

hope is the converse, namely, that if one does good, works hard at his job, and is careful in expenditure and life, the prospects are bright for upward mobility and the achievement of the success image that he suggests underlies Adventist thinking. This interpretation of Adventist thinking may indeed be the motivational force behind the religiosity of some Adventists, but undoubtedly many have found a better motivational basis.

Not being fully familiar with Pentecostal belief and practice, I make no attempt here to evaluate Schwartz's treatment of that group.

As Glock and Stark suggest in *Religion and Society in Tension*, it may very well be that the conflict between science and religion peaked in the well-known Scopes trial in Dayton, Tennessee, as far as biology is concerned, but that the emerging conflict is in the social sciences. If that is the case, this work by Schwartz, with all of its methodological and theological weaknesses, might be a book with which Adventist scholars should become acquainted.

LETTERS

My hearty appreciation to Herold Weiss (SPECTRUM Spring 1972) for the penetratingly true way in which he deals with Seventh-day Adventists as Protestants. All of our advanced Bible teachers should read this and ponder it well, especially his observations on Ellen White's stance on doctrines. Hermeneutically we must give the Bible the *first* place in any exegesis of Scripture.

WILLIAM G. WIRTH
Pasadena, California

Ronald Graybill has added another chapter to the discussion of Ellen White's use of historical sources initiated in the pages of SPECTRUM two years ago by William S. Peterson.¹ The latest contribution is justified by the assertion that "some interesting evidence has come to light which can hardly be overlooked." The 1911 revision of *The Great Controversy* was undertaken, in part, to "identify historical sources in which material quoted in *The Great Controversy* could be found by those who wished to verify the quotations." According to Graybill, "an examination of the correspondence and other documents dealing with this revision has turned up significant data with a direct bearing on Ellen White's use of the historical sources appearing in chapter fifteen."

The "significant data" are marginal notations made by Clarence C. Crisler on certain "torn-out pages of chapter fifteen of the 1888 edition," indicating that Mrs. White "drew the quotations entirely from Uriah Smith's work." That is, Smith quoted

from Scott, Gleig, Thiers, and Alison — and Mrs. White "drew the historical quotations from Smith, not from the original works." Graybill claims this information is significant because "it changes our understanding of the way in which Ellen White selected the historical quotations she used," and "knowing the source from which Ellen White actually worked also helps explain the supposed suppression and distortion of evidence."

Peterson's central concern, by contrast, was the question: To what extent was Ellen White's description of the French Revolution "based primarily on visions" and to what extent was she indebted to historical sources? His conclusion is clear: "It simply will not suffice to say that God showed her the broad outline of events and she then filled in the gaps with her readings. In the case of the French Revolution, there was no 'broad outline' until she had read the historians."² In the ensuing dialogue, no one successfully refuted this view.

Although interesting, the latest contribution merely shows that Mrs. White read Uriah Smith on the French Revolution and then uncritically accepted both his sources and his use of them. To rephrase Graybill's summary of Peterson: Ellen White's source for her treatment of the French Revolution was not the visions she received, but Uriah Smith, who read bad historians whom he used badly.

I for one hope that the issue of the historical sources for chapter fifteen of *The Great Controversy* can be laid aside. It is clear that the chapter on the French Revolution, and probably much more, is based primarily on historical and other source materials. Concern about the quality of those materials is important — but secondary to the fact that they are the basis of Ellen White's writing on the subject.

It is time now to consider the implications of this finding for interpreting and applying her writings, and for understanding the nature of her inspiration.

1 William S. Peterson, A textual and historical study, *SPECTRUM*, (Autumn 1970), pp. 57-69.

2 Peterson, p. 66.

J. RUSSELL NELSON
Vice President, University of Colorado

I am very grateful for Ronald Graybill's lucid contribution (*SPECTRUM*, Summer 1972) to our understanding of how Ellen G. White used historical materials in writing chapter fifteen of *The Great Controversy*. The principle which he enunciates — that the footnotes in her books frequently conceal her almost total dependence upon secondary sources — is undeniably sound. I have observed similar instances elsewhere in *The Great Controversy* that illustrate this tendency of Crisler and her other editors to cite a variety of impressive-sounding sources which are in fact quoted in, say, d'Aubigné or whatever historian she was closely paraphrasing at the moment. Graybill's analysis makes it clear that chapter fifteen does, after all, conform to her usual pattern of heavy reliance upon merely one or two secondary (and not very good) sources.

WILLIAM S. PETERSON
Associate Professor of English, University of Maryland