I INTRODUCTION - PART A

The document in your hands is the official report of a research project commissioned by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in early 1980. The study has been long and involved, the report is quite detailed, and sections of it are technical. In view of the fact that many readers will be approaching this report without having had much background in comparative literary analysis and/or in the nature of the problem this study was designed to address, I have intentionally written a rather complete introduction. In the interest of those who have some knowledge of the nature of the project or the historical context in which it was conducted, let me quickly outline the content of the first two chapters of this report.

Chapter I (Introduction - Part A) sets forth the general background and organization of the project. We treat (1) the historical and literary context of the study, (2) the nature and implications of a literary analysis when sacred texts are involved, (3) the method of investigation followed in the research, and (4) the structure of the research report. Under (1) we will briefly review what was known about Ellen White's use of sources from the investigations of others. In that section we will also present a general overview of the concerns in Adventism at the time this study was

commissioned. In (2) we will address the "faith" aspect of the project. That is to say, we will try to set forth my assumptions and to show why the academic study of sacred texts is in the best interest of preserving those texts. Included here will be a description of literary analysis and some definition of technical terms. The general principles noted under (2) will be specifically applied to this project under section (3). Here we will outline the research process, what we were trying to discover, and what we did not attempt to cover. The criteria for the evaluation levels and the evaluation questions will be fully explained. The final segment of this first chapter will describe the form of the research report, particularly the 15 chapters analyzing the text of The Desire of Ages. The keys to understanding abbreviations, symbols, indentation, text arrangement, and appendices are all identified in section (4).

It will be necessary to say something about the history and nature of the production of The Desire of Ages in Chapter I; but most of the information on Ellen White as a writer, her use of secretaries, and her writings on the life of Christ will be treated in Chapter II (Introduction - Part B). Under section (1) we will discuss the history of Ellen White's writings on the life of Christ, with an emphasis on how she wrote The Desire of Ages. We will summarize what we

knew about her use of sources and her personal writing methods under (2). In part (3) the focus will be on her literary assistants, who they were, and what they did.

The second section of the introduction will not anticipate the conclusions of the investigation. It merely presents some additional background for the study of the text of The Desire of Ages. Ellen White's writing methods and her use of secretaries are described according to the evidence found in her writings or that of her associates. The reader is left to judge whether the conclusions of this research corroborate these earlier claims.

I was asked to make a thorough study of Ellen White's use of sources. The intent was to investigate some of the questions being raised by scholars and students with some background in literary analysis. The report was to be carefully written and detailed so that it would be credible for the critics yet readable and comprehensible for those who are untrained in the area. Often when one tries to do two things at once one fails at both. I trust that this introduction will prove useful to those who have little knowledge of the situation in Adventism which called for the study in the first place, helpful to those who are not acquainted with the technical aspects of literary analysis, and acceptable to those who are familiar with both and find it rather long.

Historical and Literary Background

Over the seven years it has taken to complete this research project, which was first envisioned as a six-month study, many rumors and questions about it have circulated in the church. Individuals have written to me, telephoned me, and contacted me in person. Others have put their questions and comments in tracts and letters circulated among church members. People have questioned the need for the study, the value of the study, and the wisdom of the officers of the General Conference in choosing me to direct the research. Others have said I would never have the freedom to look at all the Ellen White documents in the White Estate office at the General Conference, the General Conference would never make the results of the study known to the church at large, and I could never write an honest report of my findings and still maintain my employment in the Adventist church organization.

It is clear to me that most if not all of those voicing their concerns or their questions to me during the last seven years were honest and loyal Adventists. The doctrinal controversies, the financial disasters of Davenport, and more recently Harris Pine Mills, and the newly-discovered (for many) evidence on Ellen White's writing methods have been troubling to a large segment of the Adventist church,

particularly those in Europe, Australia, and in North America.

At the same time I have also been confident that the officers of the General Conference and of the White Estate wanted to know the truth and were no less concerned than those who raised the questions about recent developments in the church. I was given the freedom to go anywhere and speak to anyone if such a journey would serve the interests of the project. And Robert Olson, Secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate board, gave me free access to the documents vaults in Washington, D. C. When the historical background and literary context of the 1980s is understood, I think most readers will understand why this study was necessary and why it was organized as it was.

It is well-known by Seventh-day Adventists and other publics that Ellen G. White used the works of other writers in the production of her own works. The first public notice was given by D. M. Canright in 1887.[1] Among the latest public reports was the feature article in TIME magazine, August 2, 1982[2]. In the century between these two dates several major presentations included references to Ellen

---

[1] Michigan Christian Advocate, October 8, 1887, p. 2 [Cited by Francis D. Nichol, Ellen White and her Critics (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1951), p. 417.].

[2] Richard N. Ostling, "The Church of Liberal Borrowings," Time, August 2, 1982, p. 49.

White's literary borrowing.

A. G. Daniells, President of the General Conference in 1919, made it clear to the delegates attending that year's Bible Conference that Ellen White had taken material from Wylie, Conybeare and Howson, and Farrar.[1] W. C. White had spoken on the topic before the General Conference in 1911 with respect to the 1911 revision of The Great Controversy[2] and again in a presentation to the Advanced Bible School at Pacific Union College in 1935.[3] The fact of Ellen White's use of sources was also noted by F. D. Nichol in 1951,[4] by T. Housel Jemison in his college text on Ellen White first published in 1955,[5] by A. L. White at the North American Academy Principals' Council in 1965,[6] and by others we shall not take the time to mention here.[7]

---

[1]Molleurus Couperus, "The Bible Conference of 1919," Spectrum, Vol. 10, Number 1, pp. 23-57.

[2]Cited by Arthur L. White in The Ellen G. White Writings (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1973), pp. 186-191.

[3]W. C. White, "Addresses to Faculty and Students at the 1935 Advanced Bible School" (White Estate Office), 37 pp.

[4]Francis D. Nichol, Ellen White and Her Critics (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1951), pp. 403-428.

[5]T. Housel Jemison, A Prophet Among You (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1955), pp. 330-350, 420-422.

[6]Cited by Warren H. Johns, "Ellen White: Prophet or Plagiarist?" Ministry, June, 1982, p. 12.

[7]See for example Donald McAdams' "Shifting Views of Inspiration: Ellen G. White Studies in the 1970s," Spectrum,

Though Walter Rea, a pastor in Southern California, called our attention to Ellen White's use of Edersheim as early as 1965,[1] it was probably the work of Ronald Numbers in 1976 which brought the question of Ellen White's use of sources to the attention of contemporary Adventists, particularly college students and teachers.[2] Arthur White's volume on The Ellen G. White Writings in 1973 covered the question of influences on Ellen White and her sources. His conclusion was that "It is neither correct nor in harmony with the facts to assume that similarity of views indicates that Ellen White gained her information from men, instead of God."[3] When he reviews the statements of W. C. White, Ellen White's son and confidant, Arthur White makes the same point.

Vol. 10, Number 4 (March, 1980). Warren H. Johns, op. cit., has indicated where one may find "the first written or published records of borrowing known," in 1982. More recently (May, 1985) Gary W. Shearer, Special Collections Librarian at Pacific Union College, compiled a bibliographical guide to theses, dissertations, books, and periodical articles on Ellen White. In the last ten years numerous articles on the topic have appeared in the the Review, Ministry, and Spectrum, and several pamphlets have been circulated by the White Estate Office. Anyone seeking further information on the topic of Ellen White's use of sources would do well to look for articles written by Arthur White, Robert Olson, Ron Graybill, Donald McAdams, Delmer A. Johnson, Paul Gordon, Roger Coon, Donald Casebolt, and David Neff.

[1]Walter Rea, Claremont Dialogue, Vol. 2, Number 2, p. 32 as cited by Warren Johns, op. cit.

[2]Ronald L. Numbers, Prophetess of Health: A Study of Ellen G. White (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1976).

[3]Arthur L. White, The Ellen G. White Writings (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1973), p. 39 [Emphasis his].

"Regardless of how W. C. White approached the matter of Ellen White's sources, all statements are in agreement, namely, that the basic concepts came to her in vision."[1] Numbers' work challenged the White Estate position. He argued that there were some problems in harmonizing Ellen White's disclaimers on the use of sources with the claims of James White, Ellen White's husband, and other documentary evidence of the times.[2] The reputation of Numbers as a scholar, the fact that Harper and Row had published his work, and the picture he drew of Ellen White's work and writings in her own social and spiritual world of the 19th century, was an "eye-opener" for many Adventists.

It was not as though Numbers was the first to show Ellen White used sources, for as we have already indicated that fact had been known in the 19th century. Numbers raised in a public forum the same question being raised "in house" by Donald McAdams and Ron Graybill. Did the sources Ellen White used provide more than incidental details and historical background? McAdams draws the following conclusion on Ellen White's use of Protestant historians.

> In short, I believe that nothing in the statements of Ellen White, and those by her son which she endorsed, preclude the view that at least some of the historical

---

[1] Ibid., p. 127.
[2] Ronald L. Numbers, op. cit., pp. 80-85.

> passages in Great Controversy were taken directly from Protestant historians and were not seen in vision.[1]

In addition to the question of "how" literary sources were employed by Ellen White, especially in relation to the role of visions, there was the matter of extent. When the officers of the White Estate and the works of Nichol and Jemison had mentioned the fact of Ellen White's literary indebtedness, the extent of borrowing was usually minimized. Jemison argued that "the problem of the accusation of plagiarism may be regarded as limited to these books (Sketches From the Life of Paul, and The Great Controversy)."[2] Jemison was largely echoing the views of Nichol who had earlier concluded:

> Of all this vast amount of matter only an insignificant part is borrowed from other authors. And the borrowed part is most certainly not central to the spiritual theme that distinguishes her writing. Thus if the little that she borrowed were deleted, it would scarcely affect the total of the writings, but much more importantly, it would not affect the quality and the force of the message that is contained in her writings. She borrowed the little she did with no attempt to deceive and for reasons which she clearly stated.[3]

Arthur White, supporting his position largely by the statements of W. C. White, also claimed that the sources played a very limited role. The amount of space he devotes

---

[1]Donald R. McAdams, "Ellen G. White and the Protestant Historians," unpublished manuscript, 1974, revised 1977.

[2]Jemison, op. cit., p. 420.

[3]Nichol, op. cit., p. 467.

to this aspect of Ellen White's writings in his descriptive account of her writings as well as the following statement bears this out.

> There is evidence that she was not shown the names of all of the places and the dates of all the events. The basic conception of the significant events of the controversy story was clearly laid before her in vision. In many cases minor details were not presented. Some of this information could be ascertained from the sacred writings, some from common sources of knowledge, some from reliable historians. Apparently God in His providence did not consider it essential to impart these minutiae through vision.[1]

It is no wonder with statements such as these circulating in Adventist textbooks and writings that many would be surprised over what Walter Rea and Donald McAdams were reporting in the late 1970s.[2] Many Adventists asked if the claims being made that the visions were the major source of Ellen White's information and that sources were used in a minor way to supply such details as dates and specific locations of historical events, were substantiated by the textual evidence. It was becoming increasingly clearer that what McAdams had discovered in his study of The Great Controversy was also becoming apparent in the other books of

---

[1]Arthur L. White, op. cit., pp. 128, 129.

[2]Walter Rea was in direct correspondence with the White Estate office and later presented a summary of his findings at the Glendale meeting discussed below. Donald McAdams' study of "The Great Controversy, Chapter Six, on 'Huss and Jerome,'" cited above, clearly demonstrated that in producing this chapter Ellen White relied on James A Wylie, a Protestant historian.

Ellen White, as supported by Rea's work.

The White Estate by this time was recognizing that the source issue was not a passing fancy of a few but was becoming a major interest of many. In response to the inquiries of the field and the new evidence being unearthed through comparative source studies, the White Estate Office not only became more active in its study of the problem but it was beginning to realize that the sources were employed by Ellen White to a greater extent than previously noted. This shift in position is obvious when comparing the series of REVIEW articles of Arthur White in 1978 and 1979 with his earlier statements.[1] Nevertheless, the visions are still given as the dominant source behind The Great Controversy, and The Desire of Ages (as well as her other books).

> It seems clear that the visions given down through the years in which the life of Christ was portrayed and the visions repeated while she was working on the manuscript for The Desire of Ages and visions opening up fresh concepts all came into play as basic sources of her writing on the life of Christ.[2]

The quotations from historians found in The Great Controversy was a matter Adventists had known for some time. The same might be said for Ellen White's earlier work on the life of Paul. But the claims being made in respect to The

---

[1]Arthur L. White, "Inspiration and the Ellen G. White Writings," a reprint of articles published in the Adventist Review during January and February, 1978, and July and August, 1979.

[2]Ibid., p. 33.

Desire of Ages were for the most part new and unwelcome. In her comments on the life of Christ we have some of Ellen White's most inspiring words and some major theological insights. To many in the church, the possible use of sources for the composition of The Desire of Ages was a more troublesome question than that of using quotations (and paraphrasing) in Great Controversy. The special interest of the White Estate in this new development may be measured by its increased involvement in source studies as the decade of the 1970s closed.[1]

---

[1]I am aware that there were those in the church at that time and later who claimed the White Estate was engaged in a cover-up. I do not agree that the policies of the White Estate governing access to and release of Ellen White documents, particularly manuscript copies, are appropriate given the claims of the church regarding Ellen White--i.e., that nearly everything is available in copy form--and the many unanswered questions on which Adventist scholars should be freely working. But at the same time I do not think such a charge has any foundation in fact. In May of 1979 the White Estate began circulating a 47-page document entitled, "How the Desire of Ages was Written." Robert Olson prepared the opening statement and Ron Graybill assisted in the compilation of various exhibits on the history of Ellen White's work on the book, her use of literary assistants, and several pages from a working document on the text. Most of the material consists of excerpts of letters relating to the writing of The Desire of Ages.

