

et par conséquent des Psaumes, comme un Dieu sévère, d'une implacable justice. De même que le Dieu des Evangiles du N. T. aussi le Dieu de l'A. T. est avant tout 'el *ḥannun* et ceci à partir des temps les plus anciens auxquels remontent les sources bibliques ²³.

²⁷ S. Lach, *Versuch einer neuen Interpretation der Zionshymnen*, dans *Suppl. VT* 39, Leiden 1978, pp. 48—62.

Je me suis servi d'une transcription phonétique au lieu d'une transcription scriptement scientifique tenant compte des voyelles longues et brèves. Les livres bibliques sont cités d'après *Traduction oecuménique de la Bible*, Paris 1976.

VOLKMAR FRITZ

THE MEANING OF THE WORD „HAMMÂN/HMN”

Ḥammānīm appear for the first time in Ezek 6:4, 6 as a new word in biblical usage. The word also occurs in the Holiness Source (Lev 26:30), in the Isaiah apocalypse (Isa 27:9), and in Chronicles (2 Chr 14:4; 34:4, 7). All these passages originate from the post-exilic period. Finally, the word is found in Isa 17:8 in a late gloss ¹. From the contexts of the various references, it is clear that this word means a cultic object or even a kind of building without closer definition being possible. But the *ḥammānīm* are mentioned together with altars *mizbeḥôt* in Ezek 6:4 and with altars and *gillûlīm* in Ezek 6:6 ². This word is also used in connection with the high places *bāmôt* in Lev 26:30 ³. Isa 27:9 names it with the

¹ For the text of Isa 17: 7 f., cf. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja*, BK X/2, 1978, pp. 637, 650 ff.

² For the text of Ezek 6: 6 cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, BK XIII/1, 1969, p. 144. The meaning of *gillûlīm* is only approximately to be determined. The word designates „eine gegenständliche Darstellung eines heidnischen Kultträgers”, primarily „wird man an größere, am heiligen Ort errichtete Götterbilder denken” (W. Zimmerli, *op. cit.*, p. 149).

³ In the case of the high places it is supposedly a question of open-air places of worship which were predominantly situated outside of the cities. For two examples of Megiddo and Nahariya from the third and second millennium, see I. Dunayevsky and A. Kempinski, *The Megiddo Temples*, ZDPV 89 (1973), pp. 161—187; M. Dothan, *The Excavations at Nahariyah, Preliminary Report (Seasons 1954/55)*, IEJ 6 (1956), pp. 14—25. For the Iron Age, the round platforms west of Jerusalem can probably be interpreted as *bāmôt*, cf. R. Amiran, *The Tumuli West of Jerusalem*, IEJ 8 (1958), pp. 206—227. The high places originally had nothing to do with the death cult, cf. W. B. Barrick, *The Funerary Character of „High-Places” in Ancient Palestine*:

stones of the altars and the Ashera ('*ašerîm*). The gloss in Isa 17:8 mentions, besides the *ḥammānîm* the Ashera as well. 2 Chr 14:4 places the *ḥammānîm* near the high places and 2 Chr 34:4 contains the listing of altars, Ashera, and idols (*pēsîlîm* and *massekôt*) and the same words occur again, with the exception of *massekôt*, in 2 Chr 34:7.

The *ḥammānîm* therefore appear as a cultic furnishing which does not occur at all in the pre-exilic period. They were either unknown in this period or fell into disuse later during the exilic and post-exilic periods so that they do not appear in the pre-exilic polemic. The only further information about the *ḥammānîm* is found in the statement of 2 Chr 34:4 that these were to be found over the altars of Baal. This information about their location does not allow a decision concerning their size and appearance, however. They certainly do not have to be a kind of altar. The *ḥammānîm* were judged as not fit for use in the Jahwe cult and are accordingly criticized without anything being said about the kind of furnishing they were or what function they served.

The *ḥammānîm* cannot be brought together with the Baal Hamon of the Punic inscriptions⁴ because *B'l Ḥmn* is the „Baal of the Amanus (Mountains)”⁵. The possible derivation of the root *ḥmn*, „to be hot” also does not help in interpreting the meaning of this word⁶. The word appears otherwise as *ḥmn'* in the Palmyre-

A Reassessment, VT 25 (1975), pp. 565—595. For the meaning and usage of *bāmā* see also P. H. Vaughan, *The Meaning of 'Bāmā' in the Old Testament*, Cambridge, 1974. Against the interpretation of the temple of Arad as *bāmā* by P. Welten, *Kulthöhe und Jahwetempel*, ZDPV 88 (1972), pp. 19—37 see V. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt*, WMANT 47 (1977), pp. 71—73.

