

Source Book for Bible Students

Containing Valuable Quotations Relating to the History, Doctrines, and Prophecies of the Scriptures

1919

Review and Herald Publishing Association

WASHINGTON, D. C.

South Bend, Ind.

New York City

was not crushed to death ran out into the large places, and those near the river ran down to save themselves by boats, or any other floating convenience, running, crying, and calling to the ships for assistance; but whilst the multitude were gathered near the riverside, the water rose to such a height that it overflowed the lower part of the city, which so terrified the miserable and already dismayed inhabitants, who ran to and fro with dreadful cries, which we heard plainly on board, that it made them believe the dissolution of the world was at hand, every one falling on his knees and entreating the Almighty for his assistance. . . . By two o'clock the ship's boats began to ply, and took multitudes on board. . . . The fear, the sorrow, the cries and lamentations of the poor inhabitants are inexpressible; every one begging pardon, and embracing each other, crying, Forgive me, friend, brother, sister! Oh! what will become of us! neither water nor land will protect us, and the third element, fire, seems now to threaten our total destruction! as in effect it happened. The conflagration lasted a whole week.—*Letter of ship captain to ship's owners, in "Historical Account of Earthquakes," Thomas Hunter, pp. 72-74. Liverpool, 1756.*

NOTE.—The following table of earthquakes is gathered from the reports of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The list is of what are denominated "destructive earthquakes" only, as stated by the late Mr. John Milne, compiler of the statistics from which the subjoined table is made up. Small earthquakes have been excluded, while the number of large earthquakes both for ancient and modern times, has been extended. As an illustration of exclusion, I may mention that between 1800 and 1808, which are years taken at random, I find in Mallet's catalogue 407 entries. Only 37 of these, which were accompanied by structural damage, have been retained.

Mr. Milne also states that recent researches "indicate that thirty thousand earthquakes may occur annually."

Century	No.	Century	No.
First	15	Seventeenth	378
Second	11	Eighteenth	640
Third	18	Nineteenth	
Fourth	14	First Decade	80
Fifth	15	Second Decade	87
Sixth	17	Third Decade	132
Seventh	35	Fourth Decade	106
Eighth	59	Fifth Decade	185
Ninth	82	Sixth Decade	313
Tenth	53	Seventh Decade	339
Eleventh	84	Eighth Decade	297
Twelfth	115	Ninth Decade	339
Thirteenth	137	Tenth Decade	241
Fourteenth	174	Twentieth	
Fifteenth	174	First Decade	86
Sixteenth	253		

The distribution of more recent earthquakes is illustrated by the report for the first decade of the twentieth century, which is as follows (Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1911, p. 55):

Alaska	2	Guatemala	1
Algeria	1	India	2
Asia, Central	7	Italy	3
Asia, Minor	3	Japan	3
Baluchistan	2	Java	4
Bolivia	1	Mexico	1
California	1	New Zealand	5
Chile	2	Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama	1
China	4	Persia	1
Colombia	3	Peru	3
Costa Rica	1	Philippines	1
Crete	2	Samos	9
East Indies	1	Siberia, East	1
Formosa	6	Spain	3
France	5	Turkey in Europe	3
Greece	1	West Indies	3
Guam	3		2
	2		—Eps.

Earthquakes.— See Jerusalem, 260.

Easter.—The English word comes from the AS *Eastra* or *Eastera*, a Teutonic goddess to whom sacrifice was offered in April, so the name was transferred to the paschal feast. The word does not properly occur in Scripture, although A. V. has it in Acts 12: 4 where it stands for Passover, as it is rightly rendered in R. V. [also in the A. R. V.]. There is no trace of Easter celebration in the New Testament, though some would see an intimation of it in 1 Cor. 5: 7. The Jewish Christians in the early church continued to celebrate the Passover, regarding Christ as the true paschal lamb, and this naturally passed over into a commemoration of the death and resurrection of our Lord, or an Easter feast. This was preceded by a fast, which was considered by one party as ending at the hour of the crucifixion, i. e., at 3 o'clock on Friday, by another as continuing until the hour of the resurrection before dawn on Easter morning. Differences arose as to the time of the Easter celebration, the Jewish Christians naturally fixing it at the time of the Passover feast which was regulated by the paschal moon. According to this reckoning it began on the evening of the 14th day of the moon of the month of Nisan without regard to the day of the week, while the Gentile Christians identified it with the first day of the week, i. e., the Sunday of the resurrection, irrespective of the day of the month.—*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, James Orr, M. A., D. D., editor, Vol. II, art. "Easter," p. 389. Chicago: The Howard-Severance Company, 1915.*