The charge of a cover-up involves the judgments of motives and intentions and in my view such an attack is as out of place as is the accusation that those who raise the question of sources or who make the source studies are out to destroy confidence in Ellen White and/or her writings. I have spent hundreds of hours working at the White Estate. That same entity is often under heavy criticism from those in the church who view its positions as quite liberal when it comes to inspiration. Many do not seem to realize that the White Estate office is a resource center rather than a research center. It responds to questions and concerns of

In addition to its efforts to obtain the services of James C. Cox, Chairman of the Department of New Testament at Andrews University, the White Estate sought the help of two recently retired Adventist Bible scholars to compare the text of The Desire of Ages with William Hanna's life of Christ. Raymond Cottrell reported that a correlation between the text of 11 chapters of The Desire of Ages and the comparable text of Hanna's commentary on the life of Christ was approximately 2.6 percent.[1] Walter Specht, working on the last half of Ellen White's work and focusing on the thoughts more than on a word count as did Cottrell, found some parallels between the two commentaries but concluded that the percentage of the literary borrowing was small.[2]

The next major turning point following the publication of Ronald Numbers' book on Ellen White was the Glendale meeting between a specially selected committee chaired by Ralph Thompson, Secretary of the General Conference, and Walter Rea, a pastor in the Southern California Conference. Rea had urged the meeting in the interest of clearly showing

---

both membership and church administrators who seek Ellen White counsel on various matters. Only recently has the general concern in the church over the question of Ellen White's use of sources justified its heavier emphasis on this aspect of Ellen White's work.

[1]Raymond F. Cottrell, "The Literary Relationship Between The Desire of Ages, by Ellen G. White and The Life of Christ, by William Hanna," unpublished manuscript, November 1, 1979.

[2]Walter F. Specht, "The Literary Relationship Between The Desire of Ages, by Ellen G. White and The Life of Christ, by William Hanna, Part II," unpublished manuscript, 1979.

that Ellen White's use of sources extended far beyond the use of Hanna and involved Ellen White's other writings, including her testimonies.

The committee agreed that Rea's evidence revealed that "Ellen White in her writing, used various sources more extensively than we had previously believed."[1] Robert Olson reported that the White Estate was developing plans to make a broader study of the text of The Desire of Ages than Cottrell and Specht had been asked to do. The Glendale group followed up on this idea by including in its recommendations to the General Conference that such an investigation be made of The Desire of Ages to determine the degree of dependency and nature and significance of that dependency.[2] The committee also recommended that someone trained in literary analysis work with Walter Rea in the continued study of Ellen White's use of sources. The General Conference President's Executive Advisory Committee (PREXAD), while not approving every recommendation of the special ad hoc committee, evidently agreed with the suggestion that a thorough investigation be made of The Desire of Ages, for shortly thereafter James Cox of Andrews University was selected to direct a General Conference sponsored two-year source study of this very popular work of Ellen White's. Later in the year, after Dr.

---

[1]Douglas Hackleman, "GC Committee Studies Ellen White's Sources," Spectrum, Vol. 10, No. 4 (March, 1980), p. 14.

[2]Loc. cit.

Cox was called to the presidency of Avondale, I accepted responsibility for this investigation. The White Estate followed up the conclusions of the Glendale Committee with a statement on Ellen White's use of sources and continued its support of the Desire of Ages project which was now to be handled by the General Conference.[1] A most welcome addition to the publications on Ellen White was Selected Messages, Book Three, particularly section III on "The Preparation of the Ellen G. White Books."[2]

Thus far we have been reviewing earlier reports on Ellen White's literary dependency. We have seen how this study enters the stream of Ellen White research. Obviously this project was not designed to establish the fact that Ellen White used the writings of others to produce her own works. That point cannot be denied. We also knew in 1980 that literary sources provided more than just incidental matters of historical backgrounds. Literary parallels had been found in Ellen White's testimonies and in the recounting of her visions. We had examples of both verbatim and paraphrased quotations. As yet, however, no one had made a thorough study of a complete work or substantial portion of a work.

---

[1]Robert Olson, "Ellen G. White's Use of Uninspired Sources," White Estate Document, April 10, 1980.

[2]Ellen G. White, Selected Messages, Book III, a compilation by the Ellen G. White Estate (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1980).

No one had attempted to evaluate her dependency or independence on the basis of literary criteria. Though a number of studies included a consideration of Ellen White's own contribution, Walter Rea's far-reaching probes typically pointed out the similarities without noting the dissimilarities. It is altogether natural that initial studies would stress dependency. Given the general understanding of Ellen White's minimal use of sources, every additional literary parallel would strike one's attention. As far as I know, until this time no one had made a systematic search among 19th-century writers for possible additional sources. Clearly there were enough unanswered questions to justify further research. Before turning to a discussion of the type of research planned, it might be helpful to sketch in broad outline the general historical context of the times.

Walter Rea's disclosure of rather widespread use of literary sources in the Ellen White writings came at the very time that Desmond Ford was meeting regularly with an advisory committee to discuss his views on the sanctuary doctrine as believed by Adventists. Ford, an exchange professor from Avondale College in Australia and at the time on the religion faculty of Pacific Union College, had presented a lecture to the local chapter of the Association of Adventist Forums in

October of 1979 in which he challenged some of the traditional Adventist views on the sanctuary doctrine.[1] As is nearly always the case, questions on orthodoxy turn on the claims for authority, whether authority of the church in its interpretations of sacred writings or authority of the sources used by the church to establish doctrine. Since Ellen White had written extensively on the sanctuary issues coming under question by Dr. Ford, his views also had implications for the role of Ellen White's writings in Adventism.

Prior to Ford's presentation on the sanctuary he had been a very popular speaker at camp meetings, workers' meetings, and other church gatherings not only in Australia but also during the two years he had been teaching at Pacific Union College. Many in the church were watching to see what would be the outcome of his doctrinal challenge. It was no secret that a good number in the church, particularly among Bible scholars, while not in agreement with Ford's answers were sympathetic with his questions. After all, Ford was not

---

[1]Desmond Ford spoke on the subject of the investigative judgment. He argued that several aspects of the sanctuary doctrine as Adventists traditionally have taught are not in harmony with the teachings of Scripture. His major concern was over the post-resurrection heavenly ministry of Jesus and the significance of 1844 in terms of salvation history. Obviously his views carried implications for how one interprets Ellen White's statements on the topic and the authority of her writings.

the first to raise some concern in respect to Adventist teachings on the sanctuary.

The issues of Ellen White's use of sources and the sanctuary doctrine were particularly troublesome because they came only two years after Geoffrey Paxton, an Anglican clergyman, published his analysis of contemporary Adventism. He and Robert Brinsmead had circled the Adventist globe urging reform on the Adventist concept of the Christian gospel, particularly in reference to the teachings of the church on "righteousness by faith."[1]

History has taught us that often in such times of uncertainty, churches have taken special efforts to reaffirm their beliefs, clarify their doctrinal positions, and even have gone so far as to develop creedal statements. It was perhaps not just a coincidence that the major activity of the business sessions at the General Conference session in Dallas in April 1980 was the development of a revised statement of fundamental beliefs.[2]

The year 1980 was notable in Adventist history for other

---

[1] I have reference here to Geoffrey Paxton's work on The Shaking of Adventism (Wilmington, Del.: Zenith Publishers, Inc., 1977) and the congresses of Robert Brinsmead whose viewpoints were published in Judged by the Gospel, A Review of Adventism (Fallbrook, CA: Verdict Publications, 1980).

[2] It is hard for many not to see a heightening of Ellen White's authority in the newly-formulated church statement as it appears under Fundamental Belief 17, "The Gift of Prophecy," Adventist Review, May 1, 1980, pp. 25, 26.

developments as well. There was a cluster of events: the Sanctuary Review Committee and a Theological Consultation held in August at Glacier View, Colorado; the creation of a new religious magazine obviously directed at an Adventist audience;[1] Desmond Ford losing his Adventist credentials as an ordained minister; Robert Brinsmead publishing his critique of Adventism;[2] and finally, the feature article in the Los Angeles Times focusing on Walter Rea's research on Ellen White's use of sources and the charges of plagiarism against her.[3] The Times report was picked up by newspapers around the globe, and Adventists could not escape the questions being raised over Ellen White's literary practices.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to argue how and to what degree these various events affected the way in which this project was set up, the selection of its director, and the attitude of church members and administrators toward the project. I have no question but that these developments did have their impact, judging from the rumors and questions I have already alluded to and from the reactions of many who

---

[1]Evangelica, edited by Alan Crandall and published by Evangelica Publications, St. Joseph, Michigan, came out in 1980.

[2]See under footnote on page 18 above.

[3]John Dart, "Plagiarism Found in Prophet Books," Los Angeles Times, October 23, 1980. Walter Rea has insisted that his use of the term "plagiarism" in respect to the Ellen White writings was made on the basis of Dart's definition. Dart had defined plagiarism as using the writings of others without giving credit to the source.

attended the various services in 1981 where I was invited to explain the project and and its purposes.

We have been describing the literary and historical matrix out of which this research project was born. Before turning to the discussion of the general nature of this literary analysis, it might be well to mention what has happened along these same lines since this investigation has been in progress. Readers who now take this report in hand should also know that others have been working on projects of their own which have a bearing on the current state of affairs in Adventism today.

Ron Graybill presented a series of morning worship talks at the General Conference in November of 1981. Drawing upon his own work and that of others he concluded that Ellen White (1) "made more extensive use of . . . sources than we had previously understood," (2) borrowed words, phrases, and conceptual outlines, and (3) took not only historical and geographical information but also devotional and theological expressions. Graybill suggested that it would be "unwise" to claim that literary borrowing would not be found in any type of writing barring autobiographical material and offered the view that Ellen White's handwritten draft is often closer to the source than later forms of the text.[1] Graybill used as

---

[1]Ron Graybill, "E. G. White's Literary Work, An Update" (Annotated transcript, Nov. 15-19, 1981), 32+ pp.

one of his exhibits the literary parallels from Henry Melvill which were circulated in 1982 as a separate White Estate Document.[1] Apart from his findings in respect to Ellen White's handwritten drafts, which Walter Rea would not have had available for his studies, these three conclusions corroborated what Rea had reported to the Glendale Committee over 18 months earlier. The differences between Graybill's and Rea's reports were in the interpretations of the data and the extrapolations made from what was actually found.

Anticipating the appearance of Walter Rea's book, the major content of which Walter had shared with me and several others, John Robertson put out a short popular defense of Ellen White.[2]. Robert Olson dedicated a section of his compilation from the writings of Ellen White on the sanctuary doctrine to answering questions on Ellen White's method of writing and use of sources, and on plagiarism.[3] Rea finally published the results of his studies in 1982 and shortly thereafter his ministerial credentials were withdrawn by the Southern California Conference.[4] Arthur White completed his

---

[1] "Henry Melvill and Ellen G. White: A Study in Literary and Theological Relationships," White Estate Document, April, 1982.

[2] John J. Robertson, The White Truth (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1981), 112 pp.

[3] Robert Olson, One Hundred and One Questions on the Sanctuary and on Ellen White (Washington, D. C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981).

[4] Walter T. Rea, The White Lie (Turlock, CA: M & R Publications, 1982).

biography of Ellen White in 1986. His volume on The Australian Years, 1891-1900, contains a chapter on the writing of The Desire of Ages.[1]

Through the efforts of those mentioned here and others who could be added, we gathered more evidence to support what was already known in 1980 when the project began. But nothing in the way of new insights was offered except for Graybill's work on Ellen White's handwritten text on subjects not treated in his and Donald McAdams' previous studies on The Great Controversy. Walter Rea's book, insofar as the Ellen White writings are discussed, mainly served to acquaint many Adventists with the basic issues and evidence presented to the Glendale Committee.[2] We shall have occasion to refer again to the Ellen White documents presented by Robert Olson and Arthur White when we discuss the background to The Desire of Ages in Part B of the Introduction. A very helpful document for those studying sources used by Ellen White is the compilation of her library works made available by the Ellen G. White Estate in various editions since about 1981.[3]

---

[1]Arthur L. White, Ellen G. White: The Australian Years (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1983).

[2]Walter Rea utilizes the evidence of Ellen White's literary dependency as only one element in his argument against the Ellen White Estate and the organizational leadership of the church for what he sees as their manipulation of information on Ellen White. Hence the book's title, White Lie.

[3]Warren H. Johns, Tim Poirier, and Ron Graybill, "A

This brief survey of developments since 1980 is not meant to be exhaustive. Additional contributions to the subject may be found in the Adventist Review, Ministry, and Spectrum on Ellen White's use of sources, on the use of sources in Scripture, and on the implications of these findings for belief in the inspiration of Ellen White. Elder Wilson presented to the 1985 General Conference session in New Orleans a summary of a preliminary concluding statement I had formulated as a tentative report based upon my findings to that date.[1] Even though the major portion of the research had been completed at the time, the last chapter of this present report should be taken as the final summary and conclusion of the project.

