

error by changing the sentence in 1911, I cannot imagine why Bolton wishes to defend a figure which the writer herself disavowed.

3. As for the number of Protestants who fled France in the sixteenth century, I can only say that I have laid out all the evidence already in my article. I invite the readers of SPECTRUM to reexamine my paragraph (page 65 and note 25) and then judge whether my interpretation or Bolton's is correct. I believe the evidence speaks for itself.

4. Mrs. White's remark about "one of the priests of the new order" follows close on the heels of Scott's anecdote about the Bishop of Paris, which concludes with this sentence: "Several apostate priests followed the example of this prelate." Under these circumstances, who could possibly conclude — as Bolton claims to have done — that "one of the priests of the new order" was in fact not a priest?

REFERENCES

- 1 James A. Wylie, *The History of Protestantism*, volume two (London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin 1874-1877), pp. 600, 602.
- 2 Arthur White, Ellen G. White as an historian (unpublished manuscript), pp. 22-23.
- 3 Donald Greer, *The Incidence of the Terror during the French Revolution: A Statistical Interpretation* (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith 1966), p. 26.

69

WALTER H. ROBERTS, Loma Linda University:

At hand is volume one of the 1827 edition of Scott's *Life of Napoleon*, which I had been reading just before the appearance of [Peterson's] article, and John Buchan's life of Sir Walter Scott written [in observance of] the centenary of the latter's death. Buchan evaluates Scott's biography of Napoleon, with its introductory comments on the French Revolution in essentially the following terms:

It represents a herculean labor matched by tireless industry — a prodigious feat. Scott read, and noted, and indexed with the pertinacity of some pale compiler in the British Museum as he outlined the work. Authoritative source materials were not lacking and were secured from at home and abroad. It is a history for the ordinary reader and not for the scholar. The prerequisites of such a work would include: a just perspective, a well-proportioned narrative, and vigor and color in the telling.

In respect to the first, the work is remarkable for the fact that it was written so close in time to the events described. In respect to the second, the expository matter is skillfully interwoven into the text; it is lacking only in the ability to sustain the reader's interest throughout the nine volumes (attributable in part to the pressure under which it was composed). The work was attacked by the critics on the basis of not being judgmental enough of Napoleon; and after all, the author was not a bona fide historian. Observably, it was the product of a man of genius and on a vast scale (as even a casual perusal will confirm). I might interject here that the *Messiah* was written "in haste," but again by a man of genius.

The Scott references embellish *The Great Controversy* — if the latter needs it. They do not appear incongruous, for [Ellen] White is no mean writer herself. The absurdities and excesses of the revolutionary period are highlighted, and the basic causes are brought into focus. There is a French motto, "Death before dishonor." Perhaps the bishop of Paris (mercifully nameless) should have thought of it and achieved the honor rather than the dishonor. It was my impression that *The Great Controversy*, like Scott's *Napoleon*, was written for the common man. This seems to have been lost on the eminent critic.

Carlyle's *French Revolution*, written in 1837, says essentially the same things as Scott does regarding the bishop and associated events, even giving the bishop's name. McCrie's life of Anton Lavoisier, the great French scientist and patriot, might have suited Peterson better if it had yet been written. In any case, we would look in vain in Lavoisier's writings for any aspersion of the clergy of that day; Lavoisier lived and died a staunch Catholic.

In my opinion, the English instructor at our sister university had better take on a less formidable opponent than [Ellen] White. It is unfortunate that so many readers will not have the resources available to check out the allegations. As Carlyle would say, "Faith is gone out; Scepticism is come in." In these times we need more faith, not more doubt.

WILLIAM S. PETERSON'S REPLY:

I am sorry to have to report that Roberts has seriously misinterpreted John Buchan's remarks on Scott's biography of Napoleon. The passage which he cites — praising Scott for his industrious research — is in fact a quotation from J. G. Lockhart, Scott's son-in-law; but Buchan then goes on to evaluate the *Life of Napoleon* in language almost identical to that which I used in my article:

It was task-work, no doubt, but a prodigious feat of task-work. Most of it was written in haste, with a mind overwrought and a heart distracted by cares. The materials were not available for a full and accurate chronicle, even had Scott the capacity and the desire to use them. . . . Both [Scott's *Life* and Hazlitt's *Life of Napoleon*] are productions of men of genius; both are on a vast scale; neither is the work of a careful scholar.¹

It is true that Buchan praises the *literary* qualities of the biography, but he nowhere makes the claim that it is reliable *history*. Hence Roberts cannot legitimately invoke the authority of Buchan to endorse his own view that Scott is a sound historian. Modern historians are, in fact, almost unanimous in their low estimate of Scott's biography of Napoleon, for the very reasons which I outlined in my article.

In his attempt to defend Scott, Roberts is quarreling not only with me but with a host of witnesses. Scott's own publisher complained that the "tautologies and inaccuracies" of the *Life of Napoleon* cost him "5 hours labour" on every proof sheet of the book;² and when it was published, John Stuart Mill subjected the *Life* to a searching analysis in the *Westminster Review* which revealed once and for all the profound