The Easter Day indeed was always kept by St. John on the 14th day of the lunar month, whatever the day of the week. So Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius (H. E. v. 24), informs us. For he says that Polycarp could not be persuaded by Anicetus, the Roman bishop, not to keep it on that day, when not Sunday, "because he had always so kept it with John the disciple of the Lord, and other of the apostles."—*Horæ Apocalypticæ, Rev. E. B. Elliott, A. M., Vol. I, p. 71, Note 4. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1847.*

The occurrence of this word in the A. V. of Acts 12: 4, is chiefly noticeable as an example of the want of consistency in the translators. In the earlier English versions Easter had been frequently used as the translation of *pascha* (πασχα). At the last revision [of the A. V.] "Passover" was substituted in all passages but this.—*A Dictionary of the Bible, edited by William Smith, LL. D., p. 156. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company.*

Easter.— See Papacy.

Eastern Question, MODERN MEANING OF.—In its strict and narrow sense, the Eastern Question is the question, What is to be done with the southeast of Europe and the contiguous portion of Asia? . . . From the point of view of European politics, the Eastern Question has come to include the complications arising out of the possession by the Turks of the east of Europe and the possibility of Russian predominance in the Ægean Sea.—*The Crime of Christendom, Daniel Sceliey Gregory, pp. 8, 9.*

The Balkan or Near Eastern Question has been one of the most complicated political problems of the world's history for half a century. . . . For four centuries and a half, or ever since the conquering Turk crossed the Bosphorus and took Constantinople, the grim contest has been on to dislodge him by war and diplomacy.—*American Review of Reviews, November, 1912.*

"The Eastern Question" is one which the statesmen of Europe will probably wrangle over until the millennium. . . . When told that his once ally and sworn friend, the tsar Alexander of Russia, desired to gain it [Constantinople], Napoleon the Great excitedly sprang to his feet, saying, "Constantinople! Never—it is the empire of the world." —"*Decisive Battles of the World*," Charles King, *Brigadier-General*, p. 243, 1895.

Eastern Question, AN ANCIENT QUESTION.—Some countries seem destined from their origin to become the battlefields of the contending nations. . . . The nations around are eager for the possession of a country thus situated. . . . From remote antiquity Syria was in the condition just described. . . . By its position it formed a kind of meeting place, where most of the military nations of the ancient world were bound sooner or later to come violently into collision.—"*Struggle of the Nations*," Sir Gaston Maspero, chap. 1, pp. 3, 4.

The Eastern Question, which began with Constantine and Theodosius, stretches through the centuries. It is ever old and ever new, like a figure in mythology. . . . The interests at stake are so important and complicated that Europe and Asia, and even America, cannot stand by as unconcerned spectators of the struggle which recurs century after century for the possession of the Bosphorus, the Hellespont, and the Aegean Sea. The East has been the goal of every ambition of the Christian and barbarian powers alike.—M. R. Ivanovitch, on "*The Future of the Balkans*," in *Fortnightly Review* (London), June, 1909.

Eastern Question, REVOLUTIONARY FRANCE AND EGYPT IN CONFLICT.—Bonaparte's expedition, consisting of forty thousand land troops and ten thousand seamen, sailed from Toulon for Egypt on the nineteenth of May, 1798.—"*Library of Universal History*," Vol. VIII, p. 2637.

