

**Edwin de Kock**

**The Ingredients, Scope,  
and Structure of  
*The Great Controversy*  
of Ellen G. White**

The magnum opus of Ellen G. White (1827–1915), as well as her favorite book, is a blend of theology, history, and prophecy. It has two authors, a particular American woman—highly intelligent, self-educated, ultimately a powerful intellectual—who lived in the nineteenth and the early twentieth century, as well as the Eternal One addressing all who inhabit this planet during the time of the end. It also has a particular scope and structure. Let us briefly consider the nature, interplay, and significance of these factors.

**1. Theology, History, and Prophecy.**

*The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan* is concerned with more than what is normally regarded as prophecy, although—especially in its final chapters—predicting the future is also prominent.

Its theology was not an invention of Ellen White or even her colleagues of the young Seventh-day Adventist Church, who worked on it during the nineteenth century. Garnered into this book is a rich harvest of what outstanding Christian thinkers have taught in ages past. In several ways, the author was an old-fashioned, unreconstructed Protestant, untouched by the ecumenical ideas—with their largely Catholic inspiration—that have become so prominent in our day.

From childhood, Ellen White absorbed the viewpoint of the sixteenth-century Reformation, together with its precursors and those who followed afterwards: the Waldenses, Wycliffe, Hus, Luther, and Wesley. All these were among her heroes. To reject her writings, including this book, is to a considerable extent to turn one's back on the Reformation.

*The Great Controversy* hews close to the Scriptures. Its purpose is not theological originality but doctrinal soundness. In this, it transmits a magnificent tradition handed down by thousands of those who, through many, many ages, have loved their Lord and often even died for Him. At the same time, the Holy Spirit superintended the way in which Mrs. White recorded those insights.

Although the historical element is based on what the Lord revealed to his servant in dreams and visions, much of it is not

directly inspired. She followed up on what was shown to her by reading a variety of historians, such as J. H. Merle d'Aubigné and J. A. Wylie, amongst others. Samuele

Bacchiocchi has suggested that there are historical inaccuracies in *The Great Controversy*, because its author allegedly used *Uriah Smith's Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation* and "followed his lead"—although he was "a very poor historian."<sup>1</sup>

For none of these allegations, has Bacchiocchi provided any supporting evidence. Let us rather, as a sample, look for ourselves at one of her chapters, "Luther's Separation From Rome." In these twenty-five pages, she cites at least the following five sources: J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, C. L. Gieseler, K. R. Hagenbach, [William Carlos] Martyn, and J. A. Wylie. No trace of Uriah Smith can be found.

Because Ellen White has made use of sources, she has often been criticized, especially by nitpickers who either fault the authors whose material she incorporated or accuse her of plagiarism. But if she had bypassed the historians, skeptics would have been even more scornful, rejecting her descriptions as figments of a fevered imagination.

This is a case of being damned if she did and damned if she did not.

## **2. The Different Faces of Inspiration.**

It is not easy to say just how inspiration functions, because it concerns the supernatural and the mysterious activities of the Holy Spirit. The best way to examine it is to observe it at work in producing the Scriptures. We find that it does not always operate in the same way.

Some of the most authoritative and valuable pieces in the Bible are not inspired at all. Most notable of these is the Decalogue, spoken directly to the entire Israelite nation and then personally written by God. The Ten Commandments are not a mediated document. They are the only part of the Bible written by God Himself. Much in the four Gospels is quoted from what Jesus said. In such cases, the Holy Spirit has directed the inclusion of such material in the Bible instead of dictating it.

Other contents are of purely human and sometimes diabolic origin. Quotations from wicked persons like Cain, Ahab, Caiaphas, and even Satan abound, as do statements, edicts, and letters from pagans such as that impudent Rabshakeh, who represented Sennacherib outside the walls of Jerusalem during the Assyrian siege when Hezekiah was king. Such, too, was the nasty decree by pagan Nebuchadnezzar against all who dared to speak anything

amiss about the God who had saved Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego from the fiery furnace (Daniel 3:29). But we also read the chapter-long testimony by the same, now humbled monarch after his seven years' insanity and conversion (Daniel 4). Vitally important was the decree of King Cyrus, whom the Lord had stirred up to order the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem. This document was transcribed into two parts of the Bible, namely 2 Chronicles 36:22, 23, and Ezra 1:1-4. That Ellen White in writing *The Great Controversy* would sometimes follow a similar procedure is not surprising.

