THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE CHAIN OF TRUTH

A Study of the Seven Times of Leviticus 26

Testing the Seven Times by Scripture, Pioneer History,
and the Spirit of Prophecy

Designed for careful Adventist Bible study

A Bible Adventism Production

Prepared by Christopher Mangar

How to Use This Workbook

This workbook is designed as an investigation, not as a demand for agreement. The 2520 is disputed within modern Seventh-day Adventism. The student is asked to read the biblical passages in context, examine pioneer and Spirit of Prophecy evidence, consider the strongest objections, and record a conclusion only after the evidence has been tested.

Method

Bible first → compare Scripture with Scripture → examine historical evidence → examine Spirit of Prophecy → state the objection fairly → test the objection → record your conclusion.

Evidence Labels

Direct evidence

The source explicitly says the point being asserted.

Strong cumulative inference

Several direct facts converge toward a conclusion, but the conclusion is not stated verbatim.

Typological / corroborative

A biblical pattern or correspondence that supports a theme but should not carry the primary proof.

Advanced interpretive hypothesis

A proposed interpretation that remains open to further testing.

Important Editorial Principle

The workbook will not treat every supporting argument as equal. Leviticus 26 and its biblical parallels must carry the primary exegetical case. Historical and Spirit of Prophecy evidence then tests whether the pioneer interpretation was part of the divinely guided Advent movement. Typology and the Seven Thunders proposal come later as corroborative or advanced material.

Primary materials used in this workbook include the KJV Bible; William Miller's published statements; Ellen G. White, Early Writings; The Spirit of Prophecy, vol. 4; Manuscript Releases; the 1843 prophetic chart; the 1850 Nichols chart; and the January 26, 1864 Review and Herald article "The Seven Times of Lev. xxvi."

Study Roadmap

Lesson	Title	Purpose
1	Who Interprets the Bible?	Scripture as its own expositor; role and limits of Hebrew/Greek scholarship.
2	The Seven Times of Leviticus 26	Read the covenant curse before deciding what “seven times” means.
3	Severity or Duration?	Moses interprets Moses: Leviticus 26 compared with Deuteronomy 28.
4	The Curse, the Oath, and the Scattering	2 Kings 17, Nehemiah 9, Daniel 9.
5	Two Kingdoms, Two Scattering Lines	723 B.C. → 1798 and 677 B.C. → 1844.
6	Two or Three Witnesses	The 2520 as first witness; the 2300 as second witness.
7	William Miller and the Chain of Truth	Angelic guidance and the three commencements.
8	The Two Prophetic Charts	1843 and 1850 as primary evidence.
9	What Was the Mistake?	Early Writings 74 compared with the 1843–1844 correction.
10	The Strongest Objections	Hebrew, Septuagint, “longest and last,” James White, and EGW naming.
11	Christ and the Seven-Year Pattern	Daniel 9, Hebrews 2:3, the daily lambs, and seven arraignments.
12	The Seven Thunders	An advanced historical-prophetic hypothesis.
13	Scattering, Gathering, and the Firm Platform	Present-truth application without prejudging the evidence.
14	Final Evidence Matrix	Build your own conclusion from the complete record.

Lesson 1 — Who Interprets the Bible?

Lesson Objectives

- Identify the Protestant principle that Scripture interprets Scripture.
- Distinguish useful language study from dependence on an expert class.
- Prepare to test the 1864 Hebrew/Greek objection fairly.

Isaiah 28:10 — "For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little."

Isaiah 8:20 — "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Miller's Study Principle

William Miller's published rules insisted that Scripture must serve as its own expositor. Ellen White later commended the principles contained in Miller's rules of Bible interpretation. The issue is not whether Hebrew and Greek are valuable—they are. The issue is whether a linguistic specialist becomes the final authority over the Bible's own internal testimony.

Investigate

A Protestant use of scholarship asks: "What does the original language help us see?" A scholastic misuse asks: "What must the ordinary Bible reader believe because the expert says so?" The workbook will test the linguistic evidence rather than dismiss it.

Why is it important to distinguish scholarship as a tool from scholarship as the final authority?

Preview of the 1864 Objection

The January 26, 1864 Review and Herald article "The Seven Times of Lev. xxvi" argues that the Hebrew and Greek forms in Leviticus 26 do not denote a prophetic period. It also appeals to Gesenius and to the Septuagint. We will examine the argument after first allowing Moses to explain the covenant curse in his own parallel discourse.

