done between different geographic regions for the same time period and the same geographic regions across different time periods. Being able to visually observe changes over time and similarities and differences inter-regionally would be quite illuminating. I appreciated having the color photographs at the end, and I believe this section could be expanded online (and maybe the entire content of these volumes could be made available electronically). There is a lot of work and research being done in the analysis of pottery online, especially with the advent of 3D laser scanning and using computer programs to create highly accurate pottery drawings. These drawings could then be uploaded to the Pottery Informatics Query Database (or PIQD), where eventually all pottery drawings will be uploadable and searchable by any different metric. Perhaps these volumes should reflect this new reality in some way. At the very least, since all of the pottery drawings were re-inked for consistency, they should all be uploaded to the CRANE Project (www.crane.utoronto.ca) which is now hosting PIQD. Regardless of these minor critiques, I would highly recommend this book to anyone interested in the ancient pottery of Israel and Jordan. Students and scholars alike will benefit from having these volumes in their personal libraries.

Charlevoix, Michigan

Owen Chesnut


Sooner or later, most religion students will face biblical language classes during their education. Learning the new alphabets, memorizing the vocabulary, and translating the biblical text into modern languages often takes extra effort for the students enrolled in these classes. Unfortunately, the reality is that the majority of the students trained in biblical languages will forget most of what they have learned. Many of them become pastors and their exegetical sermon preparation, if they preach exegetically at all, will be based on modern translations of the biblical text. Professors and publishers have realized that, over time, this will become a real problem for Christianity. Therefore, we have recently seen a plethora of tools produced and published which intend to assist a trained theologian in reading the biblical text in its original language with as few interruptions as possible. Using these tools, the hope is that theologians will be able to not only keep their hard-learned skills in biblical languages, but also to improve their knowledge of Hebrew and Greek and to read the Bible in the original languages as part of their daily professional life.

the Greek New Testament. After a short introduction (7–11), a list of cited works (13–16), and a list of abbreviations (17–19), concise notes on selected verses of each book of the New Testament are divided into twenty-seven chapters. The final part of the book is the index of subjects (607–629), where the syntactical categories are listed with their respective Bible references.

Regarding the nature of the notes, the author states a fourfold intention. First and foremost, the notes “assist readers of the Greek New Testament by providing brief explanations of intermediate and advanced syntactical features of the Greek text” (7). Second, Irons “also provides suggested translations to help the reader make sense of unusual phrases and difficult sentences” (7). These translations are primarily taken from the NASB, the ESV, and the NIV, among others (8). Third, some text critical issues are briefly discussed if they are related to syntactical discussions (7, 11). Finally, “limited exegesis” is included here and there (7). All this information should help “the reader to make sense of the Greek text at a level of linguistic communication one step higher than the word to the syntactical level of the phrase, clause, or sentence” (7). The recent developments in the field of biblical Greek, namely the challenge of the traditional linguistic categories, force every author to take a decision regarding the usage of linguistic terminology. Irons decides to use traditional linguistic terminology. By doing this, he uses similar terminology as Wallace and Blass, Debrunner, and Funk do in their Grammars.

After reading selectively through different genres of the Greek New Testament with the help of Irons’s Syntax Guide for Readers of the Greek New Testament, my experience was the following: First, I found the conciseness of the notes to be extremely helpful, along with the reference to dictionaries and grammars for further reading on certain syntactical features. However, I often wished Irons would have provided additional information as to why a certain translation suggestion is accurate. Second, although it definitely helps to improve the understanding of the Greek text, using Irons’s guide along with the text while reading still leads to many interruptions. To improve a reader’s experience, the solution would probably be to include Irons’s work within a reader’s edition of the Greek New Testament. Third, I realized that Irons’s selection of syntactical features for comment is subjective. Sometimes he adds a note which, from my perspective, is unnecessary, whereas, for example, a genitive absolute construction remained uncommented upon. The only solution I see for accommodating the individual levels of syntax knowledge among the readers of the Greek New Testament would be to create, within a Bible software, a customizable vocabulary and syntax guide. Irons’s work definitely qualifies as foundational work for such a project. Finally, my favorite feature, which will bring me back to Irons’s book many times in the future, is the very last part, the Index of Subjects. This index is a tremendous help for any Greek teacher who wants to create exercises on a certain syntactical construction for his or her students.

Overall, I see Irons’s Syntax Guide for Readers of the Greek New Testament as a first valuable step in the right direction. I hope to see this book available soon within major Bible software packages, which would make it more
user-friendly for the reader because of the possibility to hyperlink provided references to dictionaries, grammars, and commentaries.

Berrien Springs, Michigan  
Dominic Bornand


The theory of the four original documents—J, E, D, and P—of the Pentateuch, as claimed in the Documentary Hypothesis, is fervently discussed these days. Did the documents of J and E ever exist separately? What was the chronological order of D and P? Do we understand the legal parallels in the Pentateuch as literary reuse or as shared tradition? When is it legitimate to speak of modifications and interpolations in the text? What is the proper dating of the Pentateuch and its parts? How do the synchronic and diachronic readings of the text fit together? Opinions about these and many other questions represent a wide spectrum. Pentateuchal scholarship today is characterized by increased divergence rather than convergence.

One of the more promising approaches to address these questions is the study of inner-biblical reuse, or inner-biblical exegesis and inter-textuality, as they are often called. Through a close reading of the text, we can detect indicators that one Pentateuchal passage intentionally reused, and possibly reworked, certain other sections of the Pentateuch. Thus, the relative chronology between Pentateuchal passages can be established before we attempt to answer questions of absolute chronology. Given the interest in such studies during the last decades, it is surprising that no one yet has undertaken a systematic study of all cases of legal reuse in the Pentateuch without already presupposing a compositional history and direction of dependence (12, 30). Kilchör’s *Mosetora und Jahwetora* itself is limited to a focus upon reuse and direction of dependence between Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers on one side as compared to Deuteronomy on the other side. Nevertheless, it addresses questions of reuse and direction of dependence also within Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers where relevant. Further, it is comprehensive in the sense of covering all legal parallels in the Pentateuch, even if this inclusive scope also places certain limitations on how detailed each case can be studied. Qualified by these limitations, Kilchör’s study can therefore be called the first systematic and comprehensive study of legal reuse and direction of dependence in the Pentateuch. As such, it sets a new standard in the field.

Instead of entering a discussion of particular cases, I want instead to briefly reflect on Kilchör’s approach to the study of reuse and direction of dependence. He uses the following guidelines for analysis of direction of dependence (35):

(a) no model for Pentateuchal composition should be presupposed; (b) no theory of the religion of history should be presupposed; (c) the final text as we have it should be our point of departure; (d) in cases where we have more than two parallels, all passages need to be taken into consideration. At the end of the book (330–332) he stresses (a) the importance of a methodological circle