sixteenth century the ancient St. Peter’s Basilica had fallen into disrepair, whereas the Sistine Chapel was a recent structure. (Michelangelo did mural and ceiling painting at the Sistine; but this was both before and after the time of the indulgence sales in question, at which time he was in Florence, not Rome.)

A second puzzling statement is that “Tetzel was in a town across the river from Wittenberg” (p. 106). The river must, of course, be the Elbe, on which Wittenberg is situated. The difficulty is that crossing this river from Wittenberg, which (looking downstream) is on its right bank, or north side at this particular place, simply takes a person farther into Saxony, where the sale of indulgences by Tetzel was prohibited. Jüterbog, some 25 or 30 kilometers to the northeast of Wittenberg, was probably the nearest locale where Tetzel’s salesmen functioned.

Finally, Kittelson’s portrayal of Staupitz’s relationship to the German Augustinian Observantines is flawed (pp. 57-58). Contrary to the impression given, Staupitz was already their head in Germany at the time of Luther’s trip to Rome. Also, there were some twenty-nine Observantine houses in the German Congregation, not “nine” (perhaps an uncorrected typesetter’s mistake?).

The flaws, however, should not be considered as outweighing the usefulness and merits of a book filled with as much important factual information as is Kittelson’s Luther the Reformer.

This volume will undoubtedly be especially helpful for its targeted audience, lay persons desiring a fairly comprehensive and eminently readable presentation of the career and activities of the pioneer Protestant Reformer.

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND


A current trend in American education is toward inter-disciplinary studies. A part of that trend, Abraham Malherbe’s book is a fascinating attempt to bridge the gap between NT scholarship and the discipline of pastoral care. As Malherbe unpacks Paul’s motives and techniques in addressing the first-century church at Thessalonica, the reader gains insight into the foundation, care, and feeding of religious communities.

Malherbe’s stated purpose is “to illuminate [Paul’s] practice by comparing it to that of his contemporaries who were engaged in a similar, if not identical, enterprise” (p. 108). Thus, the book focuses more on Paul’s “practice” in caring for the churches he had founded than it does on his theology. A careful study of such “pop philosophers” of first-century Greece as Dio Chrysostom and Musonius Rufus leads Malherbe to conclude that 1 Thessalonians is a fairly typical piece of first-century Greek
“pastoral care.” By including lengthy passages from the writings of such philosophers, he invites readers to evaluate the evidence for themselves.

The book contains four main chapters. The first, “Founding the Christian Communities,” deals primarily with the sociological process of conversion in its first-century context. Paul’s evangelistic method was carried out in the setting of the everyday tasks of an ancient household. There he modeled the faith for new and prospective converts in relative seclusion, amenable to the building up of a small but stable community. The bridge to that community was the process of conversion, a process familiar to the philosophers of the day. The main difference between Paul and the philosophers was that he attributed conversion to the power of God, while they emphasized that the power to change was inherently human and required only the skills of the teacher and the right use of reason and will by the student.

The second chapter, “Shaping the Community,” concerns itself with the process by which Paul established a congregation from among those converted by his life and preaching. Malherbe notes that among the philosophers it was widely recognized that conversion brought with it social, as well as religious and intellectual, dislocation. He sees this kind of dislocation in the thlipsis of 1 Thess 1:6 and 3:3, 4 and in the mention of disorderly, discouraged, and weak elements in the community in 5:14, 15. Paul’s answer to the struggles of new converts was to gather them around him and demonstrate in his daily tasks how to live the Christian life in community. In this he had much in common with the moral philosophers of his day.

The third chapter, “Nurturing the Community,” focuses on the problem of how to nurture a community during one’s absence. The Thessalonians apparently felt abandoned as a result of Paul’s precipitous departure from their city. Paul chose to meet that problem in three ways: He sent Timothy as a representative, he wrote 1 Thessalonians, and he encouraged the converts to continue among themselves the nurture he had begun. In all three aspects, Paul was acting in harmony with the philosophical practices of the times. Recognition of that fact enables the interpreter to understand Paul’s pastoral methods in far greater and more practical detail than before.

It is in the final chapter, “The Christian Community in a Pagan Society,” that major differences between Paul and the popular philosophers are set forth. The Christians of Thessalonica were now, due to their conversion, radically different from the people around them. Paul was concerned that these Christians live the kind of “quiet life” (1 Thess 4:9-12) that would gain the approval of their pagan contemporaries. This quiet life was not, however, the laziness of “philosophical contemplation,” but was rather occupation in manual labor and the pursuit of civic responsibility.

Malherbe’s book concludes with helpful indexes of passages (one-third from the NT, the rest mostly Greek Gentile literature) and subjects
including such fascinating key words as "courage," "fault-finding," "gratitude," "reputation," "sarcasm," and "ugly disposition").

The book as a whole is a success. For the pastor, especially one who considers Paul's theology and practice in some sense authoritative, the volume is a gold mine of insight into the problems of establishing and nurturing a Christian community. As an expert in both the NT and the sociology of the Roman world, Malherbe has also succeeded in shedding fresh light on the issues and tactics involved in Paul's writing of 1 Thessalonians. What is all the more impressive is that such an important contribution could be made in a book of only 120 pages.

Andrews University  

Jon Paulien


Originally, George Marsden tells us, he intended to write a history of fundamentalism since the 1920s as a sequel to his Fundamentalism and American Culture. When asked to write a history of Fuller Seminary, however, he saw an opportunity to use Fuller as a window through which to view the recent development of fundamentalism and evangelicalism. The result is a work that, while containing many of the elements of an institutional history, also tells a larger and even more significant story.

Founded by radio evangelist Charles Fuller in Pasadena, California, in 1947, Fuller Seminary sought to become a more conservative alternative to Princeton Theological Seminary. Drawing together faculty and administrators—including Harold Ockenga, Carl F. H. Henry, and Wilbur Smith—who had achieved eminence in the fundamentalist world, the seminary emphasized both scholarship and evangelism. Men such as Henry believed that through their conservative scholarship the faculty could move modern thought back to orthodox Christianity.

Tensions, however, appeared from the beginning. Although the seminary attempted to maintain a nonsectarian position with regard to longstanding fundamentalist controversies, it was unable to escape them. The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., of which many faculty were members, pressured those faculty to leave Fuller and for a time was unwilling to accept Fuller graduates as pastors. Many fundamentalists believed that Bela Vassady, a European scholar who was not part of the American fundamentalist tradition, was too sympathetic to Karl Barth. Vassady proved to be a focal point of controversy after joining the faculty in 1948. In addition, faculty members such as Harold Lindsell and Charles Woodbridge attempted to move the seminary in the direction of fundamentalist separatism.

By the mid-1950s it was apparent that fundamentalism was splitting into two camps, the conservative wing retaining the name "fundamentalist"