Ellen White's Literary Indebtedness

WILLIAM S. PETERSON

Although I admire Mr. Wood's evident industriousness, I must take exception to the method of his article, which really obscures rather than clarifies the issues at stake. His technique is to assault our sensibilities with such an onslaught of miscellaneous factual information— most of it wildly irrelevant — that we are left feeling benumbed by what superficially appears to be a tour de force of scholarship. In fact, Mr. Wood is guilty of (*a*) manipulating evidence to his own advantage, (*b*) offering misleading generalizations about the historiography of the French Revolution, (*c*) repeatedly asserting what he cannot prove, and (*d*) concealing the dogmatic assumptions upon which his argument rests. Under these circumstances, his claim to sit in judgment on the quality of the scholarship of others seems rather hollow.

I must also object to the tone of calm superiority with which he announces, in his final paragraphs, that he has now successfully disposed of all the problems discussed in my article. Given the very imperfect state of our knowledge about Mrs. White's writings, we really should at this point make our assertions less sweeping than that. So far as possible, both Mr. Wood and I ought to try to avoid the ex cathedra note in our pronouncements. I was particularly startled to find Mr. Wood declaring that "no one need enter into . . . a discussion of Mrs. White's theory of history." I cannot believe he really means that, since in the following paragraph he observes that "there is everything to be gained and nothing to be lost if Adventist scholarship would take a long and careful look at her work. Truth —if it is truth — is always strengthened by careful study."

I will proceed on the assumption, then, that the latter statement reflects Mr. Wood's real sentiments.

I

Clearly Mr. Wood is happiest and most persuasive in dealing with questions of fact. Some of these matters I will discuss here, though I have relegated the more trivial ones to a long footnote.[1] On the other hand, when he turns his attention to the *ideas* of my article, he seems to me less successful. Consider, for example, this paragraph:

> Peterson apparently has no objection to Wylie at all except that he has arrived at the same conclusions as Mrs. White. The strange argument is given that Mrs. White should not have used Wylie, since Wylie shared her conclusions. Are we to assume that all historians who agree with Mrs. White are therefore automatically excluded as sources of historical truth? Non sequitur.

This is utter nonsense, and Mr. Wood must surely know that it is. It does not bear the slightest resemblance to anything I said in my article. Anyone who has so seriously misread me is certainly in no position to deliver a patronizing lecture on my alleged misinterpretation of a passage by Mrs. White — which, he claims, would be perfectly clear to "any freshman English student."

Mr. Wood first offers a survey of the historians cited by Mrs. White in chapter fifteen of *The Great Controversy,* since he feels I have evaluated them unfairly. Some of the information he supplies here is of interest, but most of it seems to me, frankly, irrelevant (and for that reason I have dealt with his specific objections in my first note). The question at issue is not how much time Sir Walter Scott devoted to lunch or even what he thought of Napoleon, but rather his reputation as a historian.

I contended in my article that Scott's unusually strong Tory bias and his careless research prevented him from treating the French Revolution objectively or accurately. If Mr. Wood has any evidence to refute this observation, he should present it, instead of quibbling about Scott's eating habits. In fact, as Mr. Wood must realize, the estimate of Scott's historical writings which I presented reflects the consensus of modern historians. If Mr. Wood then wishes to assert (as Elder Bradley did) that Scott and his contemporaries presented a "true" picture of the French Revolution and that twentieth-century historians have been corrupted by papal influence, I can only throw up my hands in despair. At that point we are no longer dealing with evidence that can be rationally assessed; we have instead imperceptibly drifted into the realm of our collective Adventist fantasies.

Similarly, I fail to see the connection between the repressive policies of Pius IX and Wylie's *History of Protestantism.* The internal evidence of Wylie's writings suggests very strongly that he was an anti-Catholic fanatic of the type that no Adventist ought to respect. Our rejection of Catholicism is based on doctrinal grounds, not a visceral hatred as in the case of Wylie. Again, although Mr. Wood speaks admiringly of "Wylie's stature," he offers no proof of it. The reason for this silence, I presume, is that — so far as I can determine — Wylie *has* no stature today as a historian.