Literary Analysis

When the Glendale Committee reviewed the work of Walter Rea they were impressed by the number of sources Ellen White used, the various kinds of content exhibiting parallels from the sources, and the differing degrees of literary dependency. They recognized that there was enough literary borrowing to merit a serious study of a major work of Ellen

---

Bibliography of Ellen G. White's Private and Office Libraries," Ellen G. White Estate, Second Revised Edition, January, 1983.

[1]Neal C. Wilson, Adventist Review, July 11, 1985, p. 18.

White's. They also agreed that they wanted a scholarly comparative study of Ellen White's text and of 19th-century writers.

This type of analysis is one form of literary criticism. The term "criticism" as used in such a study refers to careful and discriminating analysis. When scholars "criticize" a report, an article in a magazine, a text, or the work of another scholar, they do not limit themselves to negative considerations. Many critical reviews are completely positive. "Criticism" as used here is not a loaded term. It carries neither positive nor negative connotations.

Literary criticism may be broadly defined as that branch of knowledge which seeks to understand any work of literature.[1] By "literary" we do not limit the criticism to "belle lettres" (literature judged for its literary magnificence) or to any particular standard of literature. The term may apply to popular as well as to elitist works.

Since there are many ways in which a text may be

---

[1]William A. Beardslee, Literary Criticism of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), p. 1. While I am indebted to Beardslee for some of the thoughts presented in connection with the discussion on literary criticism, my comments reflect for the most part various studies in the area in connection with my special interest in New Testament interpretation. For further information the reader may consult almost any introduction to the New Testament literature, or any study of Old or New Testament interpretation for that matter.

approached, with nearly every approach demanding a different methodology, students of literary criticism have found it useful to categorize the various studies according to their specific focus.[1] It may be a study of a text to determine authorship, intention of the author in writing the literary work, an investigation into the content to determine the type of literature a given text is, et cetera. We hear of textual criticism,[2] form criticism, style criticism, rhetorical criticism, historical criticism, redaction criticism, genre criticism, linguistic criticism, and source criticism, to name a few of the more familiar types of literary criticism. The two ways we approached the text were source criticism and redaction criticism.

In view of the fact that it is difficult to separate form and content, and that source analysis includes a look at forms of literary expression, we found it necessary to give some attention to content criticism. But we should emphasize that this investigation was not concerned in any major way with content analysis. We were not comparing ideas expressed but rather the actual words used to express the ideas.

---

[1]Literary criticism is not always viewed in as comprehensive a scope as is the case with Beardslee. With some writers literary criticism is used as another term for speaking of source criticism. Cf. Norman Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), p. 2.

[2]The SDA Bible Commentary discusses textual criticism of the New Testament in Vol. 5, pp. 134ff.

Individuals may express the same or very similar ideas yet never have known each other or read each other's works. Christians discussing Bible stories will most likely often express the same ideas. THe ideas have become part of the Christian framework or mind set. It would be very difficult to say who has borrowed which idea from whom. Literary dependency, though difficult to establish, does allow us to develop certain criteria or measuring devices by which we can identify to some degree what has been taken from whom. Before discussing further the particular type of literary criticism we employed, it is perhaps best to mention several characteristics of this study which raise special problems. The nature of the literature, the special claims of the writer, and the attitudes of Adventists toward the writings of Ellen White, may in the minds of some rule out any form of literary criticism.

The writings which form the subject matter of this research project are those of a special author, a prophetic personality. Traditionally, especially in the ecclesiastical community where the writings of Ellen G. White have special importance, the literary works of a prophet have been placed on a different level from those of the ordinary writer, even a Christian writer. The qualitative difference of the prophetic experience, ordinarily described under the term

"inspiration," has usually carried with it a special understanding of the prophet's writing methods, source of information, and even literary standard. To apply the critical methods of scholarship to such writings is viewed by some to be a breach of faith. It is often assumed by devout believers in such prophetic writings that anyone undertaking or promoting such an investigation has in so doing already declared his/her lack of faith in the special claims of the author under review.

To be more specific, serious questions have been raised against this study on the basis that the writer involved, Ellen White, received the content from visions. Would not an investigation looking for literary sources indicate a lack of faith in the prophet's claim to have derived the content of the writings from visions?

It is clear that Ellen G. White claimed to have had visions, dreams, and other special experiences through which God gave her information. She felt under obligation to God to communicate these messages of God to the early Advent believers and later to a more general audience. Her use in the earlier writings of such expressions as, "I saw," "Then I was carried down to," "I was shown," et cetera, were obviously meant to be understood as indicating that what followed originated through this special prophetic experience

she enjoyed. These same expressions and others of a similar nature occur in a work published in 1864 which carried in the preface this statement by Ellen White, " . . . the great facts of faith, connected with the history of holy men of old have been opened to me in vision; . . ."[1] The fact that her later treatment of these same biblical stories and themes do not include such expressions as "I was shown," is not to be taken as a denial of her original source, or that her prophetic experience has undergone a qualitative change. The publishers of her writings offer the following explanation for the change.

> However, as the reading groups greatly broadened to include many who were not acquainted with the source of her information, the author, in keeping with her responsibility, omitted in these later works intended now for the general reader, a few points dealt with in the little volumes that were penned for the church alone.[2]

In the facsimile reproduction of volume four of The Spirit of Prophecy by Ellen G. White a supplement by Arthur L. White appears. In his account of "Ellen G. White's Portrayal of the Great Controversy Story," the then secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate informs us that when the book

---

[1]Ellen G. White, Spiritual Gifts, Vol. 3 (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press, 1864), p. v.

[2]Trustees of the Ellen G. White Publications, "Preface to Facsimile Edition," Spiritual Gifts, Vols. 3, 4, by Ellen G. White (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press, 1864; facsimile ed., Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1945).

Spiritual Gifts, Volume I, was republished in 1882, "the phrase 'I saw' and its equivalent were many times omitted."[1]

Our point here is not to solve the problem of harmonizing the nature of her inspiration with what we know about her use of materials from other writers and her employment of secretaries and editorial assistants. It is hoped that this investigation of her use of sources in the writings on the life of Christ will make a contribution in that direction. What we are concerned to show here is that the claim of Ellen G. White herself and that of the many who have read her writings over the years does raise special problems for any study specifically directed at locating and analyzing literary parallels between her writings and contemporary or earlier textual materials. Does not the claim to have had visions rule out the possibility of the use of sources? Will not such a dependency upon visions lead one to minimize the use of sources? And contrariwise, will not a serious and rather exhaustive search for possible literary sources be seen as a serious attempt to negate the claim of Ellen White to have had visions or at least diminish the influence of the visions on her writings? And should our

---

[1]Arthur L. White, "Ellen G. White's Portrayal of the Great Controversy Story," The Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. 4 by Ellen G. White (Oakland, CA: Pacific Press, 1884; facsimile ed., Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1969), footnote p. 510.

knowledge that Ellen White used sources be a threat to our faith in the inspiration of these writings? Before we attempt a brief answer to these questions relating to the special kind of literature under investigation, let us turn to another distinctive characteristic of these writings.

The use of sources by Ellen G. White has not been emphasized. In fact, outside the brief notation in the Introduction to the 1888 edition of The Great Controversy we have no such admission by Ellen White. Even there the reference is limited to works of history and to Adventist writers. We do have a number of statements leading the reader to believe she did not use sources of any type. It has been her "unique" prophetic experience which has been stressed. One might reasonably argue that the mind set of the "typcial" Adventist reader of the writings of Ellen White, at least until recently, is expressed in the words of James White her husband and associate in the leadership of the early Advent believers:

> In her published works there are many things set forth which cannot be found in other books, and yet they are so clear and beautiful that the unprejudiced mind grasps them at once as truth. . . .
>
> If commentators and theological writers generally had seen these gems of thought which strike the mind so forcibly, and had they been brought out in print, all the ministers in the land could have read them. These men gather thoughts from books, and as Mrs. W. has written and spoken a hundred things, as truthful as they are beautiful and harmonious, which cannot be found in the writings of others, they are new to the most

> intelligent readers and hearers. And if they are not to be found in print, and are not brought out in sermons from the pulpit, where did Mrs. W. find them? From what source has she received the new and rich thoughts which are to be found in her writings and oral addresses? She could not have learned them from books, from the fact that they do not contain such thoughts. And, certainly, she did not learn them from those ministers who had not thought of them. The case is a clear one. It evidently requires a hundred times the credulity to believe that Mrs. W. has learned these things of others, and has palmed them off as visions from God, than it does to believe that the Spirit of God has revealed them to her.[1]

Another uncommon aspect of this project is the purpose or intention that drives the research. Can one carry out this type of research honestly and with the degree of objectivity necessary for the results to be taken seriously? Will the study receive a fair hearing? Can one writing from within the Adventist faith and tradition be open to the evidence to be found when the subject matter being investigated or read has potentially the power to seriously challenge one's faith? Is one able to stand as it were outside the data? Is it possible for one to put his (or her) existential self "on hold" as it were until the research has been completed so that there remains some kind of "constant" that guarantees the same treatment of the evidence throughout the research task? Can we be sure that one's openness to the data and one's evaluation of the data are consistent throughout the investigation?

---

[1]James White, Life Sketches (Battle Creek, Mich.: Steam Press, 1880), pp. 328, 329.

In addition to the trauma effected by the nature of the data itself, there are also the external pressures. Can a researcher studying data which may have serious consequences for the faith of many in the community who have a special orientation to the writings of Ellen G. White be faithful to his/her task as well as to the community whose faith he (or she) shares? Is there a greater loyalty to be addressd than a researcher's loyalty to truth, particularly when it must be admitted that at best we do not recognize truth, only our perceptions of truth?

This research task has not originated as some grand flight of fantasy. It is not a matter of pure scholarly interest for the sake of pushing back the frontiers of our knowledge of Ellen White and her writings. We have already indicated above that this research project was conceived, designed, commissioned, and executed in a context in which to some degree questions of theological understanding and doctrinal authority were matters of concern in Adventism. The church administrators sponsoring this research on behalf of the church at large are well aware of the crucial role played by the Ellen G. White writings in the religious life and teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist church. These church leaders are also very much concerned to foster and maintain a strong sense of unity in practice and teaching

throughout an international church endeavoring to fulfil its mission in an ever-changing and increasingly more complex world. It is only natural for such leadership to question whether this kind of a study, which has the potential of being "counter productive" for the general growth, economic stability, and spiritual strength of the whole church, should be carried out at all.

Our purpose in mentioning these special characteristics of the Ellen White writings and their place in the religious life of Adventists is not to lead the reader to expect that the research will answer questions in the area of Ellen White's inspiration, the content of her visions, her limited admission to using sources, and the authority of her writings in matters of theology. Our point is rather to suggest that this study recognizes the particular character of Ellen White's writings. One does not have to call into question or deny the peculiar aspects of religious writings in order to carry out this type of research. Indeed, it should be stressed that such investigations may enhance our understanding and appreciation of these particular dimensions of the writings.

In addition to the faith or divine side of religious or divine writings there is the objective or human side. The Ellen White writings after all are just that, <u>writings</u>. They

consist of handwritten diary materials, typescript copies, and published texts. In literary type or genre there are personal diary notations, personal and formal letters, sermons, essays or topical manuscripts, testimonies, magazine articles, and books. The context varies from biography and history, to health, family, church, administration, theology, and Christian life. These textual materials were copied, edited, combined, rewritten, and partially, or at times completely, duplicated by Ellen White and her literary assistants. We also know these writings include the use of contemporary literary sources. In short, it would appear that the writings under study were produced in the same manner as were (and are) other writings, regardless of what additional assistance may have been available to the writers, such as the content of visions, the guidance of the Holy Spirit, or a deep religious experience.

It stands to reason that the appropriate methodology for any given research project is governed by the nature of the data being studied and the kinds of questions being asked of the data. We are studying textual or literary materials. Our method will therefore have to be a literary one. Even though, as we have mentioned, there are various literary methods, all share at least two common assumptions. One basic assumption is that the understanding and appreciation

of a particular literary composition is greatly enhanced through serious study and reflection as over against mere reading and immediate perception. A second assumption is that the serious study of literature involves a comparison of a given literary composition with a larger literary context or frame of reference.

It is also now generally recognized that there is much profit to be gained by looking at biblical literature or other types of "sacred" literature in just the same way we view other books. What this means, of course, is that the special nature of such "sacred" works will be given the same particular attention that is granted to other types of literature.

For those readers who may be tempted to view this comparative approach to "sacred" or "inspired" literature as demeaning and illegitimate, we would appeal to the internal evidence of the literature itself, at least the literature of the Bible. The Scriptures make it clear that the prophet, the priest, and even the Messiah were fully human and were taken from among ordinary men and women. If it was not inappropriate for God to become flesh and dwell on earth as a man among men, surely it should not be so strange to find that His Word is among us as man's word. If God communicates His Word to us only through the "otherness" of Scripture, how

would we hear, understand, and respond? Indeed, it is the very identity of God's Son and God's Word with humanity and human word that is so scandalous for faith to accept.

But to admit that the literature of the Bible or other "sacred" literature may be treated in the same way that we seek to understand other literature, is additionally to recognize that the interpreter must also take into consideration the special claims of the religious text. Literature claiming inspiration must be read in the context of an attitude of faith. If the believer is to include the more objective or human dimension in his or her study, the student of the text should also include the faith perspectives in the analysis. What we mean is that even though the "faith" aspect of the text may not methodologically be examined by literary methods, neither should literary methods be so used or applied as to rule out the faith dimension.

