

(p. xiii). While the essays provide insightful and helpful analysis, one is not sure that the hoped-for dialogue will ensue.

For one thing, the work purports to be a view "from within," but the only participant in the conference who comes close to being a genuine "fundamentalist" is Clark Pinnock. While the papers represent some of the best historical and sociological scholarship available on the subject, the work is mainly "a response from without." Even though the "without" responses are mainly irenic in tone, the goal of dialogue and deeper understanding could have been greatly enhanced if there would have been at least one genuine, "card-carrying" fundamentalist represented on the agenda. In the spirit of the conference, many of the liberal responses cry out for "fundamentalist" respondents.

The book can serve two important functions. (1) It will be a good primer for one who is seeking a helpful introduction to the study of "fundamentalism." (2) The hoped-for dialogue will be greatly enhanced if "fundamentalists" will seriously grapple with the liberal critiques, especially those of James Dunn, Eugene Borowitz, and Preston Williams.

Andrews University

WOODROW W. WHIDDEN II

Comfort, Philip W. *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1990. 235 pp. \$19.95.

Philip Comfort is senior editor of the Bible Department at Tyndale House Publishers and a visiting NT professor at Wheaton College.

The major purpose of the book is to show the extent to which the papyrus manuscripts of the NT have affected modern translations. Before Comfort does this in detail in section 3 and gives a final assessment in section 4, he presents first (in section 1) an introduction to the early papyri of the NT, a discussion of their effect on critical editions of the Greek NT, and a method of analyzing their effect both on modern English translations and on the Greek text underlying the English translations. Section 2 lists and describes all papyrus manuscripts dating to the fourth century or earlier, including their content, date, place of discovery, date of publication, location, bibliography, first inclusion in a Greek text, textual character, and significance for text and translations. This is a most helpful section for reference. In it are listed fifty-seven papyrus manuscripts and an additional five uncials (vellum or parchment) dated in or before the third century.

Comfort's method for determining the extent of the influence of the papyrus manuscripts on modern versions is to compare the translations of modern versions with that of the American Standard Version, since the latter, published in 1901 but based on the 1881 NT of the English Revised

Version, did not have available the many important early papyrus manuscripts discovered since that time. The RSV had twenty readings differing from the ASV which were due to the influence of papyrus manuscripts. Comfort mentions at this point that the NEB had more readings from the papyri than the RSV, but he discounts this because it had also adopted readings not supported by the papyri. The NASB, however, contained only five such instances beyond what we find in the RSV, although it had available more papyrus manuscripts, including p⁶⁶. The NIV improved over the NASB fourteen additional readings influenced by the papyri, since the translators had p⁷² and p⁷⁵ plus ten additional papyrus manuscripts. The TEV is nearly identical to the NIV in its selection of readings from the papyri. That is not surprising, since they both based their text on the first edition of the United Bible Societies' Greek text. At the end of the book, Comfort sets forth a list of 115 changes (and/or additions) to the ASV based on manuscripts discovered during this century. As Comfort indicates (p. 213), this number is not "phenomenally high" because the text of the papyri is largely confirmed by Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, which are already reflected in the ASV translation.

It is unfortunate that Comfort published his book before he could incorporate into it the readings in the Revised English Bible and the New Revised Standard Version, which were published soon after his work. These have made some rather significant changes based on revisions in the Greek text.

While it is obvious that the author does not consider a reading genuine simply because it is found in an early papyrus manuscript, sometimes one seems to get the impression that he does. Somewhere he should have set forth his basic text-critical principles for selecting readings in which the papyri are involved, assuming there are such.

One also wonders why the author selected for specific consideration the RSV, the NASB, and the NIV, though the NEB, the TEV, and the NJB are included somewhat in the comparisons since they are included in section 3. I am sure that he had good reasons for this, but it would have been helpful if he had set them forth.

In some instances in section 3 (Eph 1:14; Heb 12:3), the author does not include the readings of certain translations, especially that of the NEB. He does not explain why he sometimes excluded the NEB, though it was probably due to the NEB's free translation, which sometimes makes it difficult to know which reading it is following. It would have helped, nevertheless, to have indicated this so that the reader would not be left to wonder why its readings are not consistently included.

Another difficulty with the book is that it has no index. Although the need for such in a book of this sort is not great, it would be helpful to have an index of NT passages and papyrus manuscripts. In spite of that problem, the book will fill the need for a handy source to refer to the papyrus

manuscripts and to show how they have affected modern translations. Section 3 will give scholars a quick way to check which papyri-supported readings were selected by modern translations.

Chico, CA 95926

SAKAE KUBO

Dunn, James D. G. *Romans*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary, vols. 38A and 38B. Dallas: Word Books, 1988. lxxii + 976 pp. \$24.99.

Since, by the author's own admission, the book of Romans has attracted more commentaries than any other NT book, it is understandable that Professor Dunn looked upon his assignment in this continuing series as a "daunting undertaking" which he almost declined (p. xiii). On further reflection, however, he concluded that there were two areas in which he could make a further contribution to the study of Romans: 1) in previous commentaries, the movement of Paul's thought is often lost in the maze of details, such as word studies and alternative readings, and 2) most commentaries do not do justice to the historical context.

In the format of this series, the exegetical "Comment" sections are followed by less technical sections of "Explanation." Dunn suggests that such a format is ideal for meeting his objectives, particularly the first one. In fact, he feels that his explanations provide clear insights into Paul's flow of thought and should be read before the "Comment" sections. Hence, the person who does not want to pursue the technical issues and approaches of exegesis can simply read the "Explanation" sections and thereby get Dunn's reconstruction of Paul's reasoning. Since the "Explanation" sections provide a "full exposition" of Paul's argument, Dunn advises that the "Comment" sections be consulted only after first reading the "Explanation," if the reader wants to do more than "consult specific verses or issues" (p. xv). It is a helpful format for the non-technical reader.

Dunn's second objective, doing justice to the historical context, seems less auspicious, since it is hardly a new or unusual goal. But in spite of the formidable body of historical background information already available in many excellent exegetical commentaries, Dunn does make a contribution here. In his research and writing he has spent considerable time on Christianity's early history, and this commentary reflects his interest and expertise in that area.

In his introduction, Dunn appears to be writing more for the popular reader than for the scholar, as his language is quite non-technical. Also, he is true to his objective of showing the relationship between Paul's setting or situation and his subject matter. When he occasionally comes to a controversial or technical point, rather than marshal the evidence pro and con, he refers the reader to sources where such evidence can be found.