

this is a weak basis and calls for more reflection on how scholars approach the question of literary reuse in ancient Israel. As an analogy, many scholars deny literary reuse based on comparable parallels between the eighth-century prophets (Amos, Micah, and Hosea) and Torah. This raises the questions of why we seem to find such an accumulation of more elusive cases of reuse in ancient Israelite literature, and how to deal properly with these. When are we entitled to call something literary reuse, and when not? And when can we say that differences are intentional modifications?

Jassen ends the book by writing: “Thus, even as these texts turn to scriptural material for authority, they are free to change the very wording of the authoritative texts. In so doing, the Second Temple texts are themselves contributing to the formation of the canon and its textual character. In contrast, the rabbinic approaches to many of the very same scriptural passages respect their textual integrity even as they dramatically transform their meaning and practical application through midrashic reformulation” (252). Maybe these two approaches are not best described in general through terminology such as “concealment” (62) or “subversive” (65). While some reuse may be subversive, DSS reuse through rewriting and rabbinic reuse through commentary may also reflect a deep loyalty to their sources. As it seems difficult to call everything either subversive or loyal, each case needs to be studied independently on its own merits. Further, I am somewhat unsure whether the one approach is “contributing to the formation of the canon” more than the other. The rewriting of the DSS was not included in the canon as such. And both approaches testify to the authority of their sources. While one appropriates through rewriting and the other through commentary, this difference does not itself seem to be the key to understanding canonization. Both hermeneutical approaches could have been used both in the process of canonization itself and after its completion. To me, it is not clear that DSS rewriting itself is “contributing to the formation of the canon.” Rather, the accumulated attribution of authority over time seems gradually to stabilize the canon.

This said, Jassen’s book is rich and thorough, and any reader interested in intrabiblical, Second Temple, or rabbinic reuse of Scripture will be rewarded in reading it.

Grimo, Norway

KENNETH BERGLAND

Kletter, Raz, Irit Ziffer, and Wolfgang Zwickel. *Yavneh II: The ‘Temple Hill’ Repository Pit. Fire Pans, Kernos, Naos, Painted Stands, ‘Plain’ Pottery, Cypriot Pottery, Inscribed Bowl, Dog Bones, Stone Fragments, and Other Studies*. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015. xiii + 288 pp. and 63 plates. Hardcover, SF 142.00/EUR 150.00.

The book under review represents the second and concluding volume of the final report for the well-known salvage excavation of an Iron Age IIA-B *favissa* or cultic repository pit, extremely rich in finds, discovered on a hill just north of Tel Yavneh in Israel. The first volume appeared in 2010 (for a content summary of this earlier report, see my review in *Near East Archaeological Society*

Bulletin 56 [2011]: 44–48), and the authors are to be heartily congratulated for their valiant efforts in excavating this site under very trying circumstances, as well as completing the publication of all of its data. While specialist studies of the corpus of finds comprise a few chapters of the volume, the bulk of the report is historical and contextual studies of the finds, and is surprisingly engaging, as well as informative reading. Kletter provides a brief account of the excavation in the introduction (X–XI), which includes helpful information that places the finds in their likely historical and biblical context. An appendix contains the complete daily excavation diary (translated from Hebrew), which is a welcome, albeit rather unusual, addition to a published final report.

Of the eighteen chapters in the volume, seven are devoted to studies of a Kernos, zoomorphic vessels, pottery stands, Cypriot pottery, canine remains, animal representation in the cult stands, and stone objects. The remaining chapters are generally more substantial in length and cover the finds with more historical and biblical significance. The first two chapters describe the Yavneh fire pans, where Kletter and Ziffer provide Iron Age parallels and additional comparisons from other historical periods and sites, notably from the Aegean region during the Late Bronze Period. Of particular interest is their study of fire pans in the Old Testament, which they identify with the Hebrew term *maḥtāh* (e.g., the accounts of Nadab and Abihu in Lev 10 and of Korah in Num 16–17). In chapter four, Kletter presents a detailed study of a clay model shrine as well, including a valuable catalogue of known examples from other sites. The discovery and publication of the Yavneh model shrine is particularly timely for comparisons with other examples recently unearthed at Khirbet Qeiyafa and Khirbat Ataruz in Jordan. The artistic and cultic symbolism on these small models has been linked to a fascinating array of motifs and architectural parallels, such as those found on Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem. Their exact function (Kletter suggests their use as portable shrines), however, remains unclear.