⁴ Cf. K. Galling, *Ba'al Hammon in Kition und die Hammānîm* [in:] *Wort und Geschichte*, AOAT 18 (1973), pp. 65—70, who merely postulated the connection. The discussion, which has up to now been burdened by numerous hypotheses, need not be repeated here in detail.

⁵ Cf. O. Eißfeldt, *Die Wanderung palästinisch-syrischer Götter nach Ost und West im zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend*. Cf. his *Kleine Schriften* II (1963), pp. 55—63, especially page 58; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Epic* (1973), pp. 24—28.

⁶ Already the Septuagint guessed rather than translated the word, cf. βδέλυγμα Isa 18: 8, εἶδωλον 2 Chr 14: 5 (4), 34: 7, Isa 27: 9, ξύλινον χειροποίητον Lev 26: 30, τέμενος Ezek 6: 4, 6, and ὕψηλόν 2 Chr 34: 4.

nian and Nabatean inscriptions. Since the identification of the words in the two different languages is not to be doubted, this could be helpful in the determination of the function and meaning of the *ḥammānîm*. Under the supposition that the stones on which the inscription mentioning the *ḥmn'* appear were connected with the so-designated object, Johannes Lindblom understood the word to mean „stela”⁷. Harald Ingholt and Karl Elliger, independently, understood the word as „incense altar”⁸. Kurt Galling wants to designate so-called „incense box” as *ḥammānîm* since they were well-known from Uruk, Ur, Babylon, Assur, and Nippur, as well as southern Arabia but they also have been found in the Iron Age and the Persian Periods in Palestine⁹. These interpretations — as will be shown — cannot be brought into harmony

⁷ J. Lindblom, *Die Jesajaapokalypse Jes 24—27*, 1938, pp. 91—100. According to Lindblom the word has undergone a change in meaning: „Ursprünglich war es der Name eines phoenizischen Gottes, der besonders auf dem punischen Gebiet gewaltiges Ansehen genoß. Dann wurde es Bezeichnung für eine Steinsäule, die durch eine Weihinschrift diesem Gotte gewidmet war und bisweilen auch als seine Repräsentation betrachtet wurde. Dann wurde es Bezeichnung für heilige Steinsäulen überhaupt, die verschiedenen Göttern geweiht sein konnten. Schliesslich scheint das Wort, und zwar in späten Inschriften, einen besonderen Kultgegenstand, einen Räucheraltar oder dergleichen, bezeichnet zu haben” (p. 98). In the first and last meanings the word does not appear in the biblical writings.

⁸ H. Ingholt, *Le son du mot hammān*, [in:] *Mélanges syriens offerts à R. Dussaud* (Paris 1939), pp. 795—802. K. Elliger, *Chammanim = Masseben?*, ZAW 57 (1939), pp. 256—265, and *Der Sinn des Wortes Chamman*, ZDPV 66 (1943), pp. 129—139.

⁹ K. Galling, *op. cit.*, pp. 69 ff. Cf. Ch. Ziegler, *Tonkästchen aus Uruk, Babylon und Assur*, ZA 47 (1942/43), pp. 224—240; L. Woolley & M. E. L. Mallowan, *Ur Excavations IX* (1962), pl. 36 and p. 103. The finds from Palestine are gathered together by J. B. Pritchard, *An Incense Burner From Tell es-Sa'idiyeh, Jordan Valley*, [in:] *Studies On the Ancient Palestinian World* (Toronto 1972), pp. 3—17. For the examples from Tell es-Seba', cf. *Beersheba I*, ed. Y. Aharoni (Tel Aviv 1973), pls. 29 and 30; Tel Aviv 1 (1974), pls. 8 and 6 and Tel Aviv 2 (1975), pl. 35: 1—2; from Ezion Geber, cf. N. Glueck, *Incense Altars*, EI 10 (1971), pp. 120—125 (Hebrew). The Hebrew word for this object, which was probably used for the burning of incense, has not yet been determined.

with the archeological evidence. In addition, since these hypotheses were made, more inscriptions from Palmyra have been published which mention a *hmn'* and all the previously known inscriptions should be checked again with respect to the meaning of this word ¹⁰.