Mr. Wood also devotes a good deal of space in this section of his article to refuting a position I never held: that the historians in question expressed identical views on every subject. I merely said that there were some similarities in their attitudes toward the Revolution, and (though Mr. Wood ignores this point altogether) that they were far from being the best authorities available in Mrs. White's day. If Mr. Wood will take the time to study the historiography of the French Revolution — as he apparently has not yet done — he will discover that impartial, documented studies of the Revolution by men like Taine and de Tocqueville were in print when Mrs. White was revising and expanding *The Great Controversy* during the 1880s.

Mr. Wood's response to this statement, I gather, is that Mrs. White's historical sources were reliable *because* she consulted them. Indeed, this is his fundamental assumption, though it is almost hidden by a plethora of facts and footnotes. Near the end of his article he declares that the sources "were not poor ones, nor were they mishandled. Instead, they were used soundly and consistently to present those things Mrs. White had seen in vision." Beneath the trappings of a presumably factual inquiry, then, we discover here a syllogistic logic which is identical to Elder Bradley's: (1) Mrs. White was shown all of the events of the French Revolution in vision; (2) she quoted the historians whose accounts corresponded with her visions; and therefore (3) these historians provide the most reliable accounts available.

This, I submit, is the a priori basis of Mr. Wood's article which belies his pretensions of inductive scholarship. Mr. Wood seems not to understand that it was precisely his major premise that I was calling into question. What evidence does he find of visionary revelations in chapter fifteen? As I wrote in my article:

> It is true that the early part of the chapter is a discussion of the prophetic significance of the French Revolution and that the final pages offer moral generalizations on the decline of France. But the central section of "The Bible and the French Revolution,"

which is entirely historical, I have compared line by line with her sources — where they are known — and I do not find a single detail which is not also present in them. Even her moral perspective is shared by the historians she consulted. Except for a few broad generalizations about the Albigenses, Mrs. White provided no connected historical narrative in 1884; this appeared only after she had been reading in Andrews' library, and then every fact, every observation, came from printed sources.

Since writing the above, I have discovered that "The Bible and the French Revolution" was an untypical chapter in its use of a wide variety of historical sources. Some of the earlier chapters of *The Great Controversy* are based almost exclusively on d'Aubigné — that is, virtually every paragraph is a quotation, close paraphrase, or summary of d'Aubigné. Therefore, to assert, as Francis D. Nichol did, that only twelve percent of *The Great Controversy* is quoted matter is, in a sense, to beg the question.[2] D'Aubigné in these chapters is supplying the *structure* and *perspective* of the book, not merely a few illustrative details. (Obviously if I were to attempt to document this generalization, I would exhaust the patience of even the very patient editor of SPECTRUM; but Mr. Wood or anyone else can test my statement by reading d'Aubigné and *The Great Controversy* side by side.)

Mr. Wood's manner of treating Mrs. White's specific historical errors in the 1888 edition is very curious, to say the least: in each instance, *ignoring the fact that Mrs. White tacitly acknowledged the error by correcting it in 1911,* he insists that she made no mistakes in 1888. By now it should be unmistakably clear that Mr. Wood is defending not Mrs. White's inspiration — since no writer in SPECTRUM has denied or questioned it — but a particular theory of her inspiration. Evidently he sees her writings as inerrant and completely free of all factual mistakes. If he does *not* hold this view of her inspiration, then why does he feel obliged to defend her acknowledged inaccuracies?

And yet, at other times, Mr. Wood seems ready to abandon this hardline position (which I doubt is accepted by most Adventists) and to announce instead that the only really important pages in chapter fifteen are the introductory ones, which interpret the prophecies of Revelation eleven; the rest of the chapter, he appears to be saying, is merely illustrative anecdotes. Her exposition of Revelation eleven, according to Mr. Wood, "was entirely her own, and the only reason for using historical data at all." This particular claim, however, would be very difficult to support, for her interpretation of the prophetic significance of the French Revolution had been held by nearly all millenarian groups of the early nineteenth century.