Source: Review and Herald, Jan. 26, 1864, "The Seven Times of Lev. xxvi."

Direct evidence

The 1864 article explicitly bases part of its rejection on Hebrew grammar, Gesenius, and the Septuagint.

Lesson 2 — The Seven Times of Leviticus 26

Lesson Objectives

- Read the four “seven times” statements in context.
- Identify covenant, punishment, scattering, and restoration themes.
- Separate what the text says explicitly from what must still be inferred.

Leviticus 26:18 — “And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins.”

Leviticus 26:21 — “I will bring seven times more plagues upon you according to your sins.”

Leviticus 26:24 — “Then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you yet seven times for your sins.”

Leviticus 26:28 — “Then I will walk contrary unto you also in fury; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins.”

Leviticus 26:33 — “And I will scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you.”

Observation Before Interpretation

What conditions trigger the judgments?

What repeated expression appears four times?

Does the chapter contain escalating severity?

Does the chapter also culminate in national scattering?

What promises of remembrance/restoration appear later in the chapter?

Do Not Rush the Conclusion

At this stage, the student has not yet proven that “seven times” equals 2520 years. The first task is to establish what the covenant curse contains and what later inspired writers say about its fulfillment.

Lesson 3 — Severity or Duration?

Lesson Objectives

- Understand the 1864 “severity, not duration” argument.
- Compare Leviticus 26 with Deuteronomy 28.
- Determine whether Moses describes covenant punishment as prolonged.

The Objection

The 1864 article argues that the repeated “seven times” signifies the fullness or intensity of punishment rather than its duration. The article points to progressively more severe judgments in Leviticus 26.

Direct evidence

Leviticus 26 undeniably contains escalating judgments. A fair rebuttal must acknowledge that fact.

Moses Interprets Moses

> *Deuteronomy 28:58–59 — “If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law… then the LORD will make thy plagues wonderful… even great plagues, and of long continuance.”*
>
> *Deuteronomy 28:64 — “And the LORD shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other.”*

Key Question

If the parallel covenant curse explicitly includes judgments “of long continuance,” is it sufficient to say that the punishment concerns severity and not duration?

Write your conclusion from Deuteronomy 28 before moving on:

Direct evidence

Deuteronomy 28 establishes duration as an explicit feature of the covenant judgments. It does not by itself establish the numerical length 2520; that remains to be tested.

Lesson 4 — The Curse, the Oath, and the Scattering

Lesson Objectives

- Trace the covenant curse through Israel's history.
- See how later inspired writers interpret Moses.
- Identify scattering as a foretold covenant judgment.

2 Kings 17:13 — "The LORD testified against Israel, and against Judah, by all the prophets, and by all the seers."

2 Kings 17:23 — "The LORD removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets."

Nehemiah 9:30 — "Yet many years didst thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them by thy spirit in thy prophets: yet would they not give ear."

Daniel 9:11 — "Therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God."

Bible-to-Bible Chain

Trace It

Moses foretells covenant judgment → the prophets repeatedly warn Israel and Judah → the historical books record removal/scattering → Daniel identifies the calamity as the curse and oath written in Moses.

What does Daniel's language tell you about how he understood Israel's captivity?

Lexical Study to Keep in View

Daniel 9:11 uses Hebrew language for "curse" and "oath." The relationship between Hebrew words for swearing/oath and the number seven is worth studying, but this workbook will not claim that Daniel 9:11 literally says "an oath sworn seven times" unless the lexical evidence establishes that wording. The direct point is that Daniel identifies the national calamity with the Mosaic covenant curse.

Lesson 5 — Two Kingdoms, Two Scattering Lines

Lesson Objectives

- Review the divided kingdom after Solomon.
- Distinguish the northern and southern captivity lines.
- Calculate the two proposed 2520 termini without a year zero.

After Solomon, the Hebrew monarchy divided into the northern kingdom (Israel, ten tribes) and the southern kingdom (Judah, principally Judah and Benjamin). The working 2520 interpretation recognizes two corresponding national-loss lines rather than treating 723 B.C. and 677 B.C. as rival dates.

Kingdom	Proposed commencement	2520 calculation	Proposed terminus
Northern Israel	723 B.C.	723 + 1798 − 1 = 2520	1798
Southern Judah	677 B.C.	677 + 1844 − 1 = 2520	1844

The subtraction of 1 accounts for the absence of a year zero between 1 B.C. and A.D. 1.

Why Miller Used 677 B.C.

