

my computer. As for the other features, both *BibleWorks* and *Accordance* (from Oak Tree Software) allow users to create concordances, but *Logos* does not. Also, whereas all Bible programs sell text databases entered by someone else, *BibleWorks* is probably the best program for those who wish to enter their own texts—a task that is not necessarily easy, but easier in *BibleWorks* than in most other programs. This feature was originally designed to help missionaries, but is also useful to scholars. Although anyone with some background knowledge can study and learn from the research that others have done, real cutting-edge research often involves doing something that others have not yet done, and the latter may require creating one's own database and concordance. Therefore, *BibleWorks* allows the most flexibility for the user to adapt it for his or her own research projects. (Another program that allows the creation and concordance of texts is *Bibloi*, formerly *Bible Windows*, by Silver Mountain Software, which has the advantage of being able to handle Unicode databases. Since it can read Libronix databases, it is a good alternative as an add-on for those who currently use *Logos*, but are unhappy about its limitations. Silver Mountain Software also offers *Workplace Pack* for use with the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and *Packard Humanities Institute* CD-ROMs.)

I should also point out some areas where other programs do better. First, to my knowledge, *Accordance* is the only Bible software that works on both Macintosh and Windows platforms. Also, *Gramcord-Lite* is the only software package that includes the same morphologically analyzed Bible texts in the original languages for handheld computers that run Palm or one of the stripped-down versions of Windows. In addition, although *BibleWorks* offers some add-on modules, a number of databases are not (yet) available, such as the morphologically tagged Mishna and Hebrew Inscriptions, both available in *Accordance*, or biblical texts analyzed for syntax, available in *Logos*. Nor does it offer the extensive commentary sets and other libraries that *Logos* offers. The latter program is best suited for those wishing to quickly consult a vast array of secondary literature in digital format. But *BibleWorks* is still a good choice for those using computers with Windows and wishing to focus on cutting-edge research on the primary sources in Greek, Hebrew, and some dialects of Aramaic.

All in all, *BibleWorks 7* is an excellent program. It is well designed, and meets the company's stated goal of providing tools for biblical research for pastors, scholars, students, and missionaries. One might quibble over whether the price of version 7 meets the other company goal of being affordable to "poor pastors and students." However, it is competitively priced in comparison with other Bible software programs, and it is definitely worth what is included in the basic package. I would strongly encourage those who own an earlier version to upgrade. For those who own a different Bible software program, the decision of whether or not to switch depends on what type of research one does, i.e., whether the current program is adequate for one's needs. Anyone looking for a Bible program that handles the original languages will be more than well served by *BibleWorks*.

Oakwood College
Huntsville, Alabama

TARSEE LI

Brand, Leonard, and Don S. McMahon. *The Prophet and Her Critics*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press, 2005. 128 pp. Paper, \$11.99.

As its name suggests, this volume is another in that series of independent monographs by Seventh-day Adventist authors interested in clarifying the legacy of Ellen G. White. Disparate and memorable contributions to that series include Walter Rea's *The White Lie* (Turlock, CA: M & R Publishing, 1982); and Ronald Numbers's *Prophets of Health: A Study of Ellen G. White* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976). The present volume gives ample attention to the contributions and perspectives of these two writers, as well as to that of Jonathan Butler and his article "The World of E. G. White and the End of the World," which appeared in 1979 in *Spectrum* (10/2: 2:13). The book's major question may be put as follows: Does the data available discredit White's claims to be a specially supernaturally inspired prophetess/messenger of God?

Principal author Brand is a long-time researcher and professor of biology and

paleontology at Loma Linda University, California. McMahon, a surgeon and academic from Avondale, New South Wales, Australia, contributes considerable research in chapter 5, comparing White's health principles with those articulated by her ostensible human sources, as well with modern medical principles. A full report of that research is available in McMahon's own publication *Acquired or Inspired? Exploring the Origins of the Adventist Lifestyle* (Pacific Press, 2005).

The Prophet and Her Critics is most noteworthy for two features: the aforementioned research by McMahon, and the fact that fully 25 percent of its oddly balanced makeup (91-123) is dedicated to an appendix that reproduces material from two much older volumes (White's *Prophets and Kings*, and several pages from Daniel March's *Night Scenes in the Bible*). Underlined material throughout the appendix indicates words and sentences White borrows from March when composing her own work. In 1992, Rea's *The White Lie* set forward this evidence of borrowing as disconfirmation of White's claim to be a true prophetess. Brand's appendix is not a repetition of Rea's work as much as it is an answer to it. Brand publishes the borrowed lines in context of both White's and March's original usage, something Rea did not do. By reprinting White's entire chapters, inclusive of underlined borrowing, along with March's original material, Brand allows the reader to personally evaluate the nature and extent of White's borrowing. In comparing the writers, I elected to do some counting of my own: I found that the total number of lines of printed text in White's chapter 1, as it appears in Brand and McMahon's book, is 269. Twenty-nine of those lines had some kind of underlining. This datum says nothing about the relatedness of ideas or similarities of treatment, but illustrates how persuasive a testimony one can make by proving that dozens of lines or portions thereof have been borrowed by one author from another. Fred Veltman's more scholarly and objective analysis of White's use of sources is offered for comparison with Rea's work ("*The Desire of Ages* Project, Parts 1 and 2, *Ministry*, October and December 1990).

In regard to the book's main question, McMahon's findings are impressive. He shows that White, judged by the latest standards of medical science, is seen to be significantly more correct in her ideas than all the health reformers of her time, including the famous John Harvey Kellogg. Often, White does not know why her instruction is correct. Indeed, her explanations as to "why" things should be done are consistently less reliable than "what" should be done. McMahon's study of White's *Spiritual Gifts* disclosed forty-six "what" statements, of which forty-four (96 percent) have been verified by modern medical science, with 70 percent being significant principles. Compared with the other reformers whose books were in her library, the authority of White's *Spiritual Gifts* and *Ministry of Healing* is unmistakable. For White's *Ministry of Healing*, the volume of confirmed and significant medical principles is 56 percent compared to Sylvester Graham, 22 percent; James Caleb Jackson, 26 percent; Larkin Coles, 23.3 percent; and William Alcott, 15 percent. In McMahon's estimation, White is more accurate about her "whats" than her "whys" because she was much more dependent on her own resources for making sense of her divine revelations. McMahon's point is well taken. "It is evident," he summarizes, "that God has communicated the truths we need. It also is evident that the explanations He didn't communicate—which, in fact, He couldn't realistically communicate at that time—wouldn't affect our health anyway" (74).

The true wonder is not, in the end, how scholars arrive at such radically contrasting conclusions about White's work. Numbers's preface to his *Prophetess of Health* explains his approach: "I have tried to be as objective as possible. Thus, I have refrained from using divine inspiration as an historical explanation" (cited in McMahon and Brand, 44). Numbers's conclusions are the predictable and reasonable results of being "as objective as possible." And conclusions of such a nature are not unique to White studies; they also regularly appear in relation to biblical study. The true wonder is that believers should express perplexity when rigorously nonsupernaturalist analyses produce reasonably nonsupernaturalistic explanations. This is no mystery. Rather, it is entirely understandable, even though, as Brand and McMahon remark, it is the result of inadequate research design and faulty logic (87).