The point we are endeavoring to make at this juncture is to insist on the necessity of looking at religious literature in the same way as we do other literature. This approach, rather than eliminating or demeaning the special nature of such literature, demands that its particularity be seriously confronted. The Godward side is not to be neglected in favor of the manward aspect. To do this would be inconsistent with

the claims of the methodology, particularly as it is recognized by the best literary critics of today. Admittedly, the inclusion of a "faith" dimension in such scholarly research causes tension. But if such tension is openly admitted and self-conscious, it can be used creatively to enhance the study and lend integrity to the investigation. There is no way an unbeliever can understand the significance of a literature that presupposes belief on the part of the reader. Both believer and unbeliever, however, should be able to appreciate the literary dimensions of the vehicle through which the message to be grasped by faith comes to expression. The swaddling clothes of the Christ child were probably very much like the swaddling clothes of other Bethlehem children.

In the light of these assumptions the literary analysis focuses on the text and how it compares with contemporary texts. The inspiration of Ellen White, the fact that she had visions, the guidance of the Holy Spirit in her work, and her own devoted Christian commitment is assumed. These claims of Ellen White are not disputed. We are looking only at the evidence of the text, Ellen White's text, the text produced by her literary helpers, and the published text in the context of comparable literature of her times. In respect to this study our interest does not extend to the effect of the text on the reader. We are not making an audience analysis

of any of the texts coming under our examination. Our concern is with the text itself, particularly its source and redaction. We shall be using the generally applied methodologies for these approaches, but first some definitions and cautions are in order.

Source Criticism or Analysis. Source criticism endeavors to determine if and to what degree a given writer used sources in the production of his literary work. It seeks to discover the number of sources used and the nature of these sources--that is, were they oral or written--and how such sources were used by the writer. The emphasis of source critics is usually placed upon the sources or building materials used by the later author. The location of sources is largely accomplished by establishing the existence of literary parallels between a given writing and earlier textual materials.

Source criticism as a modern literary approach to the text owes its origin, at least in part, to "a reaction against the older purely dogmatic approach to Scripture, which viewed it as supernatural revelation divorced from its historical background. . . ."[1] Like most reactions, the pendulum swung too far at first and the special supernatural claims of Scripture were disclaimed or at least neglected.

---

[1]Donald Guthrie, New Testament Theology (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981), p. 34.

Indeed, among certain scholars even the religious nature of the text was not taken into consideration when making literary comparisons. It is now understood that one need not discount the faith dimension to do serious study in the area of source analysis. There are, however, some serious cautions to be kept in mind when making source critical studies. William S. Peterson, at the time Professor of English, University of Maryland, recognized and underscored several such cautions when studying Ellen White's writings.

> Any literary scholar can tell us that "source studies" are among the most treacherous tasks to under-take, 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.[1]

Samuel Sandmel, the late Jewish New Testament scholar, pointed out what might be regarded as the "occupational hazard" of source criticism. He called this dangerous tendency among those doing source studies "Parallelomania," which he defined as "that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction."[2] Students of Old Testament and New Testament studies are cognizant of the almost assumed close association of the Genesis creation stories with the Babylonian creation myth and John the Baptist with the people of Qumran. The excitment of finding certain parallels appears to cloud the eyesight and narrow the vision. The differences are somehow underplayed or overlooked and connections are established upon the flimsiest of bases. Once the initial shock of the discovery fades and calmer attitudes prevail, the scene changes in color and the picture becomes much more complex.

Another danger in source criticism is the tendency to

---

[1]William S. Peterson, "Ellen White's Literary Indebtedness," Spectrum, Autumn, 1971, pp. 78, 79.

[2]Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," JBL, LXXXI (1962), pp. 1-13.

give all parallels the same importance. Sandmel warns us that "Two passages may sound the same in splendid isolation from their context, but when seen in context reflect difference rather than similarity."[1]

We tried to accommodate these variables by developing a list of criteria to be followed when making the evaluations. We wanted to avoid the common pitfalls of source studies as mentioned above. In addition we wanted to design a system of evaluation which would reflect the special nature of the text under study. This meant that we had to allow for some parallels to have been strongly influenced by the biblical text. Other parallels had to be evaluated in terms of "stock" words, that is, words that any number of religious writers (in this case) might well have chosen were they writing on the same topic at that time. We also had to allow for the nonparallels or independent comment of Ellen White. Each sentence, whether dependent or independent, has to be evaluated for its importance as a parallel or nonparallel on its own merits as well as in terms of the role that particular sentence plays in the context. As Peterson said, this kind of study is very difficult to carry out.

We admit that any study incorporating criteria designed to avoid these pitfalls will necessarily result in minimal

---

[1] Ibid., p. 2.

claims for parallels. But in the light of the nature of our task, one fraught with the perils of subjectivity, it is probably better to err on the side of understatement.

Redaction Criticism or Analysis. Redaction criticism, particularly as used by students of Scripture, attempts to identify the theological intention or motivation of the writer who put the text in the form we have it today. For example, the stories in the Gospels on the life of Jesus are not arranged in the same order in all four accounts or even in the narratives of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The term "redaction" is based upon a Latin root meaning "to edit." We may briefly define redaction criticism then as that type of literary criticism which "is concerned with studying the theological motivation of an author as this is revealed in the collection, arrangement, editing, and modification of traditional material, and in the composition of new material or the creation of new forms. . . ."[1] Biblical interpreters as yet have not come up with an English equivalent, apart from "redaction," to speak of the process of arranging or modifying a text apart from our word "edit" which does not have a noun form with the same basic meaning.

Redaction criticism or analysis deals with the activity of the writer as editor. It may be used to speak of the

---

[1]Norman Perrin, What is Redaction Criticism (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), page 1.

writer's arrangement of his or her original composition but more often the term refers to the way in which an original text has been modified. Our study does not make a serious attempt to apply redaction analysis to Ellen White's writings but at the same time we could not altogether avoid a limited study of redaction in The Desire of Ages. We know Ellen White engaged in a certain amount of selectivity when using the materials of other writers. In addition, there is the structuring of the earlier Ellen White materials into manuscripts, articles, and books by Ellen White and her editorial staff. We did not analyze the revised text to discover the theological or other intention of Ellen White and/or her literary assistants. We were interested, however, to ask if the thematic arrangement of the chapters or the literary subunits of the chapters showed literary dependence on a given author from whom literary parallels were taken. Redaction criticism forces us to look beyond the isolated literary parallel provided by a sentence or two to the larger context. Source dependency or independency is not only registered at the point of a specific sentence but in the way the composition as a whole has been put together.

As with source analysis, redaction studies also call for careful scrutiny. Similarity in theme development may be due to the common biblical narrative used by all authors. As

Peterson has warned us, the story of Jesus' life and ministry was treated in so many Victorian lives (of Christ) that all writers had a common literary pool from which to draw. In view of this widespread literary genre, commonality would not necessarily indicate dependency. We will have to look for unusual aspects of a given writer, indisputable use of similar if not identical language expression, and perhaps reference to extrabiblical elements to establish dependency.

It might be helpful in this connection to remind the reader once again that we are not primarily concerned to locate the source of the ideas which come to expression in the E. G. White writings, even though content study is required for redaction analysis. Ideas and concepts often float, as it were, in the air of the times. Any writer or speaker, including the prophetic personality, is a product of his or her world even when the messages are in opposition to that world and its views. At any given time there are streams of common thought patterns running through the minds of a given sector of society. Ellen Harmon White was a devout Christian from the days of her early teens. She heard many sermons in the religious services she attended. She traveled widely from her late teens throughout the major portion of her life, often speaking herself or listening to others proclaim Christian messages. In addition to her

reading in books she read the religious journals of the day. And finally, there is the matter of her visions and dreams which according to her claims did include some propositional content. And when one stops to remember that at the root of all her writings were the Bible and the Christian teachings of those who held the Bible as their authority for religious faith and practice, it becomes a rather delicate, indeterminate task to isolate even the probable sources for the ideas to be found in her writings. Our efforts at redaction will be directed, rather to discover which ideas govern her use of sources. Or to put it another way, we will want to see if certain ideas dominate the dependent material as compared with the independent text. Such a comparison may help to isolate whatever literary or theological intentions Ellen White may have had and thereby help us discover her principles of selectivity. It is the result of this distillation process which is of primary interest to us. The study of the process is only important for the assistance it provides in distinguishing the finished product from the materials available independent of process.

Even in our application of source criticism to the Ellen White writings there will be some distinctions from the typical concerns of this discipline. We are not concerned to locate, necessarily, the precise literary sources used by

Ellen White in a particular sentence. For example, the location of an exact literary parallel between Ellen White's material and an earlier text does not prove that Ellen White used that source. Since it is well known that literary borrowing was not unique to Ellen White, both of these writers may have borrowed verbatim from a third work, a common source. Nevertheless such an instance of parallelism will be useful for our purposes. We are interested in locating those places where Ellen White depended to some extent on the literary work of another. It matters not if we have located the exact source. Once we have located as many of these parallels as possible, given the time and staff limitations, we will have some indication of her degree of literary dependence and independence.

Organization and Methodology

The work of organizing the various tasks and developing the proper methodology of a carefully constructed research project are both interrelated and separate activities. By organization we refer to the overall plan or protocol of the entire study. Method has to do with those aspects of the research which involve the research data, such as collection, analysis, and evaluation. Both organization and methodology

are to a large degree influenced by the nature of the data to be studied, the amount of information available, the number and kind of inquiries to be made of the data, the number of researchers, and the time available. Obviously finances play a very important role in most studies because funds determine how many can be employed on the project for a given period of time.

We could not avoid introducing some aspects of organization and method in the previous section where we discussed the general type and form of literary research under which our project falls. For example, we set forth some of the limits to our study and described the basic approach of source and redaction analysis. In this segment of the report we will outline the protocol or procedure of this specific research project.

Organization. The original design called for a thorough study of at least the full text of The Desire of Ages. Since it was also known that the material Ellen White was producing on the life of Christ "overflowed" into two additional books, Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing (published in 1896) and Christ's Object Lessons (published in 1900), some thought it might be well to cover the entire scope of Ellen White's writings on the life of Christ. The General Conference planned for the study to be completed in two years by a staff

of one full-time researcher and one or two part-time graduate student helpers. With both financial and time constraints determined, the only place left for adjusting the investigation would be in the number of questions to ask and the amount of literature to cover.

After studying the nature of the problem for three months and feeling the pressure of three months of the time period already taken up by the selection of the research director, I decided that the project had to be cut down in size. We would have to limit the investigation to a strict source study, omitting questions of content and the issue of plagiarism.

But it would take more than a reduction in the scope of the inquiries. We would have to reduce the textual base to be analyzed. There was no way we could cover the full text of The Desire of Ages, let alone the other two books created out of the "leftovers." It was now clear to me that The Desire of Ages was a composite work, constructed from a compilation and a revision of Ellen White's earlier materials and from texts specifically written for this new publication on the life of Christ. The source studies would obviously have to include the text of The Desire of Ages, for that is the basic work of Ellen White on the life of Christ. But we would also need to analyze Ellen White's manuscripts,

letters, diary notations, and published articles if we were to locate her use of sources.

It was not only the magnitude of the Ellen White textual materials forcing us to limit the scope of the study. We also discovered from our investigation of possible sources on the life of Christ that we faced literally hundreds of works to be reviewed. The two-year time period was an impossible target if we planned on doing a thorough work. We struggled with the problems of getting more help and cutting down the size of the project without jeopardizing the usefulness of the conclusions or compromising the integrity of the research.

The study was organized into five phases, the search for literary parallels, the evaluation of every Ellen White sentence for degree of dependency or independency, the analysis of the findings for each chapter, the summarization and conclusion of the study, and finally writing the research report. To save time and provide for some measure of consistency we designed a series of summary questions to be asked of each chapter once we had made the analysis. This permitted us to write up the report for each chapter as the analysis was completed.

Research responsibilities were divided according to time commitments and the demands of the project. When it became

clear that optical scanners were not at the stage of development where they could read the various type fonts used in the sources or in Ellen White's writings, including handwritten texts, and there was no money to pay people to type the texts for entry into computer memory banks, we decided to ask for volunteer help. We asked the volunteers to become well acquainted with the text of one chapter (in some cases two chapters) of The Desire of Ages. These volunteer assistants would check the Ellen White text with the photocopy of the comparable portion(s) of a 19th-century life of Christ sent to them. Each volunteer had instructions, marking pencils, and charts by which they would indicate the literary parallels they found between the two texts. This process would be repeated for each of the sources reviewed.

The sources did not include Adventist writers. We knew of no commentary on the life of Christ written by an Adventist, but doubtless Ellen White had listened to or read sermons on the life of Christ by Adventist preachers. When we limited the scope largely to books on the life of Christ it automatically ruled out Adventist works. Had we decided to include Adventist sermons there would have been the additional problem of establishing the independence of these sermons from Ellen White's messages on the life of Christ

which in turn many Adventist ministers certainly had heard and perhaps noted.[1]

To reduce the amount of text to what we hoped would be manageable size for a two-year project and yet permit us to draw valid general conclusions was a challenge. At first we thought it might be possible to cover at least the text of The Desire of Ages, the major work of Ellen White on the life of Christ. Further investigation of the texts involved convinced us we would not be able to cover even two-thirds of the 87 chapters of this popular book. It was finally decided that we could investigate with acceptable thoroughness 15 chapters. Even then, as the time commitment and cost, as well as the length and complexity of the study show, a gross underestimate was made of the effort that would be necessary.