William Miller wrote that he concluded the “seven times” must commence when the Jews ceased to be an independent nation, at the captivity of Manasseh, which his chronologers assigned to 677 B.C. In this reasoning, the earlier northern captivity is acknowledged, while 677 functions as the later/final loss of independence of the remaining southern kingdom.

> *Jeremiah 50:17 — “Israel is a scattered sheep… first the king of Assyria hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath broken his bones.”*

Use Jeremiah Carefully

Jeremiah 50:17 supports a first/last pattern in Israel’s scattering history. It does not itself establish 677 B.C.; that date must be established historically and through Miller’s chronology.

Does the two-kingdom structure make better sense of the two commencements than treating them as competing dates? Explain.

Lesson 6 — Two or Three Witnesses

Lesson Objectives

- Establish the biblical multiple-witness principle.
- Understand the proposed relationship between the 2520 and 2300.
- Avoid claiming more than the witness texts actually say.

Deuteronomy 19:15 — "At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established."

Matthew 18:16 — "In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established."

2 Corinthians 13:1 — "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established."

The Proposed Prophetic Application

Working Thesis

The 2520 is the first chronological witness in Miller's chain; the 2300 is the second witness. Their convergence upon the Advent-era terminus is proposed as corroboration rather than as a biblical rule that every time prophecy must have a second time prophecy.

What does the Bible explicitly establish about witnesses?

What additional step is required before applying that principle specifically to the 2520 and 2300?

Supporting witness passages from the study notes include Deut. 17:6–7; John 5:30–37; John 8:14–18; Rev. 11:3; Heb. 10:28; 1 Tim. 5:19; 1 John 5:7–9; 1 Cor. 14:29.

Lesson 7 — William Miller and the Chain of Truth

Lesson Objectives

- Examine Ellen White's description of Miller's angelic guidance.
- Compare that description with Miller's own list of commencements.
- Distinguish direct statements from cumulative inference.

Spirit of Prophecy Evidence

In the Early Writings chapter "William Miller," Ellen White says God sent His angel to move upon Miller's heart, that angels repeatedly guided his mind in prophetic study, and that the commencement of the chain of truth was given him. The wording establishes divine guidance of Miller's prophetic investigation, while not making every conclusion Miller ever held infallible.

Miller's Own Three Commencements

> *"From a further study of the Scriptures, I concluded that the seven times of Gentile supremacy must commence when the Jews ceased to be an independent nation, at the captivity of Manasseh... B.C. 677; that the 2300 days commenced with the seventy weeks... B.C. 457; and that the 1335 days, commencing with the taking away of the daily..."*

William Miller, William Miller's Apology and Defence (1845), p. 11; the same retrospective account is reproduced in Memoirs of William Miller. Verify the final public-edition citation before publication.

The Central Question

If Ellen White says the commencement of the chain of truth was given under angelic guidance, and Miller's own chronological summary begins with the seven times, what evidence is required to exclude that first commencement from the divinely guided chain?

Strong cumulative inference

Ellen White does not say, "the angel gave Miller the 2520." The argument arises by placing her description of the guided chain beside Miller's own account of its commencements.

After comparing the two sources, what conclusion is warranted—and what conclusion would go beyond the evidence?

Lesson 8 — The Two Prophetic Charts

Lesson Objectives

- Inspect the 1843 and 1850 charts as primary evidence.
- Verify whether the 2520 appears on both.
- Compare Ellen White's statements concerning both chart movements.

1843 Chart — Primary Evidence

Figure 1. 1843 prophetic chart. The 2520 is visibly included among the chart's prophetic calculations.

Primary source supplied by the user: Chart_1843.pdf.

1850 Nichols Chart — Primary Evidence

Figure 2. 1850 Nichols prophetic chart. The 2520 remains present in the post-1844 prophetic presentation.

Primary source supplied by the user: Chart_1850.pdf.

What Inspiration Says About the Charts

Early Writings 74 says the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord and that a mistake in some figures was providentially hidden for a time. The Spirit of Prophecy, vol. 4, connects Charles Fitch's 1842 chart work with the command of Habakkuk 2 to write the vision and make it plain upon tables.

Concerning the Nichols chart, 13MR 359.1 says God was in its publication and that there was a prophecy of the chart in the Bible. 16MR 207.1 describes the truth being made plain upon tables in connection with the three angels' messages.

Primary-Source Finding

The 2520 is present on both the 1843 and 1850 charts. Therefore, the claim that the 2520 was simply removed from the 1850 chart after the disappointment is contradicted by the charts themselves.