The first of these new finds is a 163 cm long and 54 cm high block which was found in the city defences on the western side of the Agora ¹¹. Originally this stone was built into a building in the vicinity of the Agora, which was later torn down, used for building material, and thus disappeared. On the stone's upper edge are five inscriptions of two lines each, which begin with the usual *šlm* followed by a personal name. Over the center of the stone runs an inscription of two lines in 5,5 cm high letters whose beginning and end stood on neighboring blocks. For this reason the inscription is only fragmentary and the date is not fully preserved. The inscription thus cannot be dated with certainty, but probably belongs to the first century A.D. The text reads as follows ¹²:

(1) [byrh ... šnt x+] 42 *hmn'* dnh 'bdw wqrbw mlkw br bl'qb
br m[yk']

¹⁰ J. Starcky, *Autour d'une dédicace palmyrénienne à Šadrafa et à Du 'Anat*, Syria 26 (1949), pp. 43—85; M. Gawlikowski, *Allat et Baalshamin*, [in:] *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne et d'archéologie offerts à Paul Collart* (Lausanne 1976), pp. 197—203. The two former Palmyrenean inscriptions mentioning the word have been published as Nos. 3917 and 3978 in *CIS II/3* (Paris 1926/47), pp. 79 ff., 163 ff. Cf. also M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik II* (1907), pp. 280 ff. and M. A. Levy, *Die palmyrenischen Inschriften*, ZDMG 18 (1864), pp. 65—117, especially 71—77. The two Nabatean inscriptions from the Hauran Nos. 27 and 97 were published by E. Littmann, *Semitic Inscriptions A. Nabatean Inscriptions*, [in:] *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria 4* (Leiden 1914), pp. 24—27, 74. Whether the letters *hmn'* on a block from Khirbet Leqtër can be read as *hmn'* cannot be decided with certainty since the completion could also read [r]*hmn'*, cf. H. Ingholt and J. Starcky, *Recueil épigraphique* [in:] D. Schlumberger, *La palmyrène du nord-ouest* (Paris 1951), No. 32, p. 153.

¹¹ The excavation in this area was carried out 1939/40, cf. H. Seyrig, *Rapport sommaire*, CRAI (1940), pp. 237—249.

¹² J. Starcky, Syria 26 (1949), p. 45 and pl. III: 1.

(2) [... ...] mn pḥd bny zmr' lšdrp' wld'nt 'lhy' ṭb [y']

(1) [In the month of ... of the year ... x+] 42 this *hmn'* was made and dedicated (by) MLKW, son of BL'QB, the son of M [YK' ...]

(2) [...] from the tribe of the sons of ZMR' for ŠDRP' and D'NT, the [good] gods [...]

Within this text the *hmn'* appears as a special object or building which had been dedicated to the two gods mentioned. Because of the demonstrative pronoun *dnh* it can be assumed that the stone with the inscription was part of that particular structure. Since further parts of the inscriptions had been written on stones on either side of this block, it must have been built into a wall where the inscription could be read. The five short inscriptions written in smaller letters above two lines of larger letters point to the fact that statues of the donor stood somewhere above the dedicatory inscription ¹³. The position of these statues excludes the assumption that the block originates from the foundation of a pedestal for the erection of an idol or an altar, since the representations of the donor and his family can hardly have had their place on the site for the idol or for sacrifice. Therefore, this stone can have originated only from a wall that had been part of a building.

From this inscription, the conclusion seems obvious that the *hmn'* designates a certain building which was dedicated to the two gods. Jean Starcky has already suggested the meanings „chapel”, „sanctuary” and pointed out that the *hmn'* would then be differentiated from the temple called by the term *hykl'* ¹⁴.

¹³ There is the possibility that the five inscriptions were engraved only after the stone was no longer in its original place. The fact that the name of the donor of the *hmn'* appears in both inscriptions speaks against this, however, a close chronological connection between the two different inscriptions has to be assumed.