At one time we considered dividing the chapters of The Desires of Ages into categories according to their content and selecting one or two chapters from each type. This approach was scratched when we discovered the content of most chapters was mixed between biblical, extrabiblical, historical, narrative, theological, devotional, and other such categories. Even if this classification scheme had proved possible there was the problem of selection within the

---

[1]See under Part B of the Introduction, page 111, note 1, for further comment on the issue of Adventist influence in the writing of The Desire of Ages.

types. We had received suggestions from interested observers that we include certain chapters for their known dependence or independence.

The selection of the sample chapters was not a complex process; but to eliminate any question of bias and because our purpose was to make inferences about the entire book, Desire of Ages, rather than just about the 15 chapters studied, it was decided to turn over to the Pacific Union College mathematics department a list of the 87 chapters, ordered with respect to length, and requested that five chapters each be selected from the 29 shortest, 29 middle-length, and 29 longest chapters in the book. Such a stratified random sample was drawn by Professors Richard Rockwell and Keith Anderson using a random number table and simple, standard procedure. It is these 15 statistically selected chapters that have been the focus of The Desire of Ages research project.

The only point at which I influenced the selection was in the stratification of the chapters according to length. There were those who had claimed that Ellen White's enlarging of her comments from her earliest published work to the text of The Desire of Ages was due to her increased dependency upon literary sources. Since The Desire of Ages represents a serious revision of the earlier texts, and our chapters do not match in content the chapters of The Spirit of Prophecy,

Volumes II and III, the only way we had to check on the correspondence beteen dependency and length was to take into consideration the length of the chapters in our text. By taking the average number of words in a line of text, counting the lines on each page, taking into account the space taken by pictures or partial pages of text, and counting the pages for each chapter, I drew up a list of the 87 chapters numbered in sequence from shortest to the longest.

One control chapter was randomly selected from the 15. The content of these 15 chapters became the control for locating earlier Ellen G. White material and for selecting source materials for our comparative study. At times this division of text by chapters rather than by content gave us problems. The earlier texts of Ellen White and the chapters of the Victorian lives of Christ holding possible literary parallels did not always agree on content. For example a source might have the three temptations of Christ in one chapter where The Desire of Ages covers this Jesus event in two. The limiting of the comparison to the one chapter may have resulted in missing some literary parallels.

While the volunteers were checking the sources against the text of The Desire of Ages we were following the same program for the earlier Ellen White writings. During periodic visits to the Ellen G. White Estate office in

Washington, D. C., I read and scanned all of her diary journal entries, letters, and manuscripts dating from her earliest writings in the late 1840s to December of 1898 when The Desire of Ages was published. All references to the life of Christ were noted and copies of these pages were taken to the project office for sorting to match the content of the 15 chapters and then for comparison with the contemporary writings on the life of Christ that we were collecting from libraries throughout the U. S. A. At the same time we were locating the articles on the life of Christ published in Adventist journals and Ellen White's comments on this same content published in her earlier books and testimonies. All of these textual materials were copied and filed in notebooks chronologically according to chapter content.

Once we had collected and collated both the entire textual tradition of Ellen White on the content of a given chapter and that of the sources into notebooks, the tedious and laborious task of comparison was carried out. The parallels located by the volunteers, as well as those supplied by others who had studied the text of The Desire of Ages,[1] were examined and every source was also read at the project office comparing the contemporary writers with the

---

[1]Major contributors to our beginning stock of literary parallels for the text of The Desire of Ages were Walter Rea, Norman Jarnes of Verdict Publications (Fallbrook, California), and Robert Olson and Ron Graybill of the Ellen G. White Estate office.

earlier writings of Ellen White not available to the volunteers. After more than 500 possible literary sources were reviewed, the parallels isolated were evaluated according to the methodology described below and were formatted so that they could be read in parallel arrangement on matching pages.

The final stages of the organization involved the analysis of our findings and writing of the research report which are fully detailed under the last section of this chapter. Throughout the years it has taken to complete this study the officers of the General Conference have been kept informed. During the first three years a progress report was presented each year. A preliminary statement of our findings was sent to Neal Wilson for presentation to the 1985 General Conference session in New Orleans. A special review committee was established late in 1985 and 11 chapters of the research report were reviewed at a special meeting in early February of 1986. The final statement has been revised in part to meet some of their suggestions, particularly in the presentation of the textual materials for purposes of greater clarity. Additional points on the final form of the report follow below. We turn now to a more detailed review of our method of literary analysis and evaluation.

Methodology. Methodology is the heart of a research project. The purpose of research is to arrive at valid

conclusions. The conclusions of any research task are governed by at least four factors. If the results of a study are to be convincing, there must be an adequate data base to support the claims being made, the methodology must be consistent with the type of evidence being evaluated, the methodology must be consistently applied, and the interpretation of the evidence must not intrude upon the collection of the data or the execution of the methodology. When the subject matter of an investigation involves questions of religious faith for the researchers, the sponsors, and the intended readers, as is the case with this project, the above factors are all the more crucial for the success of the research project.

It is these considerations which have guided us in the design of this research project. The following comments set forth how the research procedures attempted to fulfill the conditions of the methodology chosen.

This study was commissioned to include at the minimum not a chapter or two from Ellen White's pen but an entire book of 87 chapters. No previous study of Ellen White's use of sources ever set out to cover so much of her material. We have already described how we were forced by Ellen White's method of writing to include her earlier works as well, and by our time and financial limitations to narrow the scope of content from 87 to 15 chapters.

On the other side of the equation, however, there was

the question of possible sources. What sources were available to Ellen White? How could we be sure our research of likely sources was broad enough to validate our conclusions? After all, the study was designed to establish the extent of Ellen White's use of sources, not the fact that she used sources. This would mean the surveying of a large number of works which one might reasonably expect Ellen White would have had available and of the type she would likely have consulted.

We started at ground zero. We began with the list of books already known to have been used by Ellen White in writing The Desire of Ages. Our second approach took us to the library lists found among the documents drawn up at the death of Ellen White for the settlement of her estate.[1] From that point we noted the publishers of the books we knew she had consulted on the life of Christ. We located other works they advertised and/or published. Obviously we selected our books in the English language, published prior to Ellen White's time of writing, and those generally listed as Victorian lives of Christ, since the lives known to have been used by her were generally found in this category. We also made some effort to look among books of sermons and

---

[1]These inventory lists were later compiled by Warren H. Johns, Tim Poirier, and Ron Graybill and published by the Ellen G. White Estate as A Bibliography of Ellen G. White's Private and Office Libraries, 2nd revised ed., Jan., 1983.

devotional thoughts. The full list of over 500 works that were studied has been appended to this report. We would argue that as a result of these efforts we do have an adequate data base for supporting our conclusions.

The fundamental methodology for this source analysis, as we have noted above, comes from the discipline of literary criticism. Such an approach is not only direct in the selection of comparative texts but also in the way in which the comparisons are made. We have already emphasized how one must be careful to establish that a parallel is truly there. Even though opinion is necessarily involved, there must be some way to argue for literary dependency from factual evidence as well. In addition, the evaluation of literary dependency should allow for some measurement of the degree of dependency or independency. And above all, measures must be taken to insure a basic consistency in the evaluation process.

Walter Specht approached his comparative study of a portion of the text of The Desire of Ages and William Hanna's Life of Christ using the criteria given by Alfred M. Perry.[1] Perry's criteria have been used in analyzing the similarities and differences between the first three Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

---

[1]Walter F. Specht, op. cit., pp. 1, 2.

> The two criteria of dependence upon written sources are resemblance and continuity. Proof here does not rest upon casual similarity but upon the following rather definite similarities:
>
> 1. Resemblance of the contents: telling the same stories.
> 2. Resemblance in continuity: telling the stories in the same order.
> 3. Similar sentence and word order: telling the stories in the same way.
> 4. Extensive agreement (50 per cent to 60 per cent) in the words used.
> 5. Agreement in using unusual words or harsh constructions.
>
> The concurrence of all these lines of evidence makes an impressive argument for dependence upon written sources, and agreements in wording (items 4 and 5) would rule out the likelihood of independent translations. But where this concurrence is not consistent or close, it is not safe to consider documentary dependence proved. To account for such lesser resemblances other possibilities must be explored.[1]

As Specht also notices, these criteria while useful in source studies on Ellen White's writings on the life of Christ are not always applicable. The basic source behind both Ellen White and her contemporary writers is the Bible. Correspondence between commentators on the life of Christ, especially in respect to telling the same stories and presenting them in the same way, may be explained on the basis of a common source used independently rather than on literary dependency between them.[2]

---

[1]Alfred M. Perry, "The Growth of the Gospels," The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VII (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1981). p. 62.

[2]Specht, op. cit., p. 2.

The differences between the literature we are comparing and that of the Gospels and the fact that we also wanted to weight the criteria for purposes of indicating the degree of dependency prompted us to develop our own set of guidelines. The list of criteria with brief descriptions and the dependency rating values may be found on the following three pages. At this point we would offer a more complete explanation of their nature, the rationale behind their development, and how they are applied.

Ellen White's narrative commentary on the life of Christ, while built upon the Bible record, includes much more than may be found in the Gospel stories of the New Testament. She weaves into her account background information, moral lessons to be learned, devotional appeals, doctrinal teachings, and details on how God and the angels, as well as Satan, view the experiences of Jesus. The variations she plays on the central Bible theme taken from the life of Christ are so diverse that the unit of comparison has to be smaller than the story or even the paragraph. On the other hand, the ways in which she combined various thoughts into one sentence, or in which her literary assistants revised and combined her sentences, tempted us to use a phrase as the basic unit of comparison. Taking the small portion of text would permit us to isolate those phrases which were dependent

TYPES AND CRITERIA OF LITERARY PARALLELS

I. VERBATIM — LEGEND VALUE

1. Strict Verbatim — (V1) [7]

   Exact duplication of all words and syntax

2. Verbatim — (V2) [6]
   Slight modification of word forms, incidental word substitutions or punctuation changes

II. PARAPHRASE

1. Strict Paraphrase — (P1) [5]

   A. Significant verbatim similarities
   B. Parallel structural elements
   C. Identical or nearly identical ordering of sentence elements
   D. Obvious substitution of synonyms or variants

2. Simple Paraphrase — (P2) [4]

   A. Striking verbatim words or phrases which establish relationship to the source
   B. A number of identical words not necessarily unusual or striking, but occurring together and in a sentence whose context gives evidence of additional parallels
   C. The sentence presents a thought very closely resembling (though not necessarily identical to) the source
   D. Frequently this type of paraphrase offers a shortened, condensed, simplified, or clarified version of the source parallel
   E. When simple paraphrase treats extrabiblical material its dependency upon the source may be considered equal to that of strict paraphrase

3. Loose Paraphrase — (P3) [3]

   A. A presentation of a very similar idea to that of a given source in a context where
      (1) verbatim or closer paraphrase is also found

(2) the development of an idea is progressing in substantially the same order as in the source
(3) often a few verbatim words appear in the sentence suggesting dependency and
(4) frequently it is compressing or summarizing a more fully elaborated passage

B. When loose paraphrase treats extrabilbical material its dependency upon the source may be considered equal to that of simple paraphrase

III. BIBLE

1. Bible (B2) [0]

When the use of the Bible text may be explained on the basis of both writers following a common knowledge of the biblical materials, or when Ellen White uses the Bible independently, the Bible as a literary source is noted but not evaluated

2. Source Bible (B1) [2]

When any use of the Bible (direct or indirect quotation, strict or loose paraphrase, partial or complete text) may be accounted for from the special use of the Bible by the source and not on the basis of common usage of the Bible (Bible verses commonly associated with the theme or Bible story being treated)

IV. INDEPENDENT

1. Strict Independence (I1) [0]

A. Where the thought presented does not show itself to be dependent upon the source by reason of
(1) common literary expression
(2) parallel context development
(3) specific opposing thoughts to source

B. Where there is reasonable doubt of dependency when applying the above criteria to literary units in a given context where other literary units reveal dependency

C. Where no source has been located for the literary expression of the content whether

in a context where dependency is otherwise indicated, or where dependency is not established

D. Where Ellen White includes use of the Bible as part of her comments, but not similar use of the Bible appears at this location from a source

2. Partial Independence (I2) [1]

A. When the unit of comparison includes a category of paraphrase listed above, yet adds or omits a significant thought to or from that found in the source

B. When the literary unit presents a thought in opposition or addition to the source in the context where
   (1) the order of presentation and
   (2) the nature of the contrasting or additional thought expressed can best be explained as having been prompted by the source

C. Paraphrase of common words found in a source clearly being used in the context but could also be explained as typical usage and therefore evaluated on the side of independence rather than dependence due to doubtful source dependency

D. Same conditions as (C) above but having reference to a source used sparingly in this context

E. When the conditions of (C) or (D) above exist but additional or opposing thoughts are present

from those which were independent in complex sentences. In the end we found this plan to be too idealistic and tedious for the large textual base to be analyzed. We settled on the sentence as the fundamental unit of comparison. However, where it seemed appropriate and useful we did in several instances evaluate independent clauses as separate literary units within compound sentences.

The criteria developed for our comparative study were arranged into nine classifications measuring varying degrees of dependency from the highest dependency of verbatim to nondependency for independent sentences. We do not deny that a measure of arbitrary subjective judgment is involved in the placement of sentences into these categories of dependency/nondependency. At the same time I would argue that while opinions may vary on a given sentence, when several individuals apply the criteria to a good-sized sample of sentences the culminating results are very close. The following descriptions and illustrations are provided as a demonstration of the method of literary comparison used in this study.

