

user-friendly for the reader because of the possibility to hyperlink provided references to dictionaries, grammars, and commentaries.

Berrien Springs, Michigan

DOMINIC BORNAND

Kilchör, Benjamin. *Mosetora und Jahwetora: Das Verhältnis von Deuteronomium 12–26 zu Exodus, Levitikus und Numeri*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015. xviii + 390 pp. Hardcover. EUR 98.00.

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

going from detail to whole and back to detail again, (b) that clearer cases of direction of dependence can aid in establishing the direction of dependence in more unclear cases, when belonging to the same textual unit as in the case of multiple parallel passages between Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers and Deuteronomy, (c) that more than two parallel texts increases the certainty upon which conclusions of directions of dependence can be drawn, and (d) that the length of texts cannot be used as a basis to conclude the direction of dependence in individual cases.

Between those arguing for strict criteria for establishing reuse and direction of dependence on one side and those arguing that such criteria cannot be used as a rule on the other side, Kilchör tends to side with the latter, arguing that we need to evaluate each case by case (35, 40). While a major weakness of the former can be an anachronically projected straightjacket forced upon the biblical texts, a major weakness of the latter is the freedom allotted the individual scholar's intuition in determining reuse and direction of dependence.

In my opinion, it is preferable to speak of *indicators* of reuse and direction of dependence. In this way, we can methodologically reflect on what can be said to be valid and non-valid phenomena for speaking of reuse and direction of dependence. At the same time, the presence of indicators of reuse and direction of dependence do not, in themselves, establish such reuse and direction of dependence. A case-by-case approach is thus needed even when we have some more general reflection of when it is valid to claim that a certain phenomenon is evidence for reuse and direction of dependence. This becomes an intermediate position between those arguing for strict criteria and those rejecting such criteria.

Kilchör, for his part, attempts to strike a balance between the two by rejecting overly strict criteria to determine reuse and direction of dependence, while at the same time providing substantial textual evidence for his conclusions. Whereas the evidence needs careful consideration by all, this approach also leaves open the possibility of other scholars weighing the evidence differently, given their intuitive take on the parallel. No doubt others will continue arguing against reuse between the legal portions of the Pentateuch or opposite directions of dependence than what Kilchör observes. One weakness is that Kilchör often bases his conclusions upon the parallels of common words and phrases. Seeing reuse and direction of dependence, then, tends to rest on the interpreter's ability to see thematic links (e.g., 78–79, 102, 163–164, 211, 221–222, 254, 265)—in my opinion, the weakest type of argument for establishing literary reuse.

Kilchör could have strengthened his argument by offering a more systematic discussion of whether the parallel lexemes and/or phrases could be seen as unique or distinct to the parallel passages, and whether we find a linguistic contrast showing that the author could easily have chosen another way of formulating his words—making the parallel cases more striking. It is Kilchör's accumulation of stronger cases, which shows that Deuteronomy reuses Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, as well as his ability to explain how weaker cases of reuse may have the same direction of dependence that adds to the overall strength of his argument. This is something Kilchör himself

explicitly states. Despite the room left for the interpreter's intuitive take on the parallels, I would nevertheless say that, given Ockham's razor, Kilchör makes a convincing case for the simplest explanation being that Deuteronomy reused Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.

It is not a main point in *Mosetora und Jahwetora* to demonstrate the associative organization of Deut 12–26, according to the decalogic structure of Deut 5 (41, 69). However, following scholars like Braulik and Kaufman, he is able to demonstrate convincingly the heuristic role of reading Deut 12–26 along these lines for the study of legal reuse within the Pentateuch. Understanding Lev 19 as an expansionistic reading of the Decalogue in Exod 20, and a key to understanding the decalogic structure of Deut 12–26 (53–63) demonstrates how Lev 19 can be read as a basis for the decalogic structure of the instructions in Deut 12–26 rather than a reaction against it.

Kilchör's systematic and comprehensive approach to the question of legal reuse within the Pentateuch is much welcomed. Despite the methodological issues raised above, Kilchör is pointing Pentateuchal studies in new and refreshing directions. His argument for an overlap between the synchronic and diachronic reading is thought-provoking in an era during which the Documentary Hypothesis maintains a stronghold. While scholars of the Pentateuch repeatedly find camouflaged sociopolitical interests by later authors projected upon Israel's early history, Kilchör gives a credible account of how the legal sections of the Pentateuch, in their synchronic and diachronic sequence, is the most likely relative chronology for the origins of the texts.

In general, Kilchör's *Mosetora und Jahwetora* is the study of inner-biblical reuse at its best. Whether or not they agree with his conclusions, I am sure all interested in the field would benefit from a close reading of it. I would also highly recommend a publisher to make an English translation of the book available to a larger audience. It deserves this.

Grimo, Norway

KENNETH BERGLAND

King, Sarah Withrow. *Vegangelical: How Caring for Animals Can Shape Your Faith*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016. 176 pp. Softcover. USD 16.99.

King's *Vegangelical* is a refreshing and an (unfortunately) exotic book, considering the larger context of publication programs under which traditional Christian publishing houses operate. As the title indicates, the book blends core evangelical beliefs about the Trinity, creation, salvation, and restoration with a vegan, animal-caring lifestyle. Relating these two worldviews is usually not the norm in Christian publications. After reading King's work, it is surprising how this seemingly obvious relationship has not been brought to the Christian readership before now. The clearly present biblical theme of animal care and human stewardship (as image bearers of God) should have been part of the tradition of earlier Christian publications.

The author holds a degree in political science and theology and worked for many years for People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) and other organizations that protect animal rights and advocate for the law