedan power under the pressure of the Christian powers. These facts were printed in the Review of February, 1918.

Don't you remember Brother Spicer had an article "A wonderful Providence" in which he gives the extracts relating to this matter, that this decree of toleration was demanded under the leadership of the English representative at Constantinople. It was flatly refused. It was said that to grant that would be to destroy Islam. It is contrary to the absolute principles of the Koran. We can't possibly do it. But the ambassador would not be denied. He went held to it until he obtained it, and one extract is from Doctor Barton's work "Daybreak in Turkey." He dwells upon it. One extract I have in my file says that this event was greater than any political event of the period, because it marked a concession which struck at the very foundation principles of Islam. Now that, Brother Chairman, is just that bare outline of the statement.

F M WILCOX: Have we any time prophecy in the Bible in which the day of beginning or ending is indicated. This would be an exception, would it not?

W W PRESCOTT: Now to see some of the difficulties that we have been thrown into by this matter, not as a personal reference, to anybody, but simply that we may know. In order to have a good event to fix the close of that 150 years as we have been applying it, and to make it end July 27, 1449, the first edition of the Sear of Patmos said that Constantinople fell on the 27th of July, 1449. Of course that made a very good ending for the prophecy, but when you come to the fact of history, that it was

four years later, why it is rather bad for us to transfer it in order to have a good event to fulfill our idea of a prophecy.

I plead for this:

1. That we be consistent in this prophecy. That we give the time to the power that is signified by the symbol. If we are going to have the fifth trumpet belong to the Ottoman Empire, then we must change Bible Readings, Thoughts on Revelation, and I don't know how many other things. If we say the fifth trumpet represents the Saracens, then let's give the trumpet time to the Saracene. When we come to the sixth trumpet and we want to say it is 391 years and 15 days, then the burden is upon us to establish some historical event to mark the beginning of it. We must give some event that will mark the close of it, and when you get into that, you are in a sea of trouble. Now I say this committee was not an excitable radical committee. Our worthy editor of the Review was chairman, the secretary of the G. Conf. ~~the second-chairman~~ was a very active member of the committee, the teacher of History in Washington College at that time was another, the teacher of Bible was another, a former teacher of history was another, Professor Longford was another member. Now just considering those members, and leaving me out entirely, you will see that it was not a radical committee. We met in my editorial office and spent time on it. Each one was assigned his definite work, and had to bring in his proofs. We went into it that way and came to the conclusion which I have stated to you in this very brief outline.

ADJOURNED FOR THE DAY