Inspiration always operates to communicate truth, but prophecy is not its only mode.

Sometimes the person whom the Lord or His angel addresses hears an actual voice, as in the dramatic story of the child Samuel (1 Samuel 3:2-15). This is not just a general impression or a mere conviction, like that of preachers during sermon preparation.

A human being can have a divinely inspired dream or a vision, in which God or angels speak. The person who has such an experience can then recount it with the addition of the words, "thus saith the Lord." Objects or actions are actually seen and then described in words of the speaker's or writer's choice. Ellen White eventually claimed to have had about 2,000 prophetic dreams or visions.<sup>2</sup> If so, what she wrote should be taken very seriously. If not, she was a dreadful liar.

In passing, we note that dreams and visions are not confined to full-time, professional prophets. For instance, Joseph, Jesus' foster father, had five inspired dreams instructing him to marry Mary, flee to Egypt with the infant Saviour, and later to return and live in Nazareth. Similarly, the Adventist evangelist Joseph Bates and Annie Smith in the same night had nearly identical dreams, which led to her conversion. This was undoubtedly the Spirit of Prophecy at work, yet none of these people was a prophet.

The way in which the historical portions of the Bible were produced is especially instructive for understanding the same element in *The Great Controversy*. In such cases, the Holy Spirit apparently did not resort to visions, nor did He dictate what words were to be used. Instead, He ensured that His chosen instruments' writing would be accurate, based on eyewitness accounts or historical records. A typical refrain in the book of Kings is the following: "Now the rest of the acts of Jehu, and all that he did, and all his might, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel?" (2 Kings 10:34).

However, the Scriptures only occasionally mention such sources.

Usually when an author takes material from one part of the Bible and reuses it in another, he does not tell us that he is doing so. This brings us to the carping of critics against Ellen White for sometimes following the same procedure, in the belief that it somehow discredits her work.

For example, Isaiah 2 is practically identical with Micah 4, which could make us wonder why a prophet would quote another prophet's prediction, without giving his source, as though it were his own. In the four Gospels, especially the first three, reusing somebody else's words without attribution is a widespread phenomenon. Matthew swallowed and reproduced entire sections of Mark, often more or less verbatim, without ever alerting his readers to the fact. Only Luke, a more learned man, acknowledged that his work was based on research (Luke 1:1-4). Much of Revelation, about a third, consists of quotations or allusions—again mostly without mentioning the sources.

In secular circles, too, this neglect of attribution has through the ages been a common literary technique, for instance of the Greek dramatists, who used and reused the same stories, characters, and themes. Later writers like Virgil, Dante, James Joyce, and T. S. Eliot also did so. Frequently they incorporated into and enriched their masterpieces with bits and pieces, semi-quotations, references, and paradigmatic elements from eminent predecessors. As is well known, Shakespeare almost never invented a plot of his own. He brilliantly revamped the works of others, whom posterity has forgotten. His remarkable contemporary, Francis Bacon, is another case in point. This is how Catherine Drinker Bowen explained a method that he, and others like him, followed:

“It was a custom of the day for readers to copy out, in their commonplace books, whatever pleased them in other men's works. Often enough these diligent copyists neglected to cite the author's name and ended by simply appropriating what they found. One cannot look on it as plagiarism with Bacon, because somehow he transformed the material; he called this the hatching out of other men's creations.”<sup>3</sup>

Those who object to this method of writing on anachronistic grounds that such writers were ignoring copyright (a recent invention) or plagiarized in a disreputable way are simply manifesting an ignorant, curmudgeonly attitude.

All the same, this type of thing does raise questions about inspired writers. What, for instance, should we think of Luke's acknowledgement that he wrote as a result of diligent research? Surely, the Holy Spirit could just have dictated to him the entire Gospel that bears Luke's name.

It seems that when dealing with history, even if inspired writers do supernaturally see some events, they are also required to fill in the details through ordinary human methods, like background reading and research. Here and there, the resultant text may include some minor discrepancies, apparent or even real. The following is a well-known case. In Mark 5:1-19, we read about Jesus meeting a man possessed by many demons, whom He drove out but allowed to enter and drown an entire herd of swine. Matthew 8:28-34, however, in describing the same occasion, informs us that there were actually two demoniacs.