¹⁴ J. Starcky, Syria 26 (1949), p. 55 and *Inscriptions archaïques de Palmyre* [in:] *Studi orientalistici in onore de Giorgio Levi della Vita* (Rome 1956), pp. 509—528; 517, n. 2. Starcky refers to the terrace temple in Surh Kotal in eastern Iran from the second century A.D., cf. D. Schlumberger, *Le temple de Surh Kotal en Bactriane*, JA 240 (1952), pp. 433—453, and 242 (1954), pp. 161—187. For plan and

Since according to Starcky the *hmn'* originally designated an altar for the fire cult, he thinks that it originally designated the temple of the fire cult. But the inscription does not give any kind of hint concerning the kind of worship involved.

The other new inscription was found during the Polish excavations in 1974 and comes from the area around the temple of 'Allât. This stone block, which measures about 1 m by 34 cm, was found in the destruction debris and its original position could not be determined. It was probably built into the temple but originated from another structure whose stones were re-used. The three lines of the inscription are incomplete in that the beginning of each line is missing. The missing parts stood on the neighbouring stone but they can be at least partially reconstructed since the inscription is written in the usual formulaic expressions. The text may be read as follows:

- (1) [byrḥ ...] šnt 282 qrb blḥzy
- (2) [br ...] brt' hmn' dnh lšmš
- (3) [l ḥywhy whyy] bnwhy w'ḥwhy
- (1) [In the month ...] of the year 282 dedicated BLḤZY
- (2) [son of ...] BRT' this *hmn'* to Shamash
- (3) [for his life and the lives] of his sons and his brothers.

This short inscription from the year 31/32 B.C. dedicates the *hmn'* to the sun god ¹⁵. The stone block bearing the inscription was probably taken from another building and built into the temple of 'Allât. While the possibility cannot be excluded that the inscription refers to another structure at the front of or within this

description of this temple, cf. also D. Schlumberger, *Der hellenisierte Orient* (1969), pp. 60—67. The similarity in plan of the Nabatean square temple with that of the Iranian square temple does not allow the conclusion that they were also fire temples, cf. K. Schippmann, *Die iranischen Feuerheiligtümer*, RVV 31 (1971), pp. 489—496, 498.

¹⁵ M. Gawlikowski, *op. cit.*, p. 198 and Fig. 2: 3 reached the same conclusion as J. Starcky, *Syria* 26 (1949), p. 55 namely, that the *hmn'* was a sanctuary. The restoration of this inscription originates from the editor, but is only partly found in the translation. For the excavation see H. J. W. Drivers, *Das Heiligtum der arabischen Göttin Allât im westlichen Stadtteil von Palmyra*, *Antike Welt* 7/3 (1976), pp. 28—38.

building, it is more likely that the entire building from which the stone originated was called *hmn'*. The inscription allows the conclusion that the *hmn'*, which was dedicated to Shamash, had a cultic function. Nothing is said about the form and size of this sanctuary.

The inscription CIS 3917 is found on the console of a column of the southern stoa of the temple of Bel and is to be dated in the year 108 A.D. Above the palmyrenean text is a two-line inscription in Greek which only names the persons represented and the donor, but which enables the restoration of the missing name in the first line.

Ἀκχεον Νοαράιου τοῦ Ἀκκαέου
οἱ Γαδδειβόλιοι τειμῆς χάριν

- (1) šlm' dnh dy 'qyḥ br [n'/h]ry br 'qyḥ
- (2) dy 'bdw lh bny gdybwl bdy l dy 'bd lhn
- (3) bb' wtr'why w'p 'bd b'lgšy' hmn'
- (4) klh hw w'trh w'p ṭll 'drwn'
- (5) klh wšpr lhwn bkl šbw klh bdy l
- (6) kwt 'bdw lh šlm' dnh lyqrh
- (7) byrḥ knwn šnt 420

(1) This statue is that of 'QYḤ, the son of [N'/H] RH, the son of 'QYḤ, (2) which the sons of GDYBWL made of him because he built them (3) the doorway and its doors and also erected the whole *hmn'* in 'LGŠY', (4) it and its site and also put a roof over the whole 'drwn' (5) and showed himself obliging in all respects. Therefore (6) they erected this statue in his honor. (7) In the month Kanun of the year 420.

