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 \textit{Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae}; Junilius Africanus, a sixth-century North African, authored the \textit{Instituta Regularia Divinæ Legis}, a version of the \textit{Regula} of a Syrian 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 \textit{Rules}, Augustine’s \textit{On Christian Teaching}, and Hadrian’s \textit{Introduction to the Holy Scriptures} (cf. Cassiodorus’s grouping of these works together at \textit{Institutions} I.10).

With this \textit{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.
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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
documented, and convincingly argued in language entirely accessible to the average reader. The essential scholarly apparatus is present in reasonable detail: footnotes, evaluation of sources, and an adequate index.

In the final pages ("And What About His Accomplishments?"), Knight firmly reiterates his conclusions: "The short answer to the question of Bates' accomplishments and contributions is the fact of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. That is, without Bates there would be no Seventh-day Adventist Church." Then he restates his startling thesis: "It is therefore safe to say that the real founder of Seventh-day Adventism was Joseph Bates" (210). Then, this thorough author lists the six distinct contributions of Captain/Elder Joseph Bates to the Seventh-day Adventist Church, so that even the most unsophisticated reader will have no excuse for ignorance: our first theologian, first historian, first mission theorist, first missionary, first health reformer, and, lastly in this stunning list, first senior statesman (210-212).

Finally, clearly demonstrating that he was writing history and not mere Adventist hagiography, Knight fairly balances the record: "But [Bates's] contributions to the development of Adventism were not all positive," he candidly admits. "His legalistic tendencies, his confusion between behavior and religion, and his living in the fear of judgment perspective did not have a healthy influence on later Seventh-day Adventism" (212). Yet Knight is convinced that "while Bates' negative contributions were serious, the positive framework he established for the development of Adventist understandings far overshadowed them" (212).

Knight's thesis has been admirably developed and convincingly defended, yet a few peripheral areas may be profitably considered. One notable positive facet of Knight as author is his unusually generous acknowledgment of his debt to scholars who have previously published in this area. Amazingly, he even dedicated this work to two of his own graduate students: "Dedicated to Merlin Burt and Alberto Timm, doctoral students who helped me to obtain a fuller understanding of Joseph Bates' contribution to the development of Seventh-day Adventism." (He discusses his debt to these two students more fully in the Preface.) If this were not sufficiently impressive professional courtesy, Knight even thanks several students for their helpful work on the M.A. level. Two of these were my own students and from another university: Jerry E. Daly and Michael Ooley (xi, 34). This, of course, is in marked contrast to the conduct of all too many authors, who freely "borrow" from others without attribution or thanks.

In the Preface, Knight gives generous credit to the "one previously published scholarly biography of Bates—Godfrey T. Anderson's Outrider of the Apocalypse: Life and Times of Joseph Bates (1972), now, unfortunately, out of print. He also references Anderson's scholarly article, "The Captain Lays Down the Law," in the prestigious New England Quarterly (June 1971), in the footnotes for chapter 3 (55).

One essential primary source that Knight heavily utilized was Joseph Bates's Autobiography (1868), which first appeared serialized in the Youth's Instructor. Knight notes that a new edition of this classic has been released by Andrews University Press "as a part of the Adventist Classic Library to accompany this biography" (xi). A 1970 facsimile reproduction of the 1868 original by the old Southern Publishing Association in Nashville, Tennessee, is a treasure to historians; but it is unattractive by present printing standards and has no illustrations. Titled The Autobiography of Elder Joseph Bates, it was part of their Heritage Library. Another version, Life of Joseph Bates: An Autobiography, abridged and edited by C. C. Crisler (Takoma Park, MD: Review and Herald, 1927), sadly must be judged a disaster. What criteria Crisler used for his abridgment is not indicated. The selection of illustrations constitutes an embarrassment—not only are they of poor
quality, but many have no relation to the text. Unfortunately, Adventist scholars have never subjected Bates's autobiography to critical analysis. Memory can play extremely strange tricks on the most conscientious person—even a sternly moral New Bedford captain. The venerable historical aphorism that "autobiography is just another form of fiction" provides no exceptions or disclaimers in the rigorous pursuit of truth.

The cleverly presented old picture album adds greatly to Knight's book. Unfortunately, there is no accompanying "provenance" essay, explaining the origins of these striking pictures, their physical characteristics, and their present location. This is a regrettable oversight by the editors.