Now this is exactly the kind of thing that happens when two or more witnesses give testimony in a court case. If their versions did not to some extent differ from each other, the judge would immediately suspect collusion. Therefore, such minor variants in the Gospel accounts—and there are many of them—are not a weakness. They are evidence of authenticity. If the story of Jesus were a fiction, those who concocted it would have been very careful to avoid the smallest possible discrepancy.

Here is another example. When Jesus was crucified, Pilate wrote out a superscription that was nailed above the Saviour's head. We read about it in all four Gospels. But in each case the wording is a little different, even though they are in substantial agreement.

Only those who believe in verbal inspiration would be stumped to explain such divergences adequately. We only need to remember that though the Scriptures are the Word of God, they were authored by human beings, each with a different perspective. Ellen White explains this well:

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

“It is not the words of the Bible that are inspired, but the men that were inspired. Inspiration acts not on the man's words or his expressions but on the man himself, who, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, is imbued with thoughts. But the words receive the impress of the individual mind. The divine mind is diffused. The divine mind and will is combined with the human mind and will; thus the utterances of the man are the Word of God.”<sup>4</sup>

If this applies to the Scriptures, should we be surprised or distressed to find that Ellen White for a new edition of *The Great Controversy* revised the text and in some instances worded it differently?

One critic born and raised overseas has pointed out that where in an older version she had written, "The 1260 years of papal supremacy began with the establishment of the papacy in A.D. 538, and would therefore terminate in 1798," she changed this for the 1911 edition to read: "The 1260 years of papal supremacy began in A.D. 538, and would terminate in 1798." He thought this was because it had been brought to her attention that the papacy had actually originated a few centuries earlier. He is, however, mistaken due to his insufficient grasp of the English language.

The word "establishment," in the older edition was a technical term, which many American readers of the eighteenth century and some of nineteenth would have grasped. It also occurs in the Constitution of the United States: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." But by the twentieth century more and more people began to argue about that word. In the First Amendment, it was not meant to be a synonym for "establishing." Instead, the establishment of religion refers to adopting a particular denomination as a state church. And that is what the Byzantine emperor, Justinian I, did: He appointed the pope in Rome as the head of the Mediterranean Church.

About this point, the different editions really agree, but Ellen White had a passion for clarity and wanted to avoid misunderstanding, so she updated her book for a new generation of readers.

Those who created text that became part of the Bible apparently never wrote while they were dreaming or in vision. They did so afterwards. Sometimes there may not even have been any such supernatural manifestations. For instance, we have no evidence that Luke produced his Gospel as a result of dreams or visions. The contrary seems to have been the case, but he was aided in his work by the Holy Spirit.

Early in her public ministry, Ellen White explained that the words she chose were her own, and yet when writing them she was just as dependent on guidance from the Holy Spirit as when she had the dreams or visions. She was also careful to enclose any words spoken to her by an angel "in marks of quotation."<sup>5</sup> A prophetic writer should strive to be as accurate, as true to what was shown, as possible. On the other hand, the same thing can linguistically be expressed in many ways. For instance, "The Lord showed me . . ." or "It was revealed to me by the Lord . . ." or "I saw that . . ."

The writer may use prose or verse. Some ancients who wrote the Bible, like Isaiah and Jeremiah, preferred poetic form, which

involved an intricate arsenal of skills: prosody, figures of speech, and so on, as in Lamentations. Nevertheless in all this, he or she must never deviate from truth.

For instance, Daniel had a vision and needed to describe the third beast in it. He used his own language, but however he put it he had to bring out that it was a leopard with four wings and four heads. He could say, "I saw a leopard with four wings and four heads," or "before me there appeared a four-winged leopard, which also had four heads." Semantically these are acceptable equivalents. He could not, however, report without lying: "I saw a leopard with four wings and five heads." Therefore, to maintain that prophets are not verbally inspired does not suggest that they are not confined within certain limits. The basic question is: Did the Most High, an angel, or the Holy Spirit really speak or show something to the person concerned?