Students of prophecy had long been convinced that the 1260 days of Revelation eleven represented 1260 years, but unfortunately they had no

specific date with which to connect either the beginning or the end of the period. Thus the French Revolution — the anticlericalism of which could be interpreted as making war on the Two Witnesses (i.e., the Old and New Testaments) — created widespread interest in apocalyptic prophecies in both America and Britain, because it supplied the necessary date for the conclusion of the 1260 years. From there it was quite easy to work back to A.D. 538 as the beginning of papal supremacy.[3] Considering how generally this interpretation was accepted among millenarianists of otherwise diverse views, I do not know in what sense it can be described as "entirely [Mrs. White's] own."

Mr. Wood also lays a good deal of stress on a few passages in which Mrs. White spoke of the underlying causes of the French Revolution; these passages, he tells us, offer a subtle and profound analysis of the events treated in the chapter. Yet even here it seems to me that there are serious obstacles to accepting at face value what she said about the Revolution. I will give only a few examples:

1. She was under the mistaken impression that the Revolution was initiated by the populace. In fact, it began among the aristocracy, then filtered down to the bourgeoisie, and finally reached the masses.[4]

2. She repeatedly mentioned the extreme poverty of the middle and lower classes in France as a cause of the Revolution. In fact, they were among the most prosperous in Europe.[5]

3. She described France, on the eve of the Revolution, as being under the domination of Rome. In fact, the Gallican church was extremely nationalistic and jealous of its prerogatives. France was of course Catholic, but it was not in any real sense under papal control.[6]

4. She provided an inaccurate account (*The Great Controversy,* p. 282) of the role of the Estates-General in the Revolution. She referred to the Third Estate as the "outraged populace" and apparently attributed to it the extremism of the Terror. In fact, the Third Estate was the bourgeoisie, and it advocated only very moderate reforms. The more violent revolutionists came from a different quarter.[7]

5. She especially attributed the French Revolution to France's rejection of the Reformation. In fact, the French Revolution was part of a larger pattern of revolutions throughout western Europe and North America during the late eighteenth century. It was preceded, for example, by revolutions in Britain's American colonies, the Netherlands, and Belgium. And these other revolutions — some in Protestant lands — occasionally produced widespread suffering and social dislocation as severe as in France.[8]

Since Mr. Wood has now put himself on record as agreeing with me that Mrs. White's writings will benefit from a closer study by Adventist scholars, I feel it would be useful for me to conclude this response to his article by suggesting some further lines of inquiry.

The published sources of *The Great Controversy* are relatively easy to investigate, since they are listed in the footnotes and bibliography. There are some indications, however, that the pattern of this book's literary development is not so untypical as one might suppose, and that in many of Mrs. White's volumes there are unacknowledged borrowings. How extensive her literary indebtedness was or what particular sources she used we do not know in most cases, for there are no footnotes in her other books.

I will repeat — since neither Elder Bradley nor Mr. Wood seems willing to believe me — that I am not discussing plagiarism. I am talking about *literary indebtedness.* Plagiarism is a narrow, technical term which simply does not apply in the case of Mrs. White, because I am not accusing her of dishonest motives or of violating the copyright law. I am simply asking what published sources she used, and how and why she used them. If Elder Bradley insists on treating me as if I were a reincarnation of D. H. Canright, then he misunderstands both my method and my intent.

Any literary scholar can tell us that "source studies" are among the most treacherous tasks to undertake, for merely establishing a similarity — even a marked similarity — between two literary texts is not sufficient evidence of borrowing. One must also demonstrate (*a*) that text B was written after the publication of text A (the presumed "source"), (*b*) that the author of text B could be reasonably supposed to have had access to text A, and (*c*) that the ideas or even the language of text A have not become sufficiently dispersed so as to be, in effect, the common literary property of the age.