The highest level of dependency is the category of "strict verbatim." A verbatim sentence or independent clause is labeled "strict" if it fully duplicates a sentence or independent clause. This kind of construction has identical

words, word order, and syntax. This level carries the highest dependency rating, 7 points, and as one might expect does not occur frequently. We found this type of dependency more likely to occur in very short sentences. Since a short sentence from one writer is more likely to be identical with a short sentence of some other writer through the use of common language on the same topic, we would also need some further indication of dependency to show the correspondence was not just an isolated coincidence. Two examples of strict verbatim taken from DA chapter 14 material follow.

> Manuscript 13, sentence 267 reads--
> "The broken links have been repaired."
>
> Manuscript 13, sentence 268 reads--
> "A highway has been thrown up along which the weary and heavy laden may pass."
>
> Melvill's sermon on "Jacob's Vision and Vow," sentence 19 reads--
> "Yea, we can now thank the 'Lord of heaven and earth,' that the broken links have been repaired, so that the severed parts of creation may be again bound into one household; that a highway has been thrown up, along which the weary and heavy-laden may pass to that rest which remaineth for the people of God."

Even though the full sentence of Melvill was not used, the excerpts taken by Ellen White were verbatim insofar as they went. The sentences of The Desire of Ages are generally shorter than those of the sources, and also of the Spirit of Prophecy written by Ellen White some twenty years earlier.

When the resemblance is not complete due to some slight

change in word forms or word substitutions, the sentence is identified as simple "verbatim" and given a rating value of 6. Once again we look for additional indications of source dependency to support the claim for verbatim usage of a source. The two sentences taken from the same context as used above clearly demonstrate the "verbatim" category.

> Manuscript 13, sentence 256 reads--
> "They seemed connected by a path which Deity loved to traverse."
>
> Signs of the Times, July 31, 1884, sentence 35 of an Ellen White article reads--
> "Heaven and earth had been connected by a path that the Lord loved to traverse."
>
> Melvill's sermon on "Jacob's Vision and Vow," sentence 12 reads--
> "Up to the moment of rebellion there had been free communion: earth and heaven seemed connected by a path which the very Deity loved to traverse.

The sentences from Manuscript 13 and the Signs are very close to what Melvill had written in his sermon. In the first sentence Ellen White substitutes "they" for "earth and heaven" and omits "the very" before "Deity." The second sentence retains "heaven and earth" but in reverse order and replaces "which the very Deity" of Melvill with "that the Lord."

The paraphrase categories allow for more variation in the wording and word order. What is crucial here for establishing literary dependency is the resemblance of the wording, word order, and the arrangement of the sentence

units. The greater the similarity the higher the dependency. In "strict paraphrase" we would expect close correspondence between significant words and phrases and the structural elements. This type of sentence carries the rating value of 5. In sentences where the verbal similarities are not as great yet the structural elements are basically present I have labeled the sentence as "simple paraphrase" and given it a value of 4. Often sentences of this type will be a condensed version of the source text. When there is little in the way of verbal similarity but the thought is basically the same as the source in a context which clearly contains verbatim words and sentences, we have generally evaluated the sentence as "loose paraphrase" and rated it at a value of 3. In each of these cases we will take into consideration the presence or absence of what might be called corroborating evidence in the immediate context. By this we mean instances of strict paraphrase or verbatim, parallels involving nonscriptural content, and identical or similar thematic development. Let us take a few examples from the study to illustrate these categories of dependency. The source text from March is given first. We then follow with three different ways the content is taken over by Ellen White. The dependency will move from "verbatim," to "strict paraphrase," and finally to "simple paraphrase."

Daniel March, Night Scenes of the Bible, sentence 30, page 416.

"Nothing in his dress or manner or person leads them to suspect that he can be anything else than one of the pilgrims returning from the great feast to some distant home."

Signs of the Times, January 20, 1888, offers a "verbatim" form of March's text.

"and there was nothing in his dress or his manner to lead the disciples to suspect that he was any other than one of the many pilgrims returning from the great feast."

The Desire of Ages, chapter 83, sentence 65, presents an example of "strict paraphrase."

"They thought that He was one of those who had been in attendance at the great feast, and who was now returning to his home."

Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. III, sentence 62b, page 212, is an example of "simple paraphrase."

"nothing in his bearing suggested to them that they were listening to other than a casual pilgrim, returning from the feast, but one who thoroughly understood the prophecies."

Were it not for the last part of the sentence the evaluation of the Spirit of Prophecy sentence would have been "strict paraphrase." Clearly Ellen White has added a thought not found in the source text. Had her addition equaled about half the sentence or more it would have been more accurate to register her independence and either give the sentence the appropriate rating for partial independence or split the sentence into two independent clauses and give them separate ratings. Leaving the sentence as it stands I opted for indicating dependency, judging on the major portion of the text, but giving it a "simple paraphrase" rating of 3 rather

than the higher level of dependency. This is just one example of where one makes a judgment call which could go in more than one direction. By listing the criteria and the full text the reader has the information necessary for making his or her own judgments.

The following rather lengthy quotation is an example of "loose paraphrase." This category is not very common because it relies on the content more than the form. Great care must be taken to make sure the content is basically the same as the source text and that there is correspondence elsewhere in the context. In most cases Ellen White will expand or in some way modify the content so that other categories of evaluation become applicable as we shall discuss below.

> William Hanna, Life of Christ, sentence 70, page 667.
>
> "Jesus will now openly, not only take to himself his own name, assume his office, and assert his Divine prerogatives, but in doing so he will let those earthly dignitaries, who have dragged him thus to their tribunal, before whose judgment-seat he stands, know that the hour is coming which shall witness a strange reversal of their relative positions--he being seen sitting on the seat of power, and they, with all the world beside, seen standing before his bar, as on the clouds of heaven he comes to judge all mankind."

> Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. III, sentence 167, page 120.
>
> "In it he presented to the minds of those present a reversal of the scene then being enacted before them, when he, the Lord of life and glory, would be seated at the right hand of God, the supreme Judge of Heaven and earth, from whose decision there could be no appeal."

The Bible is the common source behind both the sources' and Ellen White's comments on the life of Christ. Ordinarily

when Ellen White quotes Scripture directly, indirectly, or clearly bases her remarks on the Bible text, we do not consider this usage of Scripture as an example of literary dependency. Nearly every chapter of The Desire of Ages opens with a footnote pointing the reader to the Bible passages supporting the commentary. Even though Ellen White does not always indicate through the use of quotation marks that she is quoting Scripture, we have tried to identify all usages of Scripture. These sentences are given the rating of zero (0) and are not included in the evaluation of dependence/nondependence.

There is, however, a second use of Scripture which we have called "source Bible." This category has been applied to any usage of Scripture in any form, whether quoted or paraphrased, whether presented as a complete or partial quotation, which may to some degree be attributable to the way the source used the Bible. This type of usage may be the quoting of a text which is not ordinarily associated with the gospel story being narrated or a pattern of quoting and commenting on a story in the same sequence and at the same junctions in the story as does the source. Another example of this kind of dependency is when Ellen White quotes Scripture in places where it would be expected of one commenting on a story from the life of Christ, but her

introductory or closing remarks for the quotation are clearly taken from or influenced by the way the literary source has used the Bible text. Since we have a separate category to indicate independent or common use of Scripture, when the Bible text is given a source-dependency rating the burden of proof would fall on the one claiming Ellen White's independent use of Scripture. Here is one example of the influence of the source upon the use of Scripture which we evaluated as 2 on the scale of literary dependency.

> Sentence 274 of The Desire of Ages, chapter 75 reads--
> "An hour had passed, when one of the servants of the high priest, being a near kinsman of the man whose ear Peter had cut off, asked him, 'Did not I see thee in the garden with Him?'"
>
> Frederic Farrar, The Life of Christ, sentences 33 & 36 read--
> "A whole hour passed: . . . and at last one of the High Priest's servants--a kinsman of the wounded Malchus--once more strongly and confidently charged him with having been with Jesus in the garden. . . ."

Ellen White has combined portions of Luke and John in her indirect and direct quoting of Scripture as has Farrar. The story of Peter's denial of Christ is reported in all four Gospels. The fact that Ellen White would at this place choose to combine the very two references that Farrar also unites, suggests the influence of Farrar. The evidence becomes stronger when one notices the other sentences of this context where Farrar's work is being utilized.

Two types of sentences were dedicated to noting Ellen

White's independence. If the entire sentence or the majority of the words appearing in a sentence exhibited no resemblance and the content did not appear to be a loose paraphrase of the source in a context where clear dependency was also registered, we labeled the sentence under "strict independence" and gave it a dependency rating of zero. No doubt many readers will conclude from their study of the evidence that I was liberal in putting many Ellen White sentences in this category, even many sentences carrying the same content as did the source. There were several reasons for giving the credit to Ellen White for the composition of such sentences.

This is a study of literary dependency and one should be careful to see that some literary evidence is present, not merely content. One must guard against giving everything over to the dependency on sources when one is dealing with common topics as are the stories of Jesus among Christian writers. In looking for a balance one is also influenced by the inability to register degrees of Ellen White's influence on the texts which carry dependency ratings. Finally, I would remind the reader once again of the subjectivity which cannot be eliminated from literary analysis, particularly source criticism. The organization and methodology followed in this research should permit the reader to make his/her own

evaluations of dependency using the textual evidence provided and either these criteria of evaluation or one's own.

The final category of literary dependence or nondependence is a rather complex one. Originally several separate types of sentences were developed to show the various ways in which a given sentence unit participated in both dependence and independence. These various kinds of mixed sentences were collapsed into one basic type which I classified as "partial independence." The lowest value of dependency, a rating of 1, was attached to this category. Obviously these sentences could have been designated as "partial dependence" even as the paraphrased sentences could have been viewed from the point of view of their independence rather than their dependence.

Once again we must point to our concern for balance in the matter of judgment for literary dependence/independence. In this type of sentence we endeavor to note the particular contribution of Ellen White which must involve at least half the sentence. Ellen White's additions, omissions, or oppositions to the source text must be clearly indicated and must make a significant difference in the reading of the sentence, whether in content or form. The single reduction of a lengthy sentence into one or more shorter sentences is not classified in this category. In every sentence of this

type some evidence of source dependency as well as independency must be apparent from a comparison of Ellen White's sentence with the content of the source.

Each sentence of the 15 chapters of The Desire of Ages was evaluated in terms of the above categories of dependency and independency. The earlier writings of Ellen White were also thoroughly surveyed and evaluated in respect to those sentences which clearly revealed source dependency. The earlier texts were not studied in full and no attempt was made to register their independent sentences.

The dependent sentences of the earlier materials were utilized as primary texts for studying Ellen White's use of sources. The evaluations of the dependent sentences of these pre-Desire of Ages texts allow us to make several literary comparisons between the Ellen White writings themselves and between her writings and the sources she appropriated. The earlier writings as pre-edited texts more clearly reveal the use of literary sources, and combined with later published works provide a comparison base from which to study how Ellen White's writings were edited.

Once we had in hand the complete body of text materials, at least to the extent we could recover the textual tradition for the content of the 15 chapters, we tabulated the dependency or independency, analyzed the textual evidence,

and summarized our findings for the chapter. Because we had selected the chapters on a random basis, the data from the 15-chapter sample could be used to make some generalizations for the text of The Desire of Ages as a whole.

The literary dependency of thematic development and narrative structure, or what we have called redaction analysis, was not a major aspect of the project. Nevertheless, by also indicating carefully the location of the source parallels in the literary source document we were able to trace the number and sequence of literary parallels in a given chapter taken from the same source. When several sentences in numerical sequence in the text of The Desire of Ages revealed literary dependence on a block of sentences occurring in one source, correspondence of literary structure could be studied. The length of these blocks of similar text content and the number of such units present in one or more sources would indicate the degree to which the composition of the chapter's content arrangements was dependent on one or more sources.

The data which emerged from the evaluation of sentence and unit dependency/independency were set out in various tables for study by the reader. Even though the tabulations are a necessary part of applying the methodology, they represent a stage of analysis beyond the actual task of

literary criticism. We shall discuss these aspects of the project as well as the questions addressed to the data under our description of the research report to which we now turn.

The Structure of the Research Report

The lengthy and detailed research report of which this chapter is one part consists of four divisions, though these major sections have not been so marked out in the Table of Contents or elsewhere. We shall briefly describe the divisions here, but the primary purpose of this section is to explain those portions of the report which have to do with the presentation of the text and its analysis.

The first two chapters of the report form the introduction to the research report, and have been outlined above. The final chapter containing the summary and conclusions of the investigation carry their own descriptions and require no special elaboration here. The fourth and final section of the report contains the appendices and research bibliographies. Each appendix carries a title page with a brief comment on the nature of the material which follows. Since several of the charts making up the first three appendices, Appendix A, B, and C, relate to the data generated by the analysis of the 15 chapters of The Desire of Ages, further explanation of those appendices will be

included in our discussion of the major section of the report which follows.

Each of the 15 chapters selected from The Desire of Ages is treated as an independent document in this project. A separate chapter in the report is dedicated to each of these chapters of The Desire of Ages. Chapters 3 through 17 of this research account are given to reporting the research and the reader can select any one of the chapters and obtain the complete information on that portion of Ellen White's text. Chapter 3 deals with the first chapter selected from The Desire of Ages, which just happened to be chapter 3. Chapter 4 of the report covers chapter 10 of The Desire of Ages, and the remaining chapters relate to the other chapters selected from Ellen White's life of Christ. Chapter 17 of our report treats the last of the 15 chapters of The Desire of Ages, chapter 84.