In spite of the desperate valor displayed by the Mamelukes led by Murad Bey, the French gained a complete victory (July 21). This battle, called the Battle of the Pyramids, overthrew the government of the Mamelukes, and opened Cairo to the French, who entered it the following day.—"*History of Modern Europe*," Dryer and Hassell, Vol. V, chap. 60, pp. 276, 277.*

The Porte [government of Turkey] solemnly declared war against France, Sept. 4, 1798, and coalesced with Russia and England. The sultan ordered the formation of an army for the conquest of Egypt. This event rendered the situation of the French extremely critical.—"*History of the Egyptian Revolution*," A. A. Paton, Vol. I, p. 98.*

Eastern Question, NAPOLEON'S AIM—CONSTANTINOPLE AND WORLD DOMINION.—If I succeed I shall find in the town [Acre] the pasha's treasure, and arms for 300,000 men. I stir up and arm all Syria. . . . I march on Damascus and Aleppo; as I advance in the country my army will increase with the discontented. . . . I reach Constantinople with armed masses. I overthrow the Turkish Empire; I found in the East a new and grand empire, which fixes my place with posterity.—Napoleon, before Acre; cited in "*The Modern Régime*," Hippolyte Adolphe Taine, D. C. L., book I, chap. I (Vol. I, p. 35). New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1890.

Eastern Question, TURKEY'S WHIRLWIND ATTACK (1799) AT MT. TABOR.—Twelve thousand horsemen, decorated with the most gorgeous trappings of military show, and mounted on the fleetest Arabian chargers, were prancing and curvetting in all directions. A loud and

exultant shout of vengeance and joy, rising like the roar of the ocean, burst from the Turkish ranks as soon as they perceived their victims enter the plain. . . . The whole cavalcade of horsemen, with gleaming sabers and hideous yells, and like the sweep of the wind, came rushing down upon them. Every man in the French squares knew that his life depended upon his immobility, and each one stood, shoulder to shoulder with his comrades, like a rock. . . .

The victory was complete. The Turkish army was not merely conquered—it was destroyed. . . . The whole majestic array, assembled for the invasion of Egypt, and who had boasted that they were "innumerable as the sands of the sea, or the stars of heaven," had disappeared to be seen no more.—"*The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte*," John S. C. Abbott, Vol. I, chap. 12, pp. 218-220.

NOTE.—Napoleon returned from this victory to the siege of Acre, where he was repulsed again and again.—Eps.

Eastern Question, "MANY SHIPS" AND MEN TURN NAPOLEON'S CAIRER AT ACRE (1799).—On the evening of the 7th May, a few sails were seen from the towers of Acre, on the furthest verge of the horizon. All eyes were instantly turned in that direction, and the besiegers [French] and besieged equally flattered themselves that succor was at hand. The English cruisers in the bay hastily, and in doubt, stood out to reconnoiter this unknown fleet; but the hearts of the French sank within them when they beheld the two squadrons unite, and, the Ottoman crescent joined to the English pennant, approach the roads of Acre. Soon after a fleet of thirty sail [Turkish] entered the bay, with seven thousand men, and abundance of artillery and ammunition.—"*History of Europe*," Sir Archibald Alison, Bart., F. R. S. E., chap. 26, par. 90, Vol. IV, p. 207, 9th edition. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1854.

Eastern Question, A TURNING POINT IN HISTORY.—Napoleon was not yet sufficiently subdued by misfortune [at Acre] to order a retreat. "The fate of the East," said he, "is in yonder fort." . . . In vain other columns, and even the Guides of Napoleon, his last reserve, advanced to the attack; they were all repulsed with dreadful loss. . . . Meanwhile the baggage, sick, and field artillery were silently defiling to the rear, the heavy cannon were buried in the sand, and on the 20th May, Napoleon, for the first time in his life, ordered a retreat.—*Id.*, pars. 92, 93, p. 208.

Many times during the deadly delays of this fatal siege, in which he experienced his first check, he was heard to inveigh against "this miserable little hole which came between him and his destiny." And many times later, when dwelling on the vicissitudes of his past life, and the different chances which had been open to him, he repeated "that if Saint Jean d'Acre had fallen, he would have changed the face of the world, and been emperor of the East." And he generally added, that it was a grain of sand that had undone all his projects.—"*The History of Napoleon the First*," Pierre Lanfrey, Vol. I, p. 296. London: Macmillan & Co., 1886.