Direct evidence

Both uploaded charts visibly contain the 2520. Ellen White explicitly connects both chart movements with divine direction, although this does not automatically make every detail on a chart individually infallible.

Habakkuk 2 and "Tables"

> *Habakkuk 2:2–3 — "Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables... for the vision is yet for an appointed time... though it tarry, wait for it."*

The working interpretation sees the 1843 and 1850 charts as the two foundational Adventist prophetic tables. The parallel with Moses' two tables and the sanctuary is typological and should not be made to carry the direct proof; the direct evidence is Ellen White's own application of Habakkuk to the chart work and her endorsement of the two chart movements.

Typological / corroborative

"Tables" is plural, but the plural alone does not prove there must be exactly two Adventist charts. The two-table parallel is supporting typology.

After inspecting both charts, what does the continued presence of the 2520 in 1850 require an opponent to explain?

Lesson 9 — What Was the “Mistake”?

Lesson Objectives

- Read Early Writings 74 and the later 1843–1844 explanation together.
- Distinguish a correction of reckoning from elimination of a prophetic period.
- Test the claim that the 2520 itself was the hidden mistake.

Early Writings 74

In the September 23, 1850 vision, Ellen White says the 1843 chart was directed by the Lord while also saying that a mistake in some figures had been hidden until the proper time. This is a tension the workbook must preserve rather than explain away.

Early Writings 236–237

Later in Early Writings, Ellen White describes the believers discovering that the prophetic periods reached to 1844 and that the same evidence they had used for 1843 pointed them to the corrected 1844 expectation. She then says believers testified that the prophetic periods extended to 1844.

Test the Claim

Does Ellen White identify the 2520 as the mistake? Or does she describe a correction in the reckoning/termination of prophetic periods? The burden of proof belongs to whichever interpretation claims to identify the mistake.

What does EW 74 explicitly say?

What do EW 236–237 explicitly say happened after the mistake was explained?

Does the continued presence of the 2520 on the 1850 chart affect your assessment? Why?

Strong cumulative inference

The plural “prophetic periods” is significant, but plural grammar alone cannot identify which periods Ellen White intended. The chart evidence and Millerite chronology must be brought alongside it.

Lesson 10 — The Strongest Objections

Lesson Objectives

- Represent the opposition fairly.
- Test linguistic, historical, and Spirit of Prophecy arguments.
- Distinguish a strong rebuttal from an overstatement.

A. “The Hebrew does not support a time prophecy.”

The 1864 article argues that Leviticus 26 uses an adverb while Daniel’s explicit prophetic periods use nouns. Response: take the grammar seriously, but test it against the full covenant context and Moses’ explicit language of long continuance.

B. “The phrase means severity, not duration.”

Response: Leviticus contains escalating severity, but Deuteronomy 28 explicitly adds long continuation. The remaining question is whether “seven times” defines the duration.

C. “The Septuagint settles the question.”

Response: the Septuagint is valuable evidence, but its authority must be applied consistently. Brenton’s English translation of the Septuagint renders Daniel 8:14 with 2400 rather than 2300. That textual difference shows why a Greek translation cannot simply function as an infallible trump card in the Leviticus 26 debate.

D. “Ellen White never mentioned 2520.”

More precise formulation: she does not appear to name the number explicitly. Yet she repeatedly addresses the charts, prophetic periods, Miller’s chain, scattering/gathering, and the 1843–1844 correction. The debate is whether those statements encompass the 2520.

E. “The 2520 was the mistake in EW 74.”

Response: Ellen White never identifies it by name as the mistake, and the 2520 remains on the 1850 Nichols chart. The claim requires evidence.

F. “The 2300 is the longest and last prophetic period.”

This is one of the strongest objections. The Great Controversy statement must be read in its narrative context: Ellen White is describing what Miller and his associates proclaimed and then focuses on Daniel 8:14. The workbook asks whether this is an absolute numerical definition or a description of the central Advent proclamation.

G. “James White later rejected it.”

James White’s January 26, 1864 Review and Herald article documents a later pioneer rejection of the 2520, and later chart material documents a changed prophetic presentation. Neither fact, by itself, establishes that the change was divinely directed. The evidentiary question is whether a comparable inspired statement identifies the later rejection or omission as God’s correction of the earlier divinely directed charts.

Which objection currently appears strongest to you, and what evidence would be required to answer it convincingly?