It is this third condition that is especially important to keep in mind in dealing with Mrs. White's books. Although many Adventist readers today are not aware of it, the types of books that Mrs. White wrote — particularly the Conflict of the Ages series — represent very common genres in the nineteenth century. In any large university or seminary library one will find row on row of Victorian lives of Christ, most of them done in approximately the same manner as *The Desire of Ages.* Frequently the engravings, the chapter titles, the style, and the pattern of development are virtually identical. To an Adventist who has been raised on *The Desire of Ages,* reading these books can be an eerie experience, evoking as it does the shock of recognition and the sudden realization that *The Desire of Ages* belongs to a

recognizable literary category; one becomes aware that it was not produced in a vacuum. Obviously to isolate specific "sources" or "influences" in such a context is difficult, for we are confronted instead with an entire atmosphere of shared literary assumptions and habits.

Nevertheless, with the advice of some of my friends, I have been able to compile a modest list of sources that Mrs. White is known to have used in her other books.[9] In each instance I have verified to my own satisfaction that some indebtedness exists, although I make no pretense of having sampled more than a few chapters in every book. What follows, therefore, is not meant to be definitive but is based on at least a brief examination of the book:

1. W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (1852). Nichol claims that "direct quotations of words, phrases, and clauses, plus any accompanying close paraphrase," constitute about seven percent of *Sketches from the Life of Paul.*[10] My impression is that the influence of Conybeare and Howson in *Sketches* is more pervasive than this figure might indicate, since their book appears to have supplied the basic structure of many of Mrs. White's chapters.

2. Frederic W. Farrar, *The Life and Work of St. Paul* (1879). Mrs. White shows some familiarity with this book also in *Sketches from the Life of Paul,* but her precise indebtedness would be difficult to establish, because Farrar borrows extensively from Conybeare and Howson.

3. Friedrich W. Krummacher, *Elijah the Tishbite* (1835; first English translation, 1836). There are unmistakable evidences throughout the chapter entitled "Elijah the Tishbite" in *Prophets and Kings* of borrowing from Krummacher.

4. Daniel March, *Night Scenes from the Bible* (1869). The chapters entitled "At the Feast of Tabernacles," "Gethsemane," and "The Walk to Emmaus" in *The Desire of Ages* draw very heavily on this work, often in the form of close paraphrases.

5. Frederic W. Farrar, *The Life of Christ* (1874). I find occasional but distinct indications of indebtedness in *The Desire of Ages.* Compare their descriptions, for example, of the marriage feast at Cana, Lazarus' grave, and the second cleansing of the Temple.

6. C. E. Stowe, *Origin and History of the Bible* (1867). Mrs. White paraphrases and quotes this book so extensively in *Selected Messages* that I will quote the relevant passages from both. (Incidentally, it will be observed that Mrs. White is here appropriating another man's ideas, not historical information.)

Moreover, human minds are unlike in the impressions which they receive from the same word; and it is certain that one man seldom gives to another, of different temperament, education, and habits of thought, by language, exactly the same idea, with the same shape and color, as that which lies in his own mind; yet, if men are honest and right-minded they can come near enough to each other's meaning for all purposes of practical utility.

Here comes in the objection that the Bible can be made to mean anything and everything, all sects build upon it, the most diverse doctrines are derived from it.

This infelicity it shares with everything else that has to be expressed in human language. This is owing to the imperfection, the necessary imperfection of human language, and to the infirmity and perverse ingenuity also of the human mind. It is not anything peculiar to the Bible. Hear two opposing lawyers argue a point of statute law in its application to a particular case. Hear two opposing politicians make their diverse arguments in reference to the true intent and force of a particular clause in the United States Constitution. . . . It is for practical purposes only that the Bible was given.

Yet prepossessions, prejudices and passions come in so plentifully to darken and confuse men's minds, when they are reading the Bible. . . .

The Bible is not a specimen of God's skill as a writer, showing us God's mode of thought, giving us God's logic, and God's rhetoric, and God's style of historical narration. How often do we see men seeking out isolated passages of Scripture, and triumphantly saying that such expressions are unworthy of God, and could not have proceeded from Him. . . . God has not put himself on trial before us in that way in the Bible. . . . It is always to be remembered that the writers of the Bible were 'God's penmen, and not God's pens.'