Each of these chapters reporting on the research, chapters 3-17, is organized according to the same pattern of four sections, namely, introduction, text presentation, analysis, and summary. In the following pages of this introductory chapter we offer a full description of these four parts so that the reader will have no difficulty, we hope, in following the analysis, and understanding the necessary abbreviations.

The reader is advised to study chapter 3 before turning to any one of the other chapters in that division of the report document. In view of the fact that chapter 3 was the first application of the research methodology to the textual data we endeavored to explain the steps of analysis and evaluation as we proceeded, even though now it involves some repetition of explanations given.

The Introduction. The first part of each chapter provides some background to the content of the chapter of The Desire of Ages under scrutiny. Ellen White's earlier writings on the topic are listed and the relation of those earlier writings to the text of The Desire of Ages is set forth. All references to the earlier materials are provided for the convenience of the reader who may wish to consult the published text for comparison purposes. The form of the text is also described as to handwritten, typescript by Ellen White's literary helpers, and whether manuscript, letter, or diary material.

This section of the chapter also lists the Bible references where the narrative event in the life of Jesus may be found. The literary sources which in my judgment are reflected in the Ellen White texts are also introduced. Where possible we make some attempt to show why it is reasonable to assume that Ellen White would have had access

to those sources. The dates to all textual materials are established so that one can relate the texts to each other in terms of their chronological priority.

Finally the introduction provides the key to the abbreviations used in the presentation of the text to identify the Ellen White and source texts. For example the text of The Desire of Ages is abbreviated with the letters, DA, which we shall hereafter also use in our references to the major Ellen White text. The earlier writings are referred to as a group with the designation, pre-DA. The individual documents are identified by the initial letters of the major terms found in their titles. The text of Spiritual Gifts carries the abbreviation of SG and Night Scenes in the Bible by Daniel March goes by the letters NS. In some usages they are underlined but when used as part of an extended reference to page location they usually are not.

The Text Presentation. The second part of each of the 15 chapters detailing the research presents the full textual evidence evaluated for that particular chapter of the DA text. The facing pages are double numbered in parallel fashion with the Ellen White texts on the left-facing page and the source texts on the right-facing page.

Before explaining the system used in presenting the various texts and identifying their location for

documentation and cross-referencing purposes, I would warn the reader that the pattern exhibits some inconsistencies. Other than unintentional errors of application three factors account for the lack of complete consistency. First, the system was set up for chapter 3. It was not developed after all texts were located and all variables noted. To save time we wrote the report as the research was completed for each chapter. Some variation of the format became necessary as new types of texts were introduced.

Second, the White Estate has not catalogued all Ellen White texts in the same way and at times a document once filed as a letter has been refiled as a manuscript, and vice versa. The diary or journals kept by Ellen White contain letter, manuscript, as well as the more familiar daily diary notations one might expect from personal records. Variations in the type of texts and their identification tags as given by the White Estate resulted in some modifications of our reference system as the research progressed. Once a person understands the basic pattern and notes the way the text is identified in the introduction of the chapter, the reference system should prove no problem to follow.

A third factor forcing some modification was the practical problem of space. In order to include the full text for both Ellen White and the sources, to identify text

references in a form short enough to allow listing also in statistical tables of columns, and if possible to list the date of unpublished documents and journal articles, we were forced to design a very limited abbreviation system. With some texts the only possibility for keeping the reference form within the space available was to modify the format. These changes should not raise serious difficulties when one becomes acquainted with the general system.

The DA text as the controlling text appears in full in each chapter. The sentences are numbered according to their order in the text, beginning with the first sentence of the chapter as sentence number 1. The DA sentences begin at the left margin of the left-facing page. The location of the sentence is given initially. The text abbreviation appears first, followed by the sentence number when counting from the beginning of the chapter, and following the slash mark (/) the page of the DA text where the sentence may be found is given.

Apart from a working manuscript of the DA text which also is presented from the left margin, all quotations from earlier Ellen White texts are indented. The first indention was usually used to present the earliest form of the text. The earliest pre-DA text might be the text of The Spirit of Prophecy, indicated by SP, written in 1877, or it might be a

diary text written in 1897. If both types of text appear in the same chapters the one closest to the hand of Ellen White will be given the first indention and the earlier though edited text of the SP will be given the second indention. With the great variety of texts the indentations may vary from chapter to chapter but within the same chapter the presentation format will be entirely consistent. The main purpose of the indentation of texts was to assist the reader in noting when the text quoted was from a different document than the preceding sentence. The width of the page made it impractical to have a different indention for each separate document.

Text taken from Ellen White's diary entries, letters, manuscripts, and journal articles are fully described in the introduction to each chapter, but only three elements appear in the reference format. The first element identifies the type of document or name of journal. For example: Di = Ellen White diary; MS = manuscript; Lt = letter; ST = Signs of the Times; and RH = Review and Herald. The second element appears in parenthesis, ( ), and refers to the year of the diary book or the year when the journal article was published.[1] In the case of letters and manuscripts the

---

[1]The year given identifies the diary, not the year when the text was written. When we designed the system the diary year matched the text date. Later we discovered diaries

middle term gives the manuscript or letter number as filed in the Ellen G. White Estate office.

The third factor of the format gives the sentence number. Unless some special circumstances of the text make it impractical or impossible, the usual practice was to number the sentences in numerical sequential order from the beginning of the letter, article, or manuscript. The diary sentences were numbered in sequence from a given location of the diary as indicated in the introduction of the chapter quoting diary material. We followed the same procedure when numbering the sentences in letters and manuscripts. Often Ellen White comments would vary widely in content within the same letter or manuscript. If the document was very long and included other types of material, the numbering might not begin at the opening of the document but at the place where the comparative content begins. Specific details are provided whenever we depart from the usual procedures.

If the textual material from a particular document or book involved only a few sentences, we found it more efficient to identify the location of the sentence by giving

---

covering several years of text. Rather than change the identification system to indicate the number of the diary book as filed at the White Estate Office, we chose the dominant year and identified the year of the text in the introduction to the chapter where such diary material appears.

the page number and the general location on the page as a decimal number or fraction of 10. For example: 2RL48.6 would refer to a sentence just below the midpoint on page 48 of Redemption Leaflets, No. 2; Lt(47)10.7 would indicate the sentence about two-thirds down the text on page 10 of Ellen White letter 47; and Lt(1a)4 would refer to sentence number 4 of Ellen White letter 1a. The reader would need to consult the introduction of the chapter to obtain the year Ellen White wrote the letter or journal articles which are not identified by year in the reference identification format.

The text following the location reference is always the exact reproduction of the sentence as it appears in the document as identified. I have added the underlining to indicate some level of dependency other than "loose paraphrase." In the majority of sentences where underlining occurs there will be one or more words in bold type. Even though the word processing and computer-driven printer did not always make the boldface easy to notice, particularly when the originals have been photocopied, our intent was to use the boldface to indicate the words in the Ellen White text which also appear in the literary source. We have used the boldface in a few places where the same word appears but in a different form. Variations might include participial- or verb-forms of a noun, plural use of singular terms,

compounds made from simple terms, or other similar modifications. In general the greater the number of verbatim words in proportion to nonidentical or similar terms, and the more extensive the underlining compared to the complete text of the sentence the greater is the degree of literary dependency.

The reader will recognize that many common words are placed in bold type and underlined. Viewed as individual words one could not make a case for verbatim and dependency. The words, even commonstock phrases, have to be viewed in terms of the context, in the word arrangement or syntax, and in relation to expressions involving technical or special vocabulary. While I do not wish to deny the subjective element in the evaluation, I will argue that the impact of the context and the general drift of the commentary have an objective bearing on decisions regarding dependency or independency.

Following every sentence listed for the Ellen White text we have indicated the literary source reference (for dependent sentences) and the sentence classification according to our schedule of nine categories. Typically the source reference consists of three elements within brackets. The first factor is a capital letter giving the first letter of the author's last name. The second element gives the

sentence or sentences of the source, and the final element lists the page of the source. If only a short section of text is entailed, just the page is given and the sentence location on the page is indicated with decimal numbers as described above for the Ellen White text when only small units of text are involved.

The limited identification system is adequate because the source text appears at approximately the same location on the right-facing page. Further details on the identity of the author and the specific volume where the text is located is provided with the source quotation. The reference system for the literary sources is explained below.

Following the source reference we have identified the sentence classification within parentheses. The schedule of sentence types and their criteria appear in conjunction with the statement on evaluation presented above on pages 64 to 74. For the convenience of the reader we are repeating the schedule in abbreviated form on the following page (87).

Three final comments are in order before moving to the description of text presentation for the source texts. Ellen White's independent use of the Bible in direct or indirect quotation is followed by the Bible reference. Obviously when the text appears in more than one New Testament gospel we cannot be certain we have selected the actual reference she

SENTENCE CLASSIFICATIONS AND DEPENDENCY VALUES

Sentence Type	Abbreviation	Dependency Value
Strict Verbatim	V1	7
Verbatim	V2	6
Strict Paraphrase	P1	5
Simple Paraphrase	P2	4
Loose Paraphrase	P3	3
Bible	B2	0
Source Bible	B1	2
Strict Independence	I1	0
Partial Independence	I2	1

had in mind, particularly if she is paraphrasing. We have inserted a bracketed reference following an Ellen White sentence when that sentence appears elsewhere also but does not serve our purposes of showing greater dependence, or aiding in the establishment of the content. The notation is helpful in the further analysis of how Ellen White's comments are duplicated and/or re-edited for additional use in other publications.

We would stress, however, that we do not include anywhere in the report the results of our efforts to trace all references in Ellen White's writings to a given episode in the life of Jesus. That data has not been collated from our working notebooks. The laser disk concordance based on the complete published text of Ellen White's writings would be the best resource for constructing an Ellen White textual tradition on a given subject.[1]

The placement of the earlier text materials of Ellen White into the sequence of the DA text is in some instances merely an arbitrary decision on my part. Due to the repetition found in the DA commentary and the dissimilarity between the earlier texts and the DA I could not in every

---

[1]I refer here to the Ellen G. White Concordance [by Select Video Products] (St. Paul, MN: 3m, 1982) and the E. G. White Concordance Word list (Bakersfield, CA: Select Video Products, 1983).

instance be sure of the proper placement. We did attempt, however, to coordinate the pre-DA text with the DA text. When the earlier writings treated the same general content of the DA chapter under study but was in part or altogether not incorporated into the DA text, we followed one of two procedures depending on the length of the early text.[1] If the previous writing involved only a few sentences we inserted them where we thought they best fitted the thematic development or harmonized with the narrative as presented in Scripture. The break in the DA text context introduced by this insertion of nonrelated DA material was indicated by a short broken line beginning at the left margin. If the earlier material constituted a major insertion we placed the pre-DA text at the end of the DA text. We hoped by this method to avoid confusion with the DA text and to permit the earlier text to be presented in continuous format. The corresponding source parallels were always located in relation to the Ellen White text, whether inserted or placed at the end of the text-presentation section of the chapter.

The literary sources which in my estimation are reflected in the writings of Ellen White on the life of Christ are presented on the right-facing page, opposite the

---

[1]For the most part we included only those texts of Ellen White or the general topic which involved the use of sources. It is quite likely such texts would have been included in Marian Davis' collection of Ellen White's earlier writings even though not selected for the DA text.

respective Ellen White sentences. As far as spacing permitted we attempted to include as much text as possible in order to allow the reader to evaluate the nature and extent of Ellen White's paraphrasing.

Each source sentence or sentence unit begins with a reference number consisting of two major elements divided by a slash mark. The first factor gives the sentence or unit number when counting from the beginning of the chapter or chapter section of the source where this Jesus event is discussed. The second element gives the page of the book where the sentence may be found. If the source is not heavily used the sentence location may be indicated by the page number and the decimal fraction of the page as used to document isolated sentences of Ellen White.

Some 19th-century writers had a writing style that involved the use of long and rather complex sentence structures. Others often strung together a number of independent clauses. The earlier writings of Ellen White exhibit some degree of this composite style, but it is not characteristic of the DA text. When such sentences contained parallels we divided the sentence into subunits and identified the sections with lower-case alphabet letters. For example, the first subsection of a sentence numbered 51 would be identified as 51a, the second subsection as 51b, and so forth throughout the sentence. If 51a, 51b, and 51d were

identified, and no 5lc was listed, the reader should conclude that 5lc contained no text parallel and space did not permit us to include that portion of the text.

The underlining and boldface type function for the source parallels as was the case for the text of Ellen White. These special marking techniques point to verbatim words and parallel thoughts and expressions between the source and Ellen White's text.

At the end of a sentence, or sometimes at the end of a series of sentences from the same source, the last name of the author and the first letters of the major words of the book's title are given in brackets. The complete bibliographic information on the sources is given in the introduction to the chapter where their sources appear.

Occasionally we list a source reference but make no mention of it in connection with the presentation of the Ellen White text. Such special source materials are identified further and explained in the analysis section of the report. Usually they are included to show how the sources appear to be dependent on earlier materials not always identified.

The reference data on both the Ellen White and source texts are tabulated separately in three appendices. Appendix A contains the source references and text evaluations for the sentences of each of the 15 chapters of the DA text. In view

of the fact that the study presents the full text of the DA, the entry numbers at the left margin correspond to the sentence numbers of the chapter. The second column contains the source reference for each dependent sentence. Bible quotations are merely identified by the term "Bible" and independent sentences are left blank. The third column gives the literary dependence rating for each sentence. This system of registering the sources and evaluations allowed us to see at a glance the arrangement or order of dependent/independent sentences for a given chapter.

