in direct communication” with the texts under study (16). His approach is to examine issues of the poor and poverty in the canonical, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphal texts, as well as Rabbinic tradition and Catholic and Protestant documents. Hoppe then proceeds to reference every text in the sacred writings in which a word having “the poor” in its semantic field occurs. However, he goes beyond the classic word-study approach. He is appreciative of the larger social issues that cause poverty and thus is able to recognize the biblical writers’ concerns regarding the problem, even if they did not use the words “poor” or “poverty.”

This study examines the issues and texts in their historical, political, and economic settings. It takes cognizance of socioeconomic realities and does not simply treat “the poor” and “poverty” as literary spiritual symbols, detached from the physical and literal social circumstances of the times. Thus, in contrast to Albert Gelin’s classic The Poor of Yahweh, Hoppe argues that “the poor” and “poverty” in the Bible are not religious metaphors for “poverty in spirit.” The biblical tradition sees poverty as a social and economic problem that the community of faith can ignore to their own destruction.

There Shall Be No Poor Among You is an excellent introductory survey on poverty and the poor in biblical times. It adequately and concisely summarizes the social situation and carefully addresses all the issues surrounding both the problematic and straightforward texts regarding the poor. The book is ideal as an introductory text or supplementary reading material for a university or seminary class. It is not burdened with footnotes, yet the minimal well-chosen endnotes give credence to the work. However, the more serious researcher of the sociological/political/economic backgrounds will find the book less helpful. But this is not the main purpose of the work. It is the biblical text that drives its ultimate purpose. Hoppe wishes the reader to hear the text and the text alone.

This work is not only valuable as an academic text, but it can also serve as an excellent study guide for the local church or for small-group discussions. Of special benefit in this regard is the list of questions for reflection that concludes each chapter. In addition, Hoppe occasionally relates the biblical material to contemporary events. For example, the pre-Exodus servitude of the Hebrews is equated with Jim Crow laws of the South, antiunion practices of the industrial North, and the oppression of the indigenous population of Chiapas, Mexico, by the government.

Although my commendation of this book is overwhelming, I find its treatment of the NT material quite inadequate. I can only hope that a second edition will give more space to this area.

Walla Walla College

College Place, Washington

PEDRITO U. MAYNARD-REID


The Handbook of Patristic Exegesis is a unique and indispensable reference work on biblical interpretation in early Christianity. This is a monumental, 1,500-page guide both to patristic scriptural exegesis, and to the burgeoning international literature in this field. C. Kannengiesser is the primary author of these two volumes, though more than a dozen collaborators lend their expertise on a variety of topics.

The Handbook divides into two parts. The first (“General Considerations”) contains four long essays. Kannengiesser opens with a helpful orientation to the literature and
research. He provides annotated lists of collections of texts and translations, leading reference works, journals, and a variety of bibliographic tools. This chapter is quite comprehensive, though the important computer database of Greek literature, the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, should also have been mentioned, as it is an invaluable tool for word searches. Most of the author’s comments in this section are colored by helpful assessments of the trends in the research from 1945 to 1995, though a few remarks are unexpectedly cantankerous—one might contest the claim that a leading journal of early Christianity is driven by a “strictly secular agenda” (69).

The contributors to this volume make their first appearance in the next essay, entitled “Judaism and Rhetorical Culture: Two Foundational Contexts for Patristic Exegesis.” The overview of Rabbinic literature is learned, though oddly distant from the concern of the Handbook. Little effort is made to relate Rabbinic exegesis to the Christian exegesis with which it was, if not in dialogue, then certainly in contact. C. Schäublin’s overview of Graeco-Roman rhetoric offers a discussion more relevant to this Handbook. He outlines the basics of late antique rhetorical education and its relationship to literary analysis, or philology; yet even here the relevance could have been greater—readers would have benefitted from a targeted discussion of philology in late antiquity, as this (and not rhetoric) was the most immediate and foundational context for early Christian biblical exegesis. By far the most comprehensive documentation of the presence of Graeco-Roman philological procedures in early Christian biblical exegesis can be found in Schäublin’s landmark study, *Unterdungen Method und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese* (1974) and in his pupil, B. Neuschäfer’s work, *Origenes als Philologe* (1987).