It is not the words of the Bible that were inspired, it is not the thoughts of the Bible that were inspired; it is the

Human minds vary. . . . The minds of different education and thought receive different impressions of the same words, and it is difficult for one mind to give to one of a different temperament, education, and habits of thought by language exactly the same idea which is clear and distinct in his own mind. Yet to honest men, right-minded men, he can be so simple and plain as to convey his meaning for all practical purposes. . . . They [skeptics] declare that the Bible can prove anything and everything, that every sect proves their doctrines right, and that the most diverse doctrines are proved from the Bible.

The writers of the Bible had to express their ideas in human language. . . . Because of the imperfections of human understanding of language, or the perversity of the human mind, ingenious in evading the truth, many read and understand the Bible to please themselves. It is not that the difficulty is in the Bible. Opposing politicians argue points of law in the statute book and take opposite views in their application and in these laws. . . . The Bible was given for practical purposes. . . .

Prepossessions, prejudices, and passions have a strong influence to darken the understanding and confuse the mind even in reading the words of Holy Writ. . . .

The Bible is written by inspired men, but it is not God's mode of thought and expression. It is that of humanity. God, as a writer, is not represented. Men will often say such an expression is not like God. But God has not put himself in words, in logic, in rhetoric, on trial in the Bible. The writers of the Bible were God's penmen, not His pen.

It is not the words of the Bible that were inspired, but the men that were inspired. Inspiration acts not on the

men who wrote the Bible that were inspired. Inspiration acts not on the man's words, not on the man's thoughts, but on the man himself; so that he, by his own spontaneity, under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, conceives certain thoughts and gives utterance to them in certain words, both the words and thoughts receiving the peculiar impress of the mind which conceived and uttered them, and being in fact just as really his own, as they could have been if there had been no inspiration at all in the case. . . .

The Divine mind is, as it were, so suffused through the human, and the human mind is so interpenetrated with the Divine, that for the time being the utterances of the man are the word of God. (*Origin and History of the Bible,* pp. 17-20; 1867.)

man's words or his expressions but on the man himself, who, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, is imbued with thoughts. But the words receive the impress of the individual mind. The divine mind is diffused. The divine mind and will is combined with the human mind and will; thus the utterances of the man are the word of God. (*Selected Messages,* volume one, pp. 19-21; written in 1866.)/896

7. An anonymous article (described as "Selected" to indicate that it had been reprinted from another source), "Men Wanted," *Review and Herald* (January 24, 1871), p. 47. This forms the basis of a famous passage in *Education:*

The great want of this age is men. Men who are not for sale. Men who are honest, sound from center to circumference, true to the heart's core — men who will condemn wrong in a friend or foe, in themselves as well as others. Men whose consciences are as steady as the needle to the pole. Men who will stand for the right if the heavens totter and the earth reel. ("Men Wanted.")

The greatest want of the world is men — men who will not be bought or sold, men who in their inmost souls are true and honest, men who do not fear to call sin by its right name, men whose conscience is as true to duty as the needle to the pole, men who will stand for the right though the heavens fall. (*Education,* p. 57.)

8. The *Apocrypha.* Mrs. White's account of her earliest vision was first printed in the *Day-Star,* an Adventist newspaper, in 1846; a year later James White reprinted it and some other material by himself and Joseph Bates in a pamphlet entitled "A Word to the 'Little Flock.' " In this reprint of her narrative, Elder White appended footnotes identifying scriptural allusions and paraphrases, and among these are seven references to the *Apocrypha,* all but one to the book of 2 Esdras. These texts supply such details as the numbers of mountains surrounding Mount Zion (in the New Earth), the kinds of flowers which grow upon them, the manner in which Christ crowns the redeemed, and the appearance of the clouds during the time of trouble.