The inscription indicates that the statue under which it was written was the statue of a man who made himself famous by donating various buildings. Where the door was is not said; it was perhaps a free-standing gate and not the entrance into a building or court. In Olegias this donor requested a 'drwn' as well as the *hmn'*. For the root ṭll the meaning „to put a roof on” is not certain, although it is probably in this case a technical building expression. For the building called 'drwn', Jean Starcky has proved that the term was borrowed from the Greek ἀνδρῶν and designated the

room for cultic meals¹⁶. The special mention of the placement ('tr') of the *hmn*' leads to the conclusion that the *hmn*' designates either an entire building or part of a building¹⁷. No cultic determination for this building is to be inferred from this inscription.

The inscription CIS 3978, which was carved on one side of an altar, had already been found in Palmyra in 1751. Another side of this altar shows the picture of two men in tunics and a candelabra-shaped vessel between them, from which smoke is rising¹⁸. This picture most likely represents the two men who donated the altar at a sacrificial ceremony. The date of the inscription is to be placed at 85 A.D.

- (1) [b]yrh 'lwl šnt 396
- (2) *hmn*' dnh w'lt' dh
- (3) [']bdw wqrbw lšmš wzbyd'
- (4) bny mlkw br ydy'bl br nš'
- (5) dy mtr' br 'bdbl dy mn
- (6) phd bny mgt lšmš
- (7) 'lh byt 'bwhn 'l
- (8) hyyhwn whyy 'hyh [wn]
- (9) wbnhywn

(1) In the month Elul of the year 396 (2) this *hmn*' and this altar (3) were made and dedicated by LŠMŠ and ZBYD' (4) the sons of MLKW, the son of YDY'BL, the son of NŠ' (5) called the son of 'BDBL, (6) from the tribe of the sons of MGRT to Shamash, (7) the God of the house of their fathers for (8) their life and the lives of their brothers (9) and children.

In this text the *hmn*' is mentioned along with the altar ('lt') and so the two words are to be differentiated from one another. According to Karl Elliger there is no compelling reason to think of

¹⁶ J. Starcky, *Syria* 26 (1949), pp. 55—59; cf. F. Rosenthal, *Die Sprache des palmyrenischen Inschriften* (1936), p. 90, n. 5.

¹⁷ For the meaning of 'tr' cf. Ch.-F. Jean — J. Hoftijzer, *Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest* (Leiden 1965), p. 27, s.v. 'šr II. The inscription 2 ter in H. Ingholt et J. Starcky, *op. cit.*, p. 144 expressly mentions the gift of a 'tr' to the god Abgal, so that the meaning „piece of property” is most probable.

¹⁸ Illustration in H. Ingholt, *op. cit.*, after p. 798.

two different cult objects¹⁹. However, the words 'lt' and 'tr', which Elliger calls synonymous, have completely different meanings, and this speaks against his interpretation. Only because Elliger understands the altar as the place ('tr') for the *hmn*' is he able to identify the *hmn*' with another altar and call it an „incense altar”. Harald Ingholt, on the other hand, identifies the *hmn*' with the incense altar in the form of a candelabra, which is shown between the two donors on the one side of the altar. He supposes that this incense altar was set on top of the stone altar bearing the inscription²⁰. Against this interpretation, however, speaks the fact that there is no proof for such a practice of placing two altars on top of one another. The example cited by Elliger from *Kefr et-Māḥaṭat* has meanwhile been demonstrated to be misleading²¹.

In the Palmyrenean inscriptions the altar is otherwise called 'lt'²². There can be no doubt that 'lt' means the altar which carries the inscription. The *hmn*' must then be differentiated from this altar. Since yet another altar is unlikely, the only supposition possible is that it is a cultic object other than an altar or a building. The altar and the *hmn*' were built for and dedicated to the god Shamash. In this connection *hmn*' means either a particular building in front of which or in which the altar stood or a statue of the god mentioned in the inscription.

The two-line Nabatean inscription No. 27 from *Dēr el-Mešqūq*, which lies approximately 25 km southeast of Bosra, is found on a stone which is broken in two pieces. This complete stone measures 159 cm by 32 cm but originally was probably somewhat longer. The inscription, in any case, seems to be complete. The two pieces were found in the wall of a Christian monastery²³. The stone may be dated in 124 A.D.