Eastern Question, EGYPT AND ITS TREASURES NOT ESCAPING.—Mohammed Ali [the sultan's pasha of Egypt] not only ruled but possessed Egypt; for in 1808-10 he successfully accomplished a repetition of the tremendous acts of spoliation for which Suleiman II, son of the first Ottoman conqueror, had given him a precedent. By one means or another, in great measure by the deliberate confiscation and suppression of title deeds, he possessed himself of almost the whole of the land in Egypt, and declared that henceforth he was the sole owner

of the soil, and all rights of possession or tenancy must be held from him. From every class in every town and province of Egypt came a passionate outcry against this wholesale robbery, but Mehemet Ali, with his terrible army of Arnouts at his back, stood firm.—*The Story of the Church of Egypt*, E. L. Butcher, Vol. II, p. 363. London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1837.

Eastern Question, SEVENTEENTH CENTURY BEGINS TURKISH DECLINE.—For a hundred and fifty years after the conquest of Constantinople, the Ottoman Empire remained in the fulness of power and prosperity, and the population, both Mohammedan and Christian, steadily increased. . . . Civil dissensions rarely disturbed the peace of the provinces; the laboring classes, both in the agricultural districts and the towns, were industrious and prosperous; manufactures flourished; the trade of the empire, both foreign and domestic, was vast and lucrative. . . . But with the seventeenth century began the decline of the Ottoman power.—*"Turkey," Edson L. Clark, pp. 148, 149. New York: Peter Fenelon Collier & Son, 1900.*

Eastern Question, GREECE DETACHED.—In July, 1827, England, France, and Russia signed the 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.—*The Ottoman Power in Europe*, E. A. Freeman, D. C. L., LL. D., p. 183. London: Macmillan & Co., 1877.

On May 7, 1832, more than a decade after the outbreak of the Greek revolt, the treaty was finally signed which added a new Christian kingdom to the states' system of Europe.—*Modern Europe*, 1815-99, W. Atkinson Phillips, M. A., p. 167, 2d edition. London: Rivingtons, 1902.

Eastern Question, THE BALKAN STATES CARVED OUT.—The Porte bowed to the inevitable [with the Russian army in the Balkans] and on Sept. 14, 1829, signed with Russia the treaty of Adrianople. True to his undertaking, the tsar stipulated for no territorial increase in Europe; but the Danubian principalities were erected into practically independent states. . . .

The news of the peace of Adrianople . . . produced something like a panic among the powers. 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.—*Id.*, pp. 165, 166.

NOTE.—Out of this, in the course of years, particularly between 1878 and 1885, came the Independent Balkan States, carved from Turkish territory.—Eds.

Eastern Question, OPENING PASSAGE OF A STIRRING DECADE OF DIPLOMACY.—On July 8, 1833, was signed the famous treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, 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.

Eastern Question, CONSTANTINOPLE THREATENED IN 1839.—On June 24 [1839] Ibrahim [the general of Mehemet Ali, the Sultan's rebellious governor of Egypt] met the Ottoman army at Nessim [Syria] and

routed it. Once more the road to Constantinople lay open to him. Disaster followed disaster, heralding, as it seemed, the downfall of the Turkish rule. On June 30 the old Sultan Mahmoud died, leaving the throne to Abd-ul-Medjid, a lad of sixteen. And, finally, as though to crown the edifice of ruin, Achmet Pasha, the Ottoman admiral, sailed into the harbor of Alexandria, and handed over his fleet to Mehemet Ali.

Obviously, if the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi were to be more than "an interesting historical relic," the time had come for its application. In common alarm, the majority of the powers, disunited on most points, combined to forestall any isolated action on the part of Russia, and by their ambassadors at Constantinople agreed to place the young sultan under the protection of Europe. At the same time they warned Mehemet Ali that the matter was now not for him, but for Europe, to decide. But at this point their agreement ceased. France now openly championed Mehemet Ali, in whom she looked to find a valuable ally against the sea power of England in the Mediterranean. She proposed that the pasha of Egypt should be left in the enjoyment of his conquests, and that France and England should come to an agreement as to common action in the event of the Russians' meeting Ibrahim on the Bosphorus. The alliance, in fact, was to be directed, not against Egypt, but against Russia.—*Id.*, pp. 225, 226.