9. John Milton, *Paradise Lost* (1667). The early chapters of *Patriarchs*

and Prophets show a close knowledge of this work. Compare their respective descriptions of the occasion on which the Father announced Christ's unique position to the angels in heaven (*PL*, bk. v; *PP*, ch. 1), the conversation between Eve and the Serpent in Eden (*PL*, bk. IX; *PP*, ch. 3), and the subsequent exchange between Adam and Eve (same references). Arthur White claims that Mrs. White did not read Milton, but this seems to be based on nothing more than oral tradition. In any event, the similarities between their treatments of the events associated with Creation are too striking to be ignored.

III

I have attempted, in these replies to Mr. Wood, Elder Bradley, Doctor Bolton, and Doctor Roberts, to explain my viewpoint as fully and honestly as possible. I really think it is now time, however, for the debate to be continued by others more qualified than myself. The intention of my original article was to stimulate thought and discussion, and I am happy to see that it has done so. But, having made my contribution, I trust that I will be forgiven for saying that I am weary of writing replies to replies, and that I now want nothing more than to return to the research for my next book — which has absolutely nothing to do with Mrs. White. I will look forward to discovering in future issues of SPECTRUM whether the methodology and suggestions I have offered prove useful to any other contributors.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 I will take up the items in approximately the order in which they appear in Mr. Wood's article:

a. Mr. Wood attributes to me the opinion that Scott's secretary was J. G. Lockhart. I said nothing of the sort. However, Mr. Wood is correct in pointing out that Robert Hogg and Scott ate in the room adjoining the library, though I cannot attach the overwhelming importance to that fact which he does. As to my assertion that Hogg was "an inexperienced young man," Mr. Wood supplies no evidence to contradict it. Hogg was not a "professional copyist," as Mr. Wood claims; he was a proofreader.

b. I *did* read some of the contemporary reviews of Scott's life of Napoleon but did not cite any of them — aside from those quoted in Corson's bibliography — because I had no desire to belabor the obvious. Mr. Wood has no right to infer from my silence on the point that I was unfamiliar with the material. Incidentally, his remarks about the supposed mediocrity of the "literary journals" (an inaccurate term) shows an alarming ignorance of the history of Victorian journalism — but let that pass.

c. Mr. Wood's lengthy discussion of Pius IX is so amusingly off the subject that it probably deserves no comment; I cannot imagine what this has to do with Wylie.

d. Mr. Wood disagrees with my statement that Gleig's "chief contribution to British public life was an attack on the Reform Bill of 1832." I was in fact merely paraphrasing the *Dictionary of National Biography:* "Gleig was a strong conservative in politics, but took little part in public affairs, except in attacking the Reform Bill of 1832."

e. If I had reported that Gleig frequently beat his wife, Mr. Wood might justifiably have complained that I was introducing irreleveant evidence; however, since I was discussing his political outlook, my comment on his attitude toward the first Reform Bill was entirely proper. If Mr. Wood also wishes us to know that Gleig was a philanthropic man (or even that he loved his wife), I have no objection, but I fail to see what this tells us about Gleig's politics.

f. Mr. Wood is flagrantly guilty of the sin of which he accuses me — distortion through selective quotation — when he cites G. P. Gooch in his discussion of Alison. According to Mr. Wood, "Sir Archibald's conclusions were not so much those of his party as his personal views;" according to Gooch, Alison's *History* "became the Bible of the Tory party." Gooch adds (in a passage which Mr. Wood neglects to quote) that Alison's fame as a historian was gradually sapped by the "growth of disinterested historical science." (G. P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* [London: Longmans, Green 1913], p. 305.)

g. Alison's passage about the Goddess of Reason is not merely "factual," because this very minor episode in the Revolution was precisely the one seized upon and moralized upon by Tory historians.

h. Mr. Wood is probably correct in saying that I should have treated Henry White. I wish that he had done so himself, for this would have made his own article more constructive.

i. I am puzzled by Mr. Wood's very angry response to my treatment of Thiers, whom I described as "somewhat more impartial" than the other historians in question. Mr. Wood, in citing Gooch, is once again guilty of quoting out of context, for Gooch (pp. 199-201) provides a largely unsympathetic view of Thiers' work. He describes the opening chapters of Thiers' *History* as "sketchy and careless;" his object is described as "frankly political;" and his treatment of events is labeled superficial.