- (1) dnh *hmn*' dy 'bd m'yrw br 'qrb
- (2) bt 'šrw (?) 'lh' 'lh m'ynw šnt šb' lhdryns qysr

¹⁹ K. Elliger, ZAW 57 (1939), p. 262; cf. id., ZDPV 66 (1943), p. 133.

²⁰ H. Ingholt, *op. cit.*, p. 798.

²¹ K. Gallinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 68 ff.

²² Cf. CIS II, 3 nos. 3903 : 1; 3973 : 1, 10; 3975 : 3; 3980 : 1; 4002 : 2; 4008 : 1; 4013 : 3; 4014 : 2 f.; 4029 : 2; 4053 : 1; 4101 : 1.

²³ Cf. E. Littmann, *op. cit.*, ill. 3.

- (1) This is the *ḥmn'* that M'YRW son of 'QRB made.
 (2) House of the god 'ŠRW, the god of M'YNW. Year seven of Emperor Hadrian.

It may be considered as certain that this stone which was reused in the monastery was originally part of the structure called *ḥmn'*. Enno Littmann considered it as part of an altar and translated *ḥmn'* with „altar for the fire cult”²⁴. The size of the stone speaks against this view. Moreover, the altar used for incense burning was represented in the Nabatean inscriptions by *msgd/msgd*²⁵. Since the stone bearing the inscription cannot have been part of an altar, the meaning „altar” for *ḥmn'* is out of the question.

The inscription, however, mentions a temple in its second line with the words *bt 'ŠRW*²⁶. Enno Littmann restores the line under the *b* in *bt* to [*b*] *bt*, but then the house of the god 'ŠRW would be the place where the *ḥmn'* was kept. More parts of the added letter are not recognizable although the stone is well preserved at this point. Concerning Littmann's grounds for the restoration of an additional letter *b*, the piece is probably damaged and there is no additional letter present. If a simple *bt* is read, however, then the designation *bt 'ŠRW* can only be a further definition of *ḥmn'*. Therefore the *ḥmn'* is to be understood as the house of a god and a sanctuary which had been built by a private person.

The Nabatean inscription no. 97 is preserved only fragmentarily on the shattered abacus of a capital which was found west of the temple of *el-Hidr*. Two of the three fragments fit together. The letters obtained from this are read and added to by Enno Littmann in the following way:

- (A) [d]nh ḥm[n'] dy]
 (B/C) grb bdrw br [...]
 (A) This is the ḥm[n'] (B/C) which BRDW the son of ... dedicated.

²⁴ E. Littmann, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

²⁵ E. Littmann, *op. cit.*, nos. 23, 24, 96A, and 38. The pedestal for a statue (*šlm*) is explicitly called *bmws*, E. Littmann, *op. cit.*, no. 101, p. 78.

²⁶ On the difficulty of the reading of the name see E. Littmann, *op. cit.*, p. 26. He read 'šdw.

The reading of the letters obtained is highly uncertain but it cannot be checked since neither a photo nor a cast of it is available. The additions to Fragment A is at least in part determined by the fact that Enno Littmann understood the *ḥmn'* to be a fire altar. Of course there are altars in the form of a column, as the example from *el-Hidr* shows, but this altar is clearly designated as *msgd*²⁷. Because of the uncertainty in the reading, this inscription cannot be used for the determination of *ḥmn'* and therefore is excluded as evidence.

As Starcky has already demonstrated, the Palmyrenean inscriptions clearly show that by *ḥmn'* a certain structure was intended. Only in the inscription CIS 3978 could *ḥmn'* mean the statue of a god. In all the other inscriptions, however, this meaning is excluded. In particular the three very large blocks which were probably part of a *ḥmn'* could only have had their original position in a building and not in the pedestal for a statue of a god. In the Nabatean inscription no. 27, the *ḥmn'* is explicitly called the house of a god. Consequently, the *ḥmn'* is the name of a building which was dedicated to a god and can be best understood as a sanctuary even though its form cannot be more closely determined. It was always erected by a private person²⁸. It may be that it contained the statues of gods, but in any case sacrifices could be offered in front of it, especially since the altar is mentioned together with it. The *ḥmn'* is therefore to be differentiated both by its designation and by its probable smaller size from the public temple called *hykl'*.