### **3. Ellen White's So-called Copyright Infringement and Derivative Material.**

Within the scope of the present article, it is impossible to deal fully with this issue. Let us just note that some who jump so blithely into the arena to argue about Ellen White's dependency on other writers are recycling old statements (often inaccurate), rumors, gossip, and even downright lies. Some twentieth-century critics have fallen prey to the most notorious of these. Just a few years ago, a correspondent of mine—a retired, prominent minister—told me: "The book *In the Steps of St. Paul* had to be withdrawn because the publishers of a similar book threatened to sue for copyright infringement. . . . Unfortunately, now that the copyright has expired, the book has been produced by photocopying the book and hundreds of readers will regard it as verbally inspired."

Such allegations are blatantly untrue and were brilliantly refuted by Francis D. Nichol half a century ago in his *Ellen G. White and Her Critics* (1951). Here is part of what he said about *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul* by Conybeare and Howson, from which Ellen White supposedly quoted so copiously, infringing copyright:

"There were no copyright relations between the United States and Great Britain until the issuance of the Presidential proclamation on July 1, 1891, which proclamation extended copyright protection to the works of British authors upon compliance with the provisions of the United States copyright law. (The Conybeare and Howson book was first published in England in 1851-52.) British authors residing in England whose books were published prior to that date could not secure any copyright protection in the United States, hence their

works were in the public domain as far as United States publishers were concerned.”<sup>6</sup>

Consequently, there never was a genuine threat to sue for copyright infringement. Nichol tells how C. D. Holmes, employed by the Review and Herald Publishing Association, established this fact. On 15 January 1924, he wrote as follows to the T. Y. Crowell Company of New York City, which had in the meantime reissued the Conybeare and Howson book in the United States:

“Some years ago you published a book entitled ‘Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul.’ In 1883 a book was printed by the Review and Herald Publishing Co., of Battle Creek, Mich., entitled ‘Sketches from [*sic*] the Life of Paul.’ For a long time it has been claimed that because of a similarity of ideas and words in several instances in this book, you at one time threatened prosecution unless the book was withdrawn from circulation.

“This report is now being scattered about in printed form and I should be pleased to know if there is any truth in it. Any information that you can give me regarding this matter will be greatly appreciated.”<sup>7</sup>

On 18 January 1925, the Crowell Company replied: “Your letter of Jan. 15th received. We publish Conybeare’s LIFE AND EPISTLES OF THE APOSTLE PAUL but this is not a copyrighted book and we would have no legal grounds for action against your book and we do not think that we have ever raised any objection or made any claim such as you speak of.” Nichol photographically reproduced this letter on p. 456 of his book and also quoted it on the adjoining page.<sup>8</sup>

But what about the charge that as a result of this “scandal” our church withdrew the book from further publication? It is unnecessary to weary the reader with the details, which all appear in Nichol. I simply state what happened back in the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. Our denomination continued selling both *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* by Conybeare and Howson (as it had been doing all along) and *Sketches From the Life of Paul* by Ellen White.

When the stocks of the latter book were exhausted, it was not reprinted. Why? Because for the new edition Mrs. White first wanted to expand the contents, especially by including material on the ministry of the other apostles. She had already been planning such changes in 1903, but other work prevented an early completion of this project. Finally her revised version came out in 1911 under its new title, *The Acts of the Apostles*.

And how much of *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* did Ellen White actually incorporate into her own book? “Direct quotations of words,



phrases, and clauses, plus any accompanying close paraphrase, constitute about 7 per cent of *Sketches From the Life of Paul*.”<sup>9</sup>

Space will not here permit a detailed analysis of derivative material in *The Great Controversy*. Let us, however, ask about just two of Ellen White’s historical sources, both of them originally published in England, which lie before me as I write: J. H. Merle d’Aubigné’s *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (1846) and James A. Wylie’s *The History of Protestantism* (1878). American copyright, of course, did not apply to either British book, since both appeared before 1891, as did the original printing of *The Great Controversy* (1888).

And did she quote immensely from these works? A little math will show that it cannot have been all that much. My copy of *The Great Controversy* has 694 pages (main text), of which less than half describes the early Church, the Dark Ages, the Reformation, and its European or British aftermath. The focus of the rest is largely on America, doctrinal matters, and prophecies about the future. But d’Aubigné’s work consists of 867 and Wylie’s of 2,112 pages, neither of them concerned with the United States.

Obviously the 210 pages that she devotes to the Reformation in Continental Europe and England could hardly have engorged and ingested the massive quantity of material that they presented. Besides, her sources were by no means confined to d’Aubigné and Wylie.