Eastern Question, WHEN NEWS OF DEFEAT REACHED CONSTANTINOPLE.—The divan, stricken with consternation, was about to yield unconditionally to Mehemet's demand for the hereditary possession of all his dominions, when a note was received from the powers. This note, which bears date of July 27, 1839, informed the Porte that the five great powers—Austria, England, France, Prussia, and Russia—had agreed to act in concert on the Eastern Question, and requested the Turkish government not to come to any definite conclusion without their advice. The Porte replied that it would await the action of Europe, and gratefully accepted the proffered mediation.—*The Eastern Question*, S. P. H. Duggan, Ph. D., p. 87. New York: Columbia University Press, 1902.

Eastern Question, NOTE OF FIVE POWERS, JULY 27, 1839.—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 agreement between the five powers upon the Eastern Question is insured, and to invite the Porte to suspend any final determination without their concurrence, awaiting the result of the interest which those powers feel for the Porte.—[Signed] Baron Roussin, Count de Koenigsmarck, Baron de Sturmer, Ponsonby, A. Boutelin. [Dated] Constantinople, July 27, 1839.—*Foreign Affairs of Great Britain, Administered by Palmerston*, published anonymously [Wm. Cargill known to be the author], p. 158. 1841.

Eastern Question, CONVENTION OF JULY 15, 1840.—The discovery of what seemed an underhand intrigue on the part of France produced upon the powers exactly the effect that Thiers had foreseen and deprecated. . . . Their countermove was to sign at London on the 15th of July, without the concurrence of France, a convention with the Porte for the settlement of the affairs of the Levant. By this instrument it was agreed that the terms to be offered to Mehemet Ali having been concerted with the Porte, the signatory powers would unite their forces in order to compel the pasha to accept the settlement. As to the terms to be offered, it was arranged that, in the event of Mehemet Ali yielding within ten days, he should receive the hereditary pashalik of Egypt

and the administration for life of southern Syria, with the title of Pasha of Acre and the possession of the fortress of St. Jean d'Acre. At the end of ten days, should he remain obdurate, the offer of Syria and Acre would be withdrawn; and if at the end of another ten days he was still defiant, the sultan would hold himself at liberty to withdraw the whole offer and to take such measures as his own interests and the counsels of his allies might suggest to him.—*Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. XVIII, art. "Mehemet Ali," p. 81, 11th edition.

Eastern Question, AS RELATED TO ASIA MINOR AND THE APPROACHES TO THE FAR EAST.—The question of Asiatic Turkey may convulse the world in a series of devastating wars unless it be solved together with the other great questions which will come up for settlement at the Peace Congress.

Innumerable great and small problems will have to be considered at the Peace. Not only the map of Europe, but that of the world, will have to be redrawn. The coming settlement will be greater, and may be far more difficult, than that made at Vienna a hundred years ago. . . .

The question of Asiatic Turkey is undoubtedly a far more difficult question than that of Constantinople. . . . The importance and value of Asiatic Turkey . . . can scarcely be overexaggerated, for it occupies undoubtedly the most important strategical position in the world. It forms the nucleus and center of the Old World. It separates, and at the same time connects, Europe, Asia, and Africa, three continents which are inhabited by approximately nine tenths of the human race. . . .