j. I have no enthusiasm to quarrel with Mr. Wood about which bell signaled the beginning of the St. Bartholomew Massacre. It is clear that he has made up his mind that Mrs. White was incapable of commiting error in her writings, and any evidence to the contrary must be desperately explained away. Mrs. White was told about her error in 1910, and she changed the passage in the 1911 edition. It is as simple as that. Yet Mr. Wood goes through the most violent intellectual contortions to deny the obvious. And what extraordinary powers of obfuscation he brings to this task: we are even given a description of the engraving on page 601 of Wylie!

k. "Breviaries of the Old and New Testament" was clearly a mistake, and only one who holds — as Mr. Wood evidently does — that Mrs. White was infallible would argue otherwise.

l. In his insistence that Mrs. White changed "millions" to "multitudes" because the latter was a "less technical" term, Mr. Wood is obviously grasping at straws. The 1888 statement was an error, and the error was corrected in 1911. Mr. Wood, for some obscure reason, feels that the error must be defended. I would refer him to my reply to Doctor Bolton (SPECTRUM, Spring 1971), in which I offer precise statistical data about the deaths during the Terror — which Mr. Wood rather presumptuously announces in advance that I cannot supply.

m. I am not persuaded by Mr. Wood's interpretation of the "thousands upon thousands" who fled from France. Again, I would merely invite the readers of SPECTRUM to read Wylie and *The Great Controversy* together and then to reach their own conclusions.

n. In dealing with the "priest of the new order," Mr. Wood once more displays his ingenuity in obscuring an issue. I haven't the slightest interest in how "a well-known weekly journal" recently used the word *priest,* nor do I understand what it has to do with the question at hand. Since throughout the chapter Mrs. White attributes the Revolution to the sins of Catholicism, this reference to a priest is not likely to be interpreted in a figurative sense by any reader.

o. As for the Bishop of Paris, Mr. Wood simply asserts — in the face of evidence to the contrary — that Mrs. White was not guilty of distorting quoted material. He offers no supporting proof for this statement, which presumably we are supposed to accept on his authority alone.

p. Mr. Wood insists that I failed to take into account the fact that Mrs. White was writing about the Revolution only from the viewpoint of religious history; yet I said this repeatedly in my article.

q. The British Museum *Catalogue* (which I consulted) lists Thiers under "Louis Adolphe" Thiers; the Library of Congress *Catalogue* lists him under "Adolphe." (His full name was Marie Joseph Louis Adolphe Thiers.) I was not guilty of misreading the L. C. *Catalogue,* as Mr. Wood suggests.

r. I am grateful to Mr. Wood for reminding me that d'Aubigné is briefly cited in chapter fifteen. I overlooked him — by mistake, not from any of the sinister motives which Mr. Wood generally attributes to me.

s. When I declared that *The Great Controversy* is not to be treated as history, I meant that it is not to be seen as *reliable* history. Obviously when Mrs. White makes historical statements, these must be tested by the usual standards of historical scholarship.

2 Francis D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics* (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association 1951), p. 420.

3 Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930* (University of Chicago Press 1970), pp. 5-7.

See also LeRoy E. Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers,* three volumes (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association 1946-50), passim.

4 Georges Lefebvre, *The French Revolution from Its Origins to 1793,* trans. Elizabeth N. Evanson (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1962), pp. 97 ff.

5 Lefebvre, pp. 33-37.

6 Albert Guerard, *France: A Modern History* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 1959), pp. 144-147.

7 Lefebvre, pp. 102-115.

8 R. R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution,* two volumes (Princeton University Press 1959-64), passim.

9 I am also indebted to an excellent mimeographed paper by C. Mervyn Maxwell, "History of Sabbath and Sunday: Change of the Sabbath." This paper is highly important and deserves to be published.

10 Nichol, p. 424.