She was extremely selective in what she used.

#### **4. Adaptive, Apt to Learn, an Excellent Mind.**

The year 1798, concluding the 1260 prophetic year-days, began an unprecedented period in our planet’s history: the time of the end. Throughout the nineteenth century and down to the present, this has brought a veritable avalanche of ever-accelerating, sometimes mind-boggling changes. With this, too, came new approaches to scholarship and research.

Side by side with these developments, a keener sense of intellectual property has developed. Authors understandably feel entitled to payment for the fruit of their labors, and publishing houses want to make as much money as possible. Right now, however, this is becoming a formidable barrier to the easy, electronic dissemination of knowledge that recent technology has made possible. We may well be on the verge of another swing in the pendulum between copyright extremism and the unfettered freedom with which a writer like Ellen White began her career.

At first, late in the nineteenth century, she still seems to have been unaware of the need to indicate her sources, but as soon this was pointed out to her, she did so—as in the present Introduction to *The Great Controversy*—and explained: “The great events which have marked the progress of reform in past ages, are matters of history, well known and universally acknowledged by the Protestant world; they are facts which none can gainsay.”

This history, as she pointed out, she has condensed, in accordance with the scope and purpose of her book; for after all she was dealing with more than past events. “In some cases where a historian has so grouped together events as to afford, in brief, a comprehensive view of the subject, or has summarized details in a convenient manner, his words have been quoted.”

She was also frank, not secretive, about passages that lack quotation marks or attribution: “In some instances no specific credit has been given, since the quotations are not given for the purpose of citing that writer as authority, but because his statement affords a ready and forcible presentation of the subject.”<sup>10</sup>

It is the latter procedure that has caused some people, used to our day’s copyright rules and lawsuits, to raise their eyebrows. Such a reaction just displays their ignorance about how the authors of the past believed they could freely use what their predecessors had created.

At any rate, she was adaptive and apt to learn, which is surely a highly commendable trait in everybody, including a servant of the Lord.

To the foregoing paragraphs, something else can be added: a misguided though sometimes well-intended emphasis on the fact that Ellen White, due to an accident, left school at the age of nine.<sup>11</sup> For this reason, she was supposedly uneducated, remaining a third-grader all her life.

How silly! The history of literature demonstrates abundantly that neither the ability to write, nor intellect, is determined by class attendance. Mark Twain (1835–1910) left school at the age of twelve.<sup>12</sup> The formal education of Charles Dickens (1812–1870) was “interrupted and unimpressive”; it ended when he was fifteen.<sup>13</sup> George Bernard Shaw (1856–1950) started with some private tutoring, but “basically rejected the schools he then attended and by age 16 he was working in a land agent’s office.”<sup>14</sup> Even William Shakespeare, whom many professors and other enthusiasts in both Britain and America regard as the world’s greatest writer, never attended a university.<sup>15</sup> We cannot even be sure that he finished high school; it is a matter of conjecture.

How could these geniuses, despite such handicaps, have fared so well—and laid the groundwork for countless lesser figures to obtain their PhDs and launch their university careers? The main answer is twofold: innate ability and self-study. For instance, Shaw deliberately educated himself in the reading room of the British Museum and by attending lectures as well as debates.<sup>16</sup> Ellen White built up and diligently used “a personal library containing nearly 2,000 books.”<sup>17</sup> To say “Her education ended with a brief period at the Westbrook Seminary and Female College of Portland, Maine, in 1839”<sup>18</sup> is quite misleading.

She was, as stated at the outset, highly intelligent, self-educated, ultimately a powerful intellectual. It may be objected that she nevertheless continued to bear some scars from her limited schooling because she used literary assistants—what we today would call editors—to help her with spelling and other matters. That, however, is common among writers, irrespective of their academic background. Many of them are indifferent spellers and especially poor at punctuation. Nowadays the larger, reputable publishing firms employ a whole tribe of editors, each with a specialized function.

The fact that Ellen White resorted to literary assistants proves her eminent good sense, as does her reuse of older material in her files, when she was producing a book. What is especially amazing is that with her busy schedule as a letter-writer, counselor, and itinerant preacher, she was still able to finish such a plethora of publications. She is said to have been perhaps the most prolific female writer who ever lived.