A powerful Asiatic Turkey can obviously dominate not only the Bosphorus, the Dardanelles, and the Suez Canal, but the very narrow entrance of the Red Sea near Aden, and that of the Persian Gulf near Muscat as well. It must not be forgotten that only a comparatively short distance, a stretch of country under the nominal rule of weak and decadent Persia, separates Asiatic Turkey from the Indian frontier. It is clear that Asiatic Turkey, lying in the center of the Old World, is at the same time a natural fortress of the greatest defensive strength and an ideal base for a surprise attack upon southern Russia, Constantinople, the Ægean Islands, Greece, the Suez Canal, Egypt, Persia, Afghanistan, and India.—*J. Ellis Barker, in the Nineteenth Century and After, June, 1916.*

Eastern Question, FILLING THE VACUUM.—The Near Eastern Question may be defined as the problem of filling up the vacuum created by the gradual disappearance of the Turkish Empire from Europe.—*The Eastern Question, Dr. J. A. Ransome Marriot, p. 2.*

Eastern Question, NOT ONE QUESTION, BUT MANY.—In the sense in which the term is generally used, it means the problem or group of problems that result from the occupation of Constantinople and the Balkan Peninsula by the Turks.—*The Diplomatic Background of the War, Prof. Charles Seymour, of Yale, p. 195.*

Eastern Question, NEGOTIATIONS WITH EGYPT.—The news of the conclusion of the treaty of July had reached Constantinople, and despite some dissensions in the interior of the divan, and some objections by his mother, the sultana Valide, the sultan, always under the influence of Redschid Pasha, hastened to accept it, and forwarded the ratification to London, instructing Rifat Bey to carry to Alexandria the successive summonses, which, in the terms of the treaty, the Porte was to address to the pasha. Rifat Bey arrived at Alexandria on the 11th of August; but found no Mehemet Ali there. He had been for some days

on a tour in lower Egypt, under the pretext of visiting the canals of the Nile, but in reality to gain time, and prepare his means of defense. Having returned to Alexandria on the 14th, he received Rifat Bey on the 16th, and without entering into discussion with him—scarcely giving him time to speak—he rejected the first summons prescribed by the treaty. On the following day (the 17th), the consuls of the four subscribing powers asked an audience, and remonstrated with him on his refusal. He repulsed them sharply, cut short Colonel Hodges, the English consul, and persevered in his remonstrance, saying, "I shall only yield to the saber whom I have won by the saber."—*The Life and Times of Viscount Palmerston, James Ewing Ritchie, Division II, p. 529. The London Printing and Publishing Company, 1866.*

Eastern Question, RIFAT BEY'S FIRST INTERVIEW WITH MEHEMET ALI.—CONSTANTINOPLE, Aug. 27, 1840: By the French steamer of the 24th [of August], we have advices from Egypt to the 16th, but they show no alteration in the resolution of the pasha. Confiding in the valor of his Arab army, and in the strength of the fortifications which defended his capital, he seems determined to abide by the last alternative; and as recourse to this is, therefore, now inevitable, all hope may be considered at an end of a termination of the affair without bloodshed. Immediately on the arrival of the *Cyclops* steamer with the news of the convention with the four powers, Mehemet Ali, it is stated, had quitted Alexandria to make a short tour through lower Egypt: the object of his absenting himself at such a moment being partly to avoid conferences with the European consuls, but principally to endeavor by his own presence to rouse the fanaticism of the Bedouin tribes, and facilitate the raising of his new levies. During the interval of this absence, the Turkish government steamer, which had reached Alexandria on the 11th, with the envoy, Rifat Bey, on board, had been by his orders placed in quarantine, and she was not released from it till the 16th. . . .

On the very day on which he had been admitted to *pratique* [certificate of permission to land passenger and crew], the above-named functionary had had an audience of the pasha, and had communicated to him the commands of the sultan with respect to the evacuation of the Syrian provinces, appointing another audience for the following day, when, in the presence of the consuls of the European powers, he would receive from him his definitive answer, and inform him of the alternative of his refusing to obey, giving him the ten days which have been allotted him by the convention to decide on the course he shall think fit to adopt.—*London Morning Chronicle, Sept. 18, 1840.*

Eastern Question, THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF NEGOTIATIONS IN EGYPT.

Colonel Hodges to Viscount Ponsonby

ALEXANDRIA, August 16, 1840.

[Extract]

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 intrusted.—*Parliamentary Papers, Session 1841, Vol. XXIX, part 2, p. 148.*

NOTE.—Colonel Hodges was British consul-general in Egypt; Lord Ponsonby, the British ambassador at Constantinople.—Ebs.