Appendix B accomplishes the same purposes for the pre-DA text but the multiplicity of text documents and the partial presentation of those texts required that we modify the columns. The first column gives entry numbers for cross-referencing the Ellen White sentences with the source references tabulated in Appendix C. They do not indicate the sentence numbers of the text.

The second column identifies the pre-DA text document, sentence, and page number. Column 3 gives the sentence evaluations and the fourth column lists the sentence numbers of the DA text after which the earlier text is located. Since the pre-DA materials were inserted where their content or context was considered closest to the DA text, the only way to identify their location in the text presentation was to tie them to the particular sentences where they appear.

Appendix C completes the tabulation of data on the pre-DA text by repeating the entry number and document information for cross-referencing with Appendix B and adding the source references. This appendix allows us to obtain an overview of the sources used by the various pre-DA documents.

Appendices A, B, and C, containing the tabulations for each of the 15 chapters on the source references and sentence evaluations for both the DA and pre-DA text may be found at the close of the report where such addenda are usually placed. Having this data collected in one place facilitates comparative analysis between the chapters. The size of the research report, however, makes it also advisable to have this information more readily available for analyzing the individual chapters. For this reason we have duplicated the tabulation charts of these three appendices and inserted them at the close of the chapters to which they apply. These pages from Appendices A, B, and C carry the pagination of the separate appendices rather than the sequential page numbering of the main body of the report.

Perhaps this is the best place to review the general nature of Appendix D. It occurred to me that while it is possible to get the general thought flow of the DA text by just reading the sentences which begin at the left margin of all left-facing pages, one cannot read the other texts so easily. Every other text, whether of Ellen White or the

sources, is subordinated to the structure of the DA text. The structural arrangements of these other texts are lost in the adjustment of their component sentences to fit the composition of the DA text. Appendix D was used as the location to present several pre-DA texts in full, at least insofar as their content related to the content covered by the 15 DA chapters under study in this project. The reader will also find some larger segments of the source texts as well.

Appendix D does not contain the texts from documents represented in each of the 15 chapters. The analysis of each chapter will identify the texts which appear in Appendix D, and the materials of Appendix D are further described in the introductions to the various sections of this fourth appendix which correspond to the chapters of the DA text.

We have also added a fifth section, Appendix E, containing some background on the major authors whose works are reflected in the writings of Ellen White. The reader may wish to consult this section of the research report when reading the writings of an author associated with a particular chapter of the DA text.

The Analysis. The analysis of each chapter was primarily designed to cover two types of literary criticism on two kinds of textual materials. Source analysis was first applied to the data generated by the text of DA and then to

the pre-DA documents. A second step took us into redaction analysis of these same two categories of Ellen White texts.

The fundamental concern of the analysis and interpretation was focused by the 14 questions being addressed to each chapter. In this section of the report we argue the evidence from the text which would be used in the summary of each chapter.

These sections of the analysis and the 14 questions will be further discussed below. What I want to emphasize at this juncture of the introduction is that our careful scrutiny of the texts was not confined to these 14 specific questions. We did not wish to approach the textual data with a set of blinders on our eyes. The analysis section of the study permitted us to face the text with a more open stance. I felt it was legitimate to mention questions or implications suggested by the study of the text even though these points would not become a part of the summary which was largely limited to the preformulated 14 questions. Hopefully, others who study these same textual materials will notice elements or draw inferences not apparent to me. Where particular insights suggest that further investigation might be appropriate, interesting, or even urgent, I have not hesitated to point those out and to include them in the final summary and conclusion of the research project.

One such interesting observation developed out of our

analysis of the pre-DA texts. We found much duplication of content and literary formulation. As we compared those earlier materials of Ellen White with each other as well as with the DA text, the compilation technique of Marian Davis became more obvious. To better portray the relationships between the Ellen White materials we designed a new table, Table A, which is not to be found in every chapter.

Table A lists in parallel columns the parallel sentences in the pre-DA and the DA texts. Each column carries the identification of a particular document, and the three-digit number in the extreme left column indicates the entry number for reference purposes. The specific sentence of each document is identified by sentence and page number separated by a slash. The multiple columns present the documents in chronological order with the earliest-dated text to the extreme left and moving through time until the latest text, the DA text, is given in the extreme right column.

I did make some attempt to use parentheses and brackets to indicate when substantive changes were made in the original form, the parenthesis indicating the first change, brackets the second, and alternating parentheses and brackets pointing to further changes. In some cases this system has not worked very well and the reader is advised to consult the sentences directly rather than to depend on this system for indicating change. For example a sentence in the DA column

without parenthesis or brackets indicates the form of the DA text to be the same as an earlier form, but the reader will not be able to tell if the DA text matches the original or one of the later modified forms.

Despite the shortcomings of certain features of the format of Table A, the reader should be able to see at a glance how certain portions of the DA text represent a reformulation of earlier material or how other sections introduce new material on the life of Christ.

Under the source analysis (or criticism) of the DA text the sentence evaluations were compiled and given their dependency ratings according to the values arbitrarily established for comparison purposes. The same was done for the dependent sentences selected from the pre-DA documents. We endeavored to compare the dependency of the DA with the pre-DA texts and also to compare the content of the dependent sentences with that of the independent sentences. We were constantly challenged to analyze the material from the points of view of both similarity and dissimilarity.

We found it helpful in getting a grasp on the statistics and their implications to make several tables of statistics. These tables appear in the analysis section of each of the 15 chapters detailing the research.

Table 1 contains the sentence evaluations for both the DA and pre-DA texts. The DA text always appears on line 1.

Every sentence of the chapter is represented in one of the 9 categories with the total number of sentences given in the column farthest to the right. Lines 2 and following list the pre-DA texts in chronological sequence; the earliest pre-DA text data is presented on line 2 and the latest text prior to the publication of the DA on the last line. The dependent sentences (and independent when it was deemed necessary to include here for establishing context) are totaled on the right, and the totals of each category are listed on the last line. The parentheses appearing in the totals of columns 8 and 9 indicate these particular sentences do not carry dependency value.

Tables 2 and 3 look at this same data from the point of view of the sources. Through these tables we are able to note which sources furnished the most parallels and therefore which authors or books functioned as major literary sources for the chapter. Table 2 presented the statistics relating to the DA text sources, and Table 3 did the same for the sources reflected in the pre-DA Ellen White materials. Both tables list the authors and their works in the left-hand column. The abbreviations of book titles follow the same system utilized in the text presentation of literary sources. Where I have concluded Ellen White has combined material from two or more sources in the same sentence, I took that combination as a source and named it by linking the initials

of the titles to the books in a format connected by a slash. Space did not permit including the names of the authors in such combined use of sources.

Table 4 was an attempt (I am not sure how successful) to compare similar sentences appearing in the DA text and in one or more earlier texts. The top section of the table lists parallel sentences which vary only slightly in wording. The bottom section lists what I think are basically parallel sentences but the similarity is determined in terms of content rather than in literary form. Obviously the second comparison is more subjective and you need the context for control. At any rate the evaluation columns list the categories and one can check my comparisons of the dependency of the DA text with that of the earlier text of Ellen White. The table is designed to compare up to two earlier texts against the text of DA. The numbers on the far left are entry numbers for reference purposes only.

The analysis of source dependency of Ellen White's writings, the evaluations, and the dependency ratings based on the evaluations were made according to the evaluation and rating schedule set out above. Readers who disagree with the criteria or their application will want to adjust the analysis according to their own schedule. These tables do permit one to change the evaluations of individual sentences and refigure the conclusions without going through the entire

statistical base.

For those readers who may wish to see how we calculated the average dependency ratings for each chapter we offer a copy of a working sheet for chapter 3 of the DA text on the following page, 101. The figures can be modified according to the data of anyone of the other chapters, or according to evaluation changes preferred by the reader, to develop other conclusions.

The final subsections of the analysis division of each chapter were dedicated to analyzing the compositional structure of the texts and/or their literary subunits. The redaction studies treated the content or themes, to discover to what degree, if any, Ellen White's order and arrangement of the narrative, background description, devotional, or other commentary was influenced by the sources. We limited our analysis to those sources known to have been consulted by Ellen White as may be established by the literary parallels. We know that Samuel Andrews' Life of Christ was used for placing the chapters of the DA text in chronological order, and there is some evidence of his influence in the composition of chapter 75 as well.[1]

The redaction analysis is a rather straightforward study

---

[1]W. C. White in a letter to L. E. Froom (Jan. 8, 1928) reported that Ellen White "occasionally referred to Andrews, particularly with reference to chronology." [Cited by Arthur L. White in Ellen G. White, The Australian Years, op.cit., p. 379]. See also Introduction, Part B, pp. 157-159.

LITERARY DEPENDENCY OF CHAPTER 3

Evaluations/Values		No. of Sentences		Chapter Value
1. V1 - 7	X	0	=	0
2. V2 - 6	X	1	=	6
3. P1 - 5	X	0	=	0
4. P2 - 4	X	9	=	36
5. P3 - 3	X	20	=	60
6. B1 - 2	X	5	=	10
7. I2 - 1	X	24	=	24
8. I1 - 0	X	67	=	0
9. B2 - [Not figured]				
TOTALS		126		136

Chapter Average dependency for all sentences, Dependent/Independent

Total sentences divided by categories 1-8
136 / 126 = 1.079 or 1.08

Chapter Average for Dependent sentences only,

Total sentences divided by categories 1-7
136 / (126-67) or 136 / 59 = 2.3

of content and needs no further clarification here. Since content analysis was not the major thrust of this investigation no attempt was made to develop and apply a list of criteria for establishing redaction dependency or independency. There remain only the chapter summaries to cover and we shall have finished the introduction to the research procedures and the completed research report.

The Summary. We have already mentioned that in an attempt to maintain a high degree of consistency in our analysis of 15 chapters of different length and content we structured 14 questions to be addressed to each chapter. It was our hope that those questions would keep our focus sharp and serve as guideposts for the literary comparison. We never intended that our analysis would necessarily be limited to those questions only, but that they would be the minimum boundaries of our inquiry regardless of the chapter's content. The questions and their answers as provided by the 15 chapters of the DA text function as the basis for the summary and conclusions of the entire project.

The 14 questions are not repeated at the end of each chapter. Instead the summary statements appear in the form of conclusions. We are therefore presenting the questions in full here. The questions carry their same identifying number(s) throughout the chapter summaries and the final concluding summary. The reader can return to this

introduction at any time to review the statement of the questions, or compare the conclusions of the various chapters using the same identifying number of a particular question.

If a chapter does not treat the content of a given question, the corresponding answer number will appear in the summary with a brief comment to that effect. This way of organizing our summary statements should also assist the reader in following the development of the investigation and in checking the final summary statement against the evidence provided by the various chapters.

We conclude this Part A of the Introduction with the listing of the 14 summary questions. Each question is briefly elaborated by the addition of several related questions.

1. In what form are the textual materials for the study of the content of this chapter of the DA text? Do we have any primary texts, that is, handwritten texts by Ellen White, for this chapter? Are we dealing with a corrected typescript of the chapter? Does this chapter appear to have been written as an original composition, or to have been compiled and edited from earlier articles, diary items, letters, or manuscripts which formed the scrapbook collection of Ellen White's writings developed by Marian Davis, Ellen White's literary assistant? Do we have any "autographs" (texts in Ellen White's handscript) of these earlier materials?

2. If the DA text represents a reworking of earlier texts, what were those earlier materials? When were they written? Is the DA chapter an expansion of the earlier works of Ellen White?

3. Were there previous writings apparently not used for the composition of the DA text? What can be said about Ellen White's previous writings on the general topic being treated in DA? Had she written much and what was the general content? Was there much duplication in the published materials?

4. Does the content of the DA text represent any significant change from that of the earlier writings evidently used? Are there additions, deletions, differences which could be taken as contradictions, changes in emphases, et cetera?

5. How many sentences of the DA text indicate literary dependency? What percentage of the total number of sentences gives evidence of this dependency?

6. How many sentences of the DA text appear to be the independent literary work of Ellen White or her assistant? What percentage of the total composition can be said to be independent of literary dependency?

7. What is the nature of the literary dependency? Were there verbatim quotations, paraphrase, and so forth? And

given the scale of dependency what is the overall or average dependency rating?

8. Which authors and what literary works were used to a major degree in the writing of the DA text? What was the nature and scope of their use?

9. Which authors and what literary works were to some degree apparently used in the writing of the the DA text? How were these writers used?

10. What authors and works were used in the writing of the pre-DA text, and to what degree were they used?

11. If any of these writers used in the earlier work are also to be found behind the DA text, how does their use compare between the DA text and the earlier writings? While it must be recognized that the earlier texts have not been studied fully, do there appear to be some differences in the degree of dependency or the nature of the content of the dependent sentences from that found in the DA text?

12. What can be said about the content of the dependent sentences and that of the independent sentences in the DA text? Is there any general nature or character to the independent sentences which may be distinguished from the content of the literary-dependent sentences?

13. How does the compositional arrangement of the chapter in DA compare with the development and/or arrangement

of the subject matter in the source materials used? Does the editing (redaction) of the DA text show dependency upon the literary framework or structure to be found in the works which otherwise were used in the writing of the DA text? How does the development of the theme being treated in the DA text compare with the development of the same theme or content by writers evidently consulted by Ellen White?

14. While we are not able to cover the earlier writings of Ellen White in their entirety, even in respect to those which cover the content of the DA text under consideration, what can be said about the arrangement of their content as compared to that of the sources evidently used in their composition?