Of special note is Kletter's lengthy discussion of the volute capitals present on selected model shrines. His careful presentation of the evidence and resultant arguments comprise a systematic and devastating critique of fellow Israeli archaeologist Oded Lipschits's recent attempt to equate volute capitals, specifically those unearthed at Ramat Rahel, with Assyrian hegemony during the seventh century BCE (see, e.g., "The Origin and Date of the Volute Capitals from the Levant," in *The Fire Signals of Lachish: Studies in the Archaeology and History of Israel in the Late Bronze Age, Iron Age, and Persian Period in Honor of David Ussishkin*, eds. I. Finkelstein and N. Na'aman [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011], 203–225). These capitals are found throughout the Levant and Cyprus. Nearly identical capitals have been unearthed in Jerusalem and recently at a site in the Rephaim Valley. On the basis of their location, stylistic variations clearly represent distinctive regional and national tastes, but all are clearly based upon earlier Northern Syrian or Phoenician prototypes. Ironically, the petrographic analysis of the Yavneh Model Shrine points to a Phoenician origin. Moreover, the datable contexts for some examples of volute capitals and their representations on

ceramics clearly precede any direct Assyrian involvement in the region. Consequently, suggestions to directly link these capitals to Assyrian imperial policy are simply preposterous. Ironically, this erroneous view did not originate with Lipschits nor apparently with his teacher Nadav Na'aman, but rather at least as early as Baruch Halpern's flawed observation published in 1996 ("Sybil, or the Two Nations? Archaism, Kinship, Alienation, and the Elite Redefinition of Traditional Culture in Judah in the 8th–7th Centuries BCE," in *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference*, eds. J. S. Cooper and G. M. Schwartz [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns], 304n32), which Lipschits fails to credit in his publication. Thankfully, Kletter's incisive remarks help to clear the air on this issue, offering badly needed correctives for these recent misrepresentations (and cases of outright wishful thinking) relating to the origins of this important architectural motif.

As in the first volume, Nava Panitz-Cohen continues her study of the local pottery (chalices and bowls), enabling her to present a "more comprehensive picture" from a larger qualitative and quantitative analysis. The results and comparisons with other sites, notably the Tell es-Safi/Gath Stratum A3 assemblage, confirm her earlier conclusions that date the Yavneh pottery from the mid-ninth to the early eighth centuries BCE. with closer affinities to the coastal plain than with the Shephelah and Negeb.

A brief chapter by Reinhard G. Lehmann publishes a short Hebrew inscription incised on a bowl. The probable reading is לְעִזָּא (belonging to 'uzza), a name ironically similar to or deriving from the same root as Uzziah, the king of Judah credited with breaching the walls of Yavneh (2 Chr 26:6).

Another very useful study is by Nicole Strassburger, who compiled a list of known *favissae* in Israel-Palestine from the Late Bronze through the Persian period contexts and thus presenting the Yavneh *favissa* in a broader chronological and regional context. Less than a dozen sites with *favissae* were noted, including the recent finds at Moza, and all of them located in Cisjordan.

In the final chapter, Kletter provides a summary of the finds and their significance by discussing the Yavneh *favissa* in the context of regional trade and Philistine ethnicity, as well as artifactual links to finds from Mt. Gerizim, Tel Dan, and Helike.

Like the first volume of this final report, editing and production are first-rate. The extensive plates, including some in color, are sharp and clear, and only a few bibliographic errors were noted.

In summary, *Yavneh II* offers the reader noticeably more than merely a collection of narrowly focused specialist reports. Rather, the volume both reveals and applies the relevance of these primarily cultic finds, identifying several fascinating connections with written sources and providing some important contributions to biblical history, including proposing more precise definitions, if not new understandings for a brace of Hebrew words. Kletter, Ziffer, and Zwickel, as well as each contributor, deserve our heartfelt congratulations.

Bethel College
Mishawaka, Indiana

JEFFREY P. HUDON