is one of the main strengths of this book. Yet, sometimes the authors assume the accuracy of “the story of the Psalter” (398), rather than demonstrate it clearly from the biblical text. For example, it is not always apparent from the analysis of Pss 107–150 that “Book Five of the Psalter tells the story of ancient Israel as it returned from exile in Babylon” (989). In this way, readers are challenged to further advance the study of the canonical shape of the Psalter.

The writers of the New Testament extensively quote the Psalms, and the authors of this book duly note and comment on the main instances. In the concluding comments on most psalms the authors seek to demonstrate the transforming power and beauty of the psalms in the context of the Christian message. Readers will appreciate hearing the psalms speak to the world today. Yet, some readers interested particularly in the NT interpretation of certain psalm quotes and the messianic psalms (e.g., Pss 16, 110) may wish that the authors offered more elaborate interpretation of the NT use of psalms.

The gender-inclusive language of the book is commendable, but the constant reference to the psalmist as both “he” and “she” will be distracting to some readers, especially for the psalms which are traditionally attributed to David and Asaph. Also, occasional typographical mistakes may be frustrating (for example, on p. 153 readers are directed to see n. 9 for a suffix supplied by LXX, but the information is given in n. 6). In addition, this work offers a very helpful index of authors, names and subjects, and Scripture and other ancient literature.

This minor critique of the book should by no means cast any depreciating shadow on this outstanding work on the Psalms. Readers will find the commentaries on the Psalms insightful and immensely enriching. It is no wonder that several eminent Old Testament and Psalms scholars have praised the book, including John Goldingay, W. H. Bellinger Jr., Patrick D. Miller, Erhard Gerstenberger, and J. Clinton McCann Jr. This book is a fine tool for use by laypersons, students, scholars, and pastors.

Washington Adventist University

Dragoslava Santrac
Takoma Park, Maryland


James Keith Elliott is currently honorary professor of New Testament textual criticism at the University of Leeds. His recent publication, New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation. NovTSup 137 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), that contains thirty-two of the fifty-seven articles he published over the past forty years in several journals and books, bears witness not only to the expertise of this giant in the field, but also to his methodology. By using “thoroughgoing eclecticism” Elliott is walking in the footsteps of George Kilpatrick, C. H. Turner, and A. C. Clark.
Two editions (SNTSMS 62, [1989]; SNTSMS 109, [2000]) and three supplements (NovT 46.4, [2005]: 376–400; NovT 49.4 [2007]: 370–401; NovT 52.3, [2010]: 272–297) preceded the recent expanded and revised edition of A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts. The table of contents of the third edition shows that the appendix, which was added in the second edition to the introduction (13–17) was not only significantly expanded by adding bibliographical data on “Guides to Various Approaches to Transcriptional Probability,” “Collected Essays,” and “URLs,” but was also relocated to the end of the book (401–408). The section on unregistered manuscripts, located at the end of the second edition, was no longer maintained in the third edition, since these manuscripts either got registered or disqualified for a Gregory number (408).

The third edition starts with the acknowledgment (vii), followed by an extensive list of abbreviations (viii–xlii). In the introduction (1–12), Elliott states that the bibliography “contains details of articles, studies and collations of manuscripts, including those dealing with text, illustrations and palaeography” (1). The actual bibliography is divided into four major parts, according to the Gregory-Aland numbering system: Papyri (13–50), Majuscules (51–128), Minuscules (129–328), and Lectionaries (329–399). As in the earlier editions, he “tended to avoid references to short notes in learned journals or in commentaries on Biblical books that treat of an isolated textual variant read by particular manuscripts” (2).

Regarding the bibliography, major changes were made in comparison to the earlier editions. The bibliographical entries are now listed for each manuscript in descending order of the publication date, which means the most recent publication is listed first. Short introduction paragraphs for important manuscripts as they appeared in the second edition are removed in the current edition. Also the considerable increase of the book’s size from 5.5 x 8.75 to 6.25 x 9.5 inches, which results from the change of the publisher and the series, allows for a clearer layout and better readability. However, there is more room for improvement regarding the layout of the bibliographic data. The layout is according to the standard format of bibliographic entries in biblical studies, having runover lines indented for general reference works in the beginning of each chapter, but not for the bibliographic entries for each manuscript. The decision to use the same line spacing between two entries and runover lines for longer entries makes it even harder to identify the beginning of each entry. Thus, regarding readability, this bibliography is still insufficient.

Another novelty of the current edition is its link to BiBIL, an online bibliographical resource, maintained by the University of Lausanne (CH). This move by Elliott is definitely worth it. However, I question the value of the bibliography in print form, since especially the discipline of textual criticism is taking more and more advantage of computer technology as well as the Internet. Spot-checking the webpage of the Institut für Neustamentliche Textforschung (INTF), http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste, for certain manuscripts, the provided bibliography for each manuscript seems to be mostly congruent or even more comprehensive than Elliott’s bibliography.
Berrien Springs, Michigan  

DOMINIC BORNAND


Flemming’s book, *Why Mission?*, is part of the Reframing New Testament Theology series edited by Joel B. Green. The series seeks to address the question, “What does it mean to engage the New Testament from within the church and for the church?” (xi). For Flemming, this broad question is focused on “What is God’s mission for communities of faith?”

In chapter one, “Reading from the Back: Mission in Matthew,” Flemming argues that Matthew’s witness to the *missio Dei* must be understood in light of the organic unity between the story of Israel and the story of Jesus: “What God has done in Jesus of Nazareth is the climax of Israel’s story and the fulfillment of Israel’s Scriptures” (3). Jesus’ renewal and restoration of Israel can be seen in his comprehensive kingdom mission where he teaches, preaches, heals, and confronts expressions of evil at every turn.

Since the post-resurrection commission of Jesus (Matt 28:16–20) is the climax of the first gospel, one must read Matthew “from the back.” The Great Commission recapitulates and gathers together the primary theological themes of the gospel; it shaped how Matthew’s Jewish Christian community read and understood the gospel; and it helps contemporary Christians “to grasp how Matthew’s Gospel . . . equips God’s people to participate in the *missio Dei*” (12).


The narrative of Luke–Acts should be understood as an instrument of the divine mission, inviting present-day missional communities to actualize the mission to bring the fullness of salvation to all nations in their own concrete settings. The mission of Jesus to proclaim good news to the poor, and release to the captives and oppressed, is our calling as well. And the church’s Spirit-empowered witness—revealed in the speeches to Jewish and Gentile audiences and in unified loving community—also become models for the contemporary church to emulate.

In chapter three, “Sent into the World: Mission in John,” Flemming claims the Fourth Gospel may well offer “the most developed theological