There is a glaring—but markedly rare—typo on p. 32, with a fascinating etiology: 

"[Bates] kept expecting some undeniable experience from God so that he would never thereafter doubt his conversion. But it alluded [rather, eluded] him." This can be readily excused as a postmodern "high-tech" error, generated by our overconfidence and overdependence upon computers. Spell checkers would not detect this sort of basic error, since the wrong word was chosen but spelled correctly. Thus there is still need for the old-fashioned, fussy proofreader. There is also a slight mistake under a picture on p. 96b of that wild-eyed pioneer that only a stereotypical proofreader with eagle eyes would catch: "H. S. Gurney was Bates's [sic] evangelistic partner on many of his travels." It is presumed that "ketch" for "catch" (35), and "exorted" for "exhorted" (36) were spelled thus in the original written by Bates, since they are in quotes. Two "[sic]" would have removed any doubts; but this approaches so closely to insufferable pedantry that it will not be urged. Not spelling but word usage is the problem when "Shanghaied" is used on the back cover and on p. 18 of the text. I propose that the correct word in that context is "impressed," as both circumstances and procedures were sharply different for the two terms. But it is not worth troubling ancient waters now, so this will be firmly "belayed."

It seems reasonable to check how some other authors have evaluated Joseph Bates as a major Adventist Founding Father. Arthur White, in his six-volume biography of Ellen White, categorizes Bates simply as one of the three "founders" of the church, along with his grandparents Ellen and James White, and as the "apostle of the Sabbath truth" in two brief evaluative comments, without elaboration or documentation (Ellen G. White: The Early Years, 1827-1862 [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1985], 284).

In a careful study of Adventist health reform, George W. Reid states that Bates was "the first of the Seventh-day Adventist founders known to have adopted vegetarianism." Besides having had "great" influence on the fledgling church, Bates also had the only "clear record of seldom being sick" among the pioneers (A Sound of Trumpets: Americans, Adventists, and Health Reform [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1982], 62).

Ron Numbers, in his epochal Prophetess of Health, does not evaluate Bates as a founder or leader of the church, confining himself to the captain's healthful living reforms. "It seems probable," Numbers concluded, "that he was a major factor in leading Ellen White in 1848 to begin speaking out against the use of tobacco, tea, and coffee" (Prophetess of Health: A Study of Ellen G. White [New York: Harper & Row, 1976], 38).

In his college-level textbook for Adventist history, R. W. Schwarz cautiously avoids any comparative evaluative statement concerning Bates's role as an Adventist founder (Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes [Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1979]).

A quotation from Everett Dick of Union College heads Knight's preface: "Everett Dick characterizes Joseph Bates as 'probably the most interesting character among the
founders of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination,' and as a ‘pioneer of the pioneers’ among the shapers of Sabbatarian Adventism”” (ix). In the book from which these words are taken, Dick elaborated further on Bates’s key role. His critical contributions were “maturity, good health, natural leadership, and prestige. He had successfully commanded all manner of men for two decades. He had been one of the recognized outstanding leaders of the 1844 movement.” Actually, “he was, in effect, the first general conference executive in that he was chairman of the general conferences regularly” (Founders of the Message [Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1938], 150).

Ellen White does not address the issue of Bates’s leadership role in founding the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The researcher searched in vain through her voluminous writings for evaluative statements concerning Bates that would lend any significant support to Knight’s analysis. Knight’s pointed reaction to this clear lack of support for his thesis is provocative: “On a more personal level are the evaluations of the Whites, the two individuals who with Bates founded the Seventh-day Adventist Church,” Knight has written in the concluding section of his work. “Ellen White was quite parsimonious in her remembrances . . . [while] James was a little more effusive” (209).

If I may suggest an agenda item for the next edition of this valuable work, it would involve Joseph Bates as a case study in the positive utilization of power, based on sound character developed during his years of command at sea when, as captain, he possessed perhaps the ultimate of almost unlimited power over the men under him. If, as the old aphorism attributed to Lord Acton phrases it, “power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely,” how did Captain Joseph Bates escape corruption? Why did that tough school of the sea turn Bates into a man of strong character and estimable leadership qualities, rather than into a Captain Queeg, or a Captain Ahab? And, parallel to this, what sort of self-education did Joseph Bates follow that developed him into a remarkably good writer, a sound and logical thinker, and a “natural” leader of men?

One of Bates’s consistent, lifelong character traits, according to Knight, “was a persistent and bold reaction to injustice” (18). This book has fully disclosed a serious injustice done to the old captain. Would he have reacted to this during his lifetime? Probably not, because his strong, reflexive reactions were against injustice to others, not against himself. Consequently, must the historical record of such injustice committed against a strongly moral, dedicated, self-effacing man such as Joseph Bates stand uncorrected? Not if historians do their job by conscientiously seeking and publicizing the truth as George Knight has so ably done here.

La Sierra University
Riverside, California


These two volumes by Gary Knoppers represent the most comprehensive and up-to-date treatment of 1 Chronicles, done by one of the world’s leading authorities on the subject. After being neglected for much of the last century, the last few decades have seen a revival of interest in the books of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. Therefore, the sheer size of this commentary on Chronicles is not only a reflection of the author’s