Lesson 11 — Christ and the Seven-Year Pattern

Lesson Objectives

- See how Daniel 9 contains a complete seven-year prophetic period.
- Examine the Christ/apostles sequence in Hebrews 2:3.
- Treat the lamb and arraignment patterns as typology, not primary proof.

> *Daniel 9:27 — "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease."*
>
> *Hebrews 2:3 — "Which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him."*

Prophetic Mathematics

One prophetic week = seven years. Using the 360-day prophetic year employed in the 1260/42-month framework: 7 × 360 = 2520 prophetic days; 3½ years + 3½ years = 1260 + 1260.

Direct evidence

Daniel 9 contains a seven-year prophetic week. The 2520-day arithmetic is a mathematical equivalence; it does not by itself prove Leviticus 26 is a 2520-year prophecy.

The Daily Lamb Pattern

The sanctuary appointed two lambs each day, morning and evening. If the first half of the seventieth week is represented as 1260 prophetic days, the daily-service count contains 2520 sacrificial appointments. The Desire of Ages describes the evening lamb escaping at Christ's death and states that type met antitype in the death of God's Son.

Typological / corroborative

The "2520th lamb" construction is a typological calculation. Ellen White does not identify Christ numerically as "the 2520th lamb." Use this pattern as corroboration, not foundation.

Seven Arraignments and the Curse

The Desire of Ages describes Christ as arraigned twice before the priests, twice before the Sanhedrin, twice before Pilate, and once before Herod—seven appearances. Galatians 3:13 says Christ became a curse for us. The proposed connection to the sevenfold covenant curse is typological, not an explicit inspired identification.

What theological value can typology add after a doctrine has already been established by direct evidence?

Lesson 12 — The Seven Thunders

Lesson Objectives

- Read Ellen White's explicit statement about the Seven Thunders.
- Compare the seven proposed historical prophetic lines.
- Keep the identification at hypothesis level unless further evidence proves it.

Ellen White says the special light expressed in the seven thunders was "a delineation of events" that would transpire under the first and second angels' messages. She also states that the thunders relate to future events. This workbook deliberately limits itself to the proposed historical dimension. See 7BC 971.4–6; cf. 19MR 320.2–3.

Proposed line	Commencement	Termination	Subject
2520 — Northern Israel	723 B.C.	1798	Scattering line
2520 — Southern Judah	677 B.C.	1844	Scattering/gathering line
2300	457 B.C.	1844	Sanctuary / judgment
1335	A.D. 508	1843	Blessing / "daily" framework
1290	A.D. 508	1798	"Daily" framework
1260	A.D. 538	1798	Persecution / papal supremacy
Revelation 9 combined line	Pioneer trumpet chronology	1840 culmination	Fifth/sixth trumpet; first/second woe

Why Combine Revelation 9?

The five-month/150-year period and the 391-years-15-days period belong to successive trumpet/woe lines in Revelation 9. The working hypothesis treats them as one continuous historical subject, while the two 2520 applications are counted separately because they have distinct kingdoms, commencements, and termini.

Advanced interpretive hypothesis

Ellen White does not list these seven lines as the seven thunders. This identification is an interpretive reconstruction that must remain open to testing.

What evidence would move this interpretation from "hypothesis" to "strong inference"?

Lesson 13 — Scattering, Gathering, and the Firm Platform

Lesson Objectives

- Connect the 2520 subject matter with scattering/gathering.
- Use Early Writings 74 accurately in its 1850 setting.
- Apply the “firm platform” and “danger of rejecting light” counsels responsibly.

The Gathering Time

Early Writings 74 records a September 23, 1850 vision. Ellen White says that in the scattering Israel was smitten and torn, while “now in the gathering time” God would heal and bind up His people. This proves that she regarded the gathering as underway by 1850; it does not by itself identify 1844 as the exact beginning of the gathering.

Direct evidence

EW 74 explicitly uses scattering/gathering language and explicitly endorses the 1843 chart in the same vision.

The Firm Platform

In “A Firm Platform,” Ellen White warns against attacks on the established Advent platform. In the General Conference Bulletin of April 6, 1903, she warns that nothing should be allowed to disturb the foundation of the faith built since the messages of 1842, 1843, and 1844.

The Danger of Rejecting Light

Gospel Workers, beginning on page 297 under “The Danger of Rejecting Light,” warns against treating the absence of controversy as proof of sound doctrine and encourages continued investigation of Scripture. This counsel should not be weaponized to declare every opponent a rejecter of light. Its proper use is methodological: investigate before accepting or rejecting.

