

uniquely chosen by God (once again, not because of their goodness), while the Canaanites uniquely should be destroyed; all other nations landed on the spectrum between these two poles (pp. 352–54). In other words, the Canaanites became a symbol of evil (this is supported by his reading of “Canaanite” in Zech 14 as a literal Canaanite, not a merchant [pp. 249–51]). If that is the case, then the destruction of the Canaanites is a prelude to eschatological judgment (pp. 358–62). Appropriately when dealing with this topic, he notes at the end of his theological reflection that it is still incomprehensible to him that God would command the total destruction of a people, though he attributes this at least partly to cultural differences (p. 381). I very much appreciated his theological reflections in this area and believe they should be accorded significant attention in future discussions of the topic of divinely commanded violence in the OT.

Charlie Trimm  
Biola University

Benjamin Kilchör. *Mosetora und Jahwetora: Das Verhältnis von Deuteronomium 12–26 zu Exodus, Levitikus und Numeri*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 21. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015. Pp. xviii + 390. ISBN 978-3-447-10409-8. \$116.00 cloth.

Every once in a while, a book appears that has the potential to change the landscape of biblical studies—if scholars will take it seriously. Here is one for which I have been waiting a long time, one that has that potential. The present volume is a revised version of Benjamin Kilchör’s doctoral dissertation produced for the Evangelische Theologische Fakultät (Protestant Theological Faculty) in Leuven, under the supervision of Professor Hendrik Koorevaar. Despite Kilchör’s significant differences in approach and conclusions from Eckart Otto, the editor of the series in which it appears, we are grateful to the latter for facilitating its publication.

Kilchör’s agenda is clear: to investigate the chronological compositional order of the four constitutional documents embedded in the Pentateuch: Decalogue (Exod 20:1–17); Book of the Covenant (BC, Exod 21–23); Holiness Instructions (Lev 17–26); and Deuteronomic Law (Deut 12–26). Before he launches into his own work, he sets the stage by helpfully reviewing three diachronic approaches to the relationships among these documents as currently advocated by scholars: (1) variations of the JE-D-P/H sequence developed in the 19th century by Julius Wellhausen; (2) the P/H-D sequence; (3) the D-BC sequence.

Building on the work of John Bergsma and Richard Hays, Kilchör follows up this survey with a superb discussion on intertextuality generally and then lays out the principles by which we may determine the direction of dependence between/among texts that are intertextually related (pp. 29–41). Early on, Kilchör summarizes the principles that should govern all intertextual analysis (pp. 35–36), but in his analysis he applies another principle that comes into play when three or more texts are involved: If a text appears to conflate the diction characteristic of two or more sources, the conflated text should be deemed the dependent, hence later, text (cf. David Carr, “Method in Determination of

Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34, 11–26 and its Parallels,” in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Ex 32–34 and Dtn 9–10*, ed. M. Köckert and E. Blum [Gütersloh: Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2001], 107–40, esp. pp. 124–26).

The bulk of Kilchör's volume involves a detailed analysis of all the laws preserved in Deuteronomy and their analogues in the rest of the Pentateuch. Arguing that the Laws in Deut 12–26 are structured after the deuteronomistic version of the commands of the Decalogue, he divides his discussion into 10 sections, each of which expounds on a successive Decalogue command: (1) Deut 12:2–13:19; (2) 14:1–22; (3) 14:22–16:17; (4) 16:18–18:22; (5) 19:1–22:8; (6) 22:9–23:15; (7) 23:16–24:7; (8) 24:8–25:4; (9) 25:5–12; (10) 25:13–26:15. All of these sections are composite and involve more than one law.

In his analysis of each of these laws, Kilchör juxtaposes the corresponding regulations from the Book of the Covenant and the Holiness Instructions. By carefully examining their literary relationships to one another, he seeks to determine which texts are dependent on which. His conclusions are extremely significant: (1) 32.3% of the material exhibits a relationship in which the direction of dependence is irreversible, but Deuteronomy always uses BC and/or H. (2) 14.7% of the material exhibits a relationship with texts in BC or H in which the direction of dependence could go either way. (3) 53% of the deuteronomistic material has no counterpart in BC or H. In the process, Kilchör also explores the relationship between BC and H where these share a legal tradition. He concludes that the four legal constitutional documents were composed in the order in which they appear in the Pentateuch: Decalogue, Book of the Covenant, Holiness Instructions, Deuteronomistic Law. Contra Stackert and Levinson, he also concludes that in no case does Deuteronomy subvert or suppress earlier laws; instead, the relationships among these law collections are always complementary.

This volume deserves a much more thorough review than I have offered here. My single criticism concerns the author's assumption that the deuteronomistic laws are structured after the Decalogue. I agree that the deuteronomistic laws are rooted in the Decalogue but find the arguments for this interpretation of their structure unconvincing. This approach may have served as a helpful heuristic tool to organize Kilchör's project, but thankfully his conclusions do not depend on it. In this volume, he has offered an impressive and credible synchronic reading of the pentateuchal laws, and in so doing has produced the most thorough and convincing critique of prevailing diachronic approaches we have seen in a century of pentateuchal scholarship. I commend the author for his diligence and courage and hope that his work will be judged not primarily by the conclusions he has reached but by the arguments through which he has reached them. One additional note: students who lack facility with German will be grateful for the English translation of the summary of his arguments and conclusions on pp. 337–41.

Daniel I. Block  
Wheaton College