The third essay offers a lengthy examination of the terms, distinctions, and nuances pertaining to the literal and spiritual senses of Scripture. Kannengiesser reminds us that the literal sense of Scripture was no less a result of divine authorship than its spiritual sense (168). While he introduces several valuable distinctions in this essay, the only disappointment is the reemergence of the typology/allegory distinction (161 and 228ff.). This distinction has little traction in early Christian literature. Invariably, modern patristic scholarship has meant by “typology” an acceptable form of nonliteral exegesis, to be demarcated clearly from its unacceptable nonliteral twin, “allegory.” While the fathers were also concerned with the criteria that distinguished successful from unsuccessful nonliteral exegesis, they did not label these two ways of reading “typology” and “allegory” respectively. “Allegory” was invariably not the pejorative term in early Christian literature that it has come to be in the modern world. As for “typology,” the Latin noun *typologia* is only the product of the nineteenth century’s imagination, and its Greek variant is even more recent; “typology” is applied anachronistically to patristic scriptural exegesis. The allegory/typology distinction is, then, quite misleading, and it is somewhat disappointing that it is endorsed in a reference work of this magnitude and importance.

The first part of the Handbook concludes with an essay authored by D. L. Balás and D. J. Bingham. It is particularly useful since it offers bibliographies of patristic homilies and commentaries keyed to the individual books of the Bible. A quick consultation of this essay will provide an extensive list of exegetical literature on any given book.

The second part of this guide (“Historical Survey”) offers an overview with admirable, and indeed, astonishing breadth. It ranges from the second century through the eighth century and surveys Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Coptic, and Ethiopian literatures. In this part, the bulk of the Handbook, individual authors are discussed within the framework of larger chapters (e.g., “Third-Century Greek Christian
Literature”). The basic pattern for each entry is a discussion of the author’s exegetical activity, followed by bibliographies of editions, translations, and studies. Entries on interpreters range in length from half a page to several that vary between thirty and forty pages in length (e.g., Origen of Alexandria, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret). The longest, on Augustine, amounts to nearly 90 pages. While there will, no doubt, be quibbles about how the entries were weighted (e.g., should John Chrysostom have received only four pages of discussion?), the real value for the scholar lies in the consolidation of bibliographic data for any given exegete.

While Kannengiesser has labored to include even some of the most marginal scriptural interpreters in his volume, two striking omissions ought to be indicated. Eucherius of Lyon, who flourished in the first part of the fifth century, wrote an important treatise on spiritual exegesis, entitled Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae; Junilius Africanus, a sixth-century North African, authored the Institutio Regularia Divinarum Legis, a version of the Regula of a Syriac exegete, a certain Paul of Nisibis. These works are important in their own right and take their place alongside the other introductory works on the interpretation of Scripture in the early church: Tyconius’s Rules, Augustine’s On Christian Teaching, and Hadrian’s Introduction to the Holy Scriptures (cf. Cassiodorus’s grouping of these works together at Institutions 1.10).

With this Handbook, Kannengiesser has rendered an immense service to scholars of early Christianity. It would be churlish to slap the ambitious reach of these tomes, since they have no peer in the field. These are accessible volumes, more comprehensive than anything available to date, and rich in bibliographic detail. All students of biblical exegesis in the early church will consult these volumes with much profit.

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana

PETER MARTENS


The cover of George R. Knight’s new work on Joseph Bates, his life and contributions to Seventh-day Adventism, seizes one’s attention on two counts. First, there is the familiar portrait of the unsmiling, former sea captain, with his arresting eyes focused on some distant horizon. Most startling, however, is the subtitle, suggesting nothing less than a revolution in Adventist history. Its thesis is carefully elaborated in the Preface by a series of specific assertions:

The current volume argues that the real founder of the denomination was Joseph Bates. After all, it was Bates who in the 1840s developed the Sabbatarian Adventism that James White built upon in the 1850s and early 1860s to form the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. Without Bates’ accomplishments White would have had no platform to construct the Seventh-day Adventist Church upon.

That, alone, would have been a forceful enough statement of Knight’s thesis; but he goes on:

It was Bates who was Adventism’s first theologian and first historian. . . . [He] developed what we today think of as great controversy theology. Bates was also Sabbatarian Adventism’s first mission theorist and first missionary. . . . Also Bates would be the denomination’s first health reformer.

Each of these critically important points is nicely developed, adequately