Only people with narrow mental horizons in both her time and ours can fault her procedures. Unfortunately they included men like A. G. Daniells (1858–1935), whom critics delight to quote, because he knew Ellen White and her husband, being their secretary for almost a year—and because he eventually became a General Conference President. However, his education at Battle Creek College in 1875 lasted for only one year,<sup>19</sup> nor did he grow intellectually as she did. Ellen White was a genius. Daniells was not.

## **5. Scope and structure of *The Great Controversy*.**

This work goes well beyond human history. As its full title suggests, it is ultimately about Lucifer’s fall and a cosmic war, conducted mostly here on planet Earth, between himself and the Creator-Redeemer. Apart from the first advent and what it accomplished, the brunt of this conflict has been borne by Christ’s faithful followers through the ages.

*The Great Controversy* especially deals with the Protestant Reformation and its aftermath.

Ninety percent of its pages and all its forty-two chapters, apart from the first four, cover the period that begins with John Wycliffe (c. 1320-1384) and ends with Paradise regained. That is less than seven of the twenty centuries that constitute our era. Furthermore, although the book makes use of history, it is even more concerned with contemporary events and the future. In a sense, it is also a rather American book, to judge from the fact that 60 percent of its contents—from chapter 16 onward—largely have a New World setting, historically this comprises fewer than four hundred years. Yet this country is vitally important, in accordance with the interpretation of the second Beast of Revelation 13.

These facts harmonize with Ellen White's own statement in her Introduction: "It is not so much the object of this book to present new truths concerning the struggles of former times, as to bring out facts and principles which have a bearing on coming events."

*The Great Controversy* largely omits the history of the early church. A single chapter, "An Era of Spiritual Darkness (The Apostasy)," in twelve pages touches on a detail here and there about the first three hundred years, as well as the fourth, the sixth, the eighth, the eleventh, and the thirteenth centuries. Occasionally the author highlights a name: Constantine, Gregory VII, Henry IV. Other important figures like Justinian are omitted, as is data about the ten Germanic peoples. In this section, we have thematic writing, not a history of events set out in fine chronological sequence.

All this has certain implications. One is that for other researchers, living in our time, a huge terrain and a vast expanse of time remain to be investigated and described, as I have attempted to do in my *Christ and Antichrist in Prophecy and History* (2001) and *The Truth About 666*.

## **Conclusion**

*The Great Controversy* is the greatest Seventh-day Adventist book that anyone has ever written. Weaving together cosmic, religious, historical, and predictive elements with an often magnificent style, it has survived for more than a century. Distributed all over the world and translated into scores of languages, it has maintained its relevance. It is a book about yesterday, today, and forever.

## Notes

1. Samuele Bacchiocchi, "The Credibility of Ellen White," *Endtime Issues Newsletter* No. 151, 11 July 2006.
2. EB 06. s.v. "White, Ellen Gould Harmon."
3. Catherine Drinker Bowen, *Francis Bacon: The Temper of a Man* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963), p. 83.
4. Ellen G. White, Manuscript 24, 1886 (written in Europe in 1886), *Selected Messages*, Bk. 1, p. 21.
5. White, *Review and Herald*, Oct. 8, 1867, p. 260, quoted in Francis D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, p. 461 (see full reference in endnote 6).
6. Francis D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics: An Answer to the Major Charges that Critics Have Brought Against Mrs. Ellen G. White* (Takoma Park, Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1951), p. 454.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 455. 8. *Ibid.*, pp. 456, 457. 9. *Ibid.*, p. 424.
10. Introduction, GC, pp. xi, xii.
11. EB 06. s.v. "White, Ellen Gould Harmon."
12. Dust jacket, *Mark Twain: Short Stories and Tall Tales* (Philadelphia: Courage Books, an Imprint of Running Press, 1993).
13. EB 06, s.v. "Dickens, Charles."
14. *Ibid.*, s.v. "Shaw, George Bernard."
15. *Ibid.*, s.v. "Shakespeare, William."
16. *Ibid.*, s.v. "Shaw, George Bernard."
17. "1919 Bible Conference Minutes Concerning Ellen G. White—Introduction," [www.christiancommunitychurch.us](http://www.christiancommunitychurch.us) (downloaded July 25, 2006).
18. EB 06, s.v. "White, Ellen Gould Harmon."
19. SDAE, s.v. "Daniells, Arthur Grosvenor."