Closing Principle

Do not accept the 2520 because William Miller taught it. Do not reject it because modern Adventist scholarship opposes it. Determine whether it belongs to the biblical and prophetic foundation by testing the evidence.

How can a believer defend foundational truth without confusing tradition, personalities, or institutional consensus with biblical authority?

Lesson 14 — Final Evidence Matrix

Lesson Objectives

- Separate direct evidence from inference and typology.
- Record both the strongest pro and con evidence.
- Write a conclusion that is proportional to the evidence.

Evidence	Category	Key question	My assessment
Leviticus 26 contains repeated “seven times” language	Direct text	What does the phrase mean in context?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
Deuteronomy 28 calls the covenant judgments “of long continuance”	Direct biblical evidence	Duration is part of the curse.	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
Daniel 9 identifies the captivity with the curse/oath of Moses	Direct biblical evidence	Later inspiration interprets Mosaic curse historically.	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
Miller lists 677 / 457 / 508 commencements	Direct historical evidence	How does this relate to EGW’s “chain of truth”?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
1843 chart contains the 2520	Direct primary-source evidence	What does EGW’s chart endorsement encompass?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
1850 chart contains the 2520	Direct primary-source evidence	Why was it retained after 1844?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
EW 74: chart directed; mistake hidden	Direct SOP evidence	What exactly was the mistake?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
EW 236–237: prophetic periods extended to 1844	Direct SOP evidence	Which periods are intended?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
Two-witness application: 2520 + 2300	Inference	Does Miller’s sequence support the application?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
Daniel 9 seven-year week = 2520 prophetic days	Corroborative mathematics	Does this illuminate Leviticus 26?	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
2520 sacrificial appointments / seven arraignments	Typology	Supporting pattern, not primary proof.	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:
Seven Thunders identification	Hypothesis	Requires further corroboration.	Strong / Moderate / Weak Notes:

Your Final Conclusion

After completing the entire workbook, answer: Does Scripture establish a 2520-year prophetic period in Leviticus 26? What role, if any, do the pioneer charts and Spirit of Prophecy play in confirming your conclusion?

What Would Change Your Mind?

List the specific biblical or historical evidence that would cause you to revise your conclusion. This is an important safeguard against confirmation bias.

Appendix A — Working Prophetic Chronology

Period	Beginning	End	Note
Northern 2520	723 B.C.	1798	723 + 1798 − 1 = 2520
Southern 2520	677 B.C.	1844	677 + 1844 − 1 = 2520
2300	457 B.C.	1844	Historicist Adventist chronology
1335	A.D. 508	1843	Pioneer/Historicist chronology
1290	A.D. 508	1798	Pioneer/Historicist chronology
1260	A.D. 538	1798	Historicist chronology
Rev. 9 line	Pioneer chronology	Aug. 11, 1840 culmination	Fifth/sixth trumpet interpretation

These dates reflect the historicist and pioneer framework examined in this workbook. Students are encouraged to verify historical dates and source citations from primary editions and denominational archival sources.

Appendix B — Core Source List

- King James Version Bible: Leviticus 26; Deuteronomy 17, 19, 28; 2 Kings 17; Nehemiah 9; Daniel 8–9, 12; Habakkuk 2; Matthew 18; Hebrews 2; Galatians 3; Revelation 9–11.
- Ellen G. White, Early Writings: “William Miller,” “The Gathering Time” (including p. 74), “The First Angel’s Message” (pp. 236–237), and “A Firm Platform.”
- Ellen G. White, The Spirit of Prophecy, vol. 4: Charles Fitch and the prophetic chart / Habakkuk 2 discussion.
- Ellen G. White, Manuscript Releases: 13MR 359.1 (Nichols chart); 16MR 207.1 (truth made plain upon tables / three angels’ messages).
- Ellen G. White, Gospel Workers, section “The Danger of Rejecting Light,” beginning on p. 297.
- William Miller, published account of his prophetic study and the commencements 677 B.C., 457 B.C., and A.D. 508.
- 1843 Prophetic Chart (primary-source facsimile).
- 1850 Nichols Prophetic Chart (primary-source facsimile).
- Review and Herald, January 26, 1864, “The Seven Times of Lev. xxvi.”

Publication Check

This master is a research workbook. Before final public release, every quotation should be checked against the original edition/page, and every disputed historical date should be footnoted to a primary or high-quality archival source.

“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” — 1 Thessalonians 5:21, KJV