The similarity of *ḥmn'* with *ḥammān* allows the conclusion that this term in Hebrew usage likewise refers to a sanctuary. The only difficulties for this understanding are presented by the closer definition of *ḥammānīm* in 2 Chr 34:4. The words *lm'lh m'lh* used there are singular in Hebrew. The expression *lm'lh* has the

²⁷ E. Littmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 71—74 and ill. 11.

²⁸ In the region northwest of Palmyra three different types of temple layouts were uncovered without any of them being able to be called a *ḥmn'* with certainty. Cf. D. Schlumberger, *La Palmyrène du nord-ouest* (Paris 1951), pp. 13 ff. The shrine of Abgal, which consisted of several buildings, is expressly designated as *hykl'*, H. Ingholt et J. Starcky, *op. cit.*, no. 3b, p. 145 and no. 7, p. 146.

basic meaning of „up”, „upwards”, while *m'l* is to be literally understood as „from above”. The expression thus emphasizes that the *ḥammānīm* were located over the altars. Accordingly, the altars stood under the *ḥammānīm* and thus within it. The meaning „sanctuary” is thereby confirmed.

In all other places this meaning for *ḥammānīm* results in good sense. The juxtaposition with the high places in Lev 26:30; 1 Chr 14:4 as well as the parallelism with altars and cult structures in Ezek 6:4, 6; Isa 27:9, 17:8; 2 Chr 34:4, 7 fits well with a sanctuary built of stone. The word in Hebrew usage probably designates those temples in which foreign gods were worshipped. The verbs used in connection with the *ḥammānīm*, *šbr* „shatter” in Ezek 6:4, *gd'* „beat to pieces” in Ezek 6:6 and 2 Chr 34:7, *qwm* „stand upright” in Isa 27:9, *krt* Hi. „root up” and *ntz* Pi. „tear down” in 2 Chr 34:4 could well be used in connection with a building made of stone. The *ḥammānīm* have not yet been archaeologically established so a closer determination of its form and origin is not possible.

Ḥammān would fit very well in the wider Hebrew usage of the post-exilic period as a designation for sanctuaries of non Jahwistic cults. Of the words for temple, the term *h'kl* refers — with one exception — only to the temple of Jerusalem²⁹. Otherwise, temples are called *mqdš*³⁰. In the post-exilic period the temple in Jerusalem was predominantly called *mqdš*³¹. Already in the prophets and the deuteronomical works the temples outside of Jerusalem not fit for worshipping Jahwe were called by the word for high place, *bmh*³², and this usage was kept in the epoch of the

²⁹ 2 Kgs 18 : 16; 23 : 4; 24 : 13; Isa 6 : 1; Jer 7 : 4; 24 : 1; Ezek 8 : 16; Hag 2 : 15, 18; Zech 6 : 12—15; Ezra 3 : 6, 10. Only the temple in Shiloh is called *h'kl* in 1 Sam 1 : 9 and 3 : 3.

³⁰ Cf. Josh 24 : 26 (Shechem), Isa 16 : 12 (Moab), Amos 7 : 9, 13 (Bethel). The word is for the most part used in the cultic speech of the Psalms as the designation of the temple of Jerusalem, cf. Ps 68 : 36; 73 : 17; 74 : 7; 78 : 69; 96 : 6.

³¹ Cf. Ezek 5 : 11; 7 : 24; 8 : 6; 9 : 6; 11 : 16, 23, 38 f.; 24 : 21; 25 : 3; Lam 1 : 10; 2 : 7, 10; Lev 12 : 4; 16 : 33; 19 : 30; 20 : 3; 21 : 12, 23.

³² Cf. Amos 7 : 9; Hosea 10 : 8; Jer 19 : 3—5; 1 Kgs 11 : 7; 14 : 23; 22 : 44; 2 Kgs 12 : 4; 14 : 4; 15 : 4, 35; 16 : 4; 17 : 9, 11; 18 : 4, 22;

second temple³³. Moreover, a special word for the temples for foreign gods could have been adopted in the exilic — post-exilic period. At any rate, the incense altar is also called *mzbh* and the addition of *qrt* is then possible³⁴, so that the meaning „incense altar” for the *ḥammān* also can be excluded on the grounds of word usage.

21 : 3; 23 : 5, 8, 13, 15 and in connection with *byt* 1 Kgs 12 : 31; 13 : 32; 2 Kgs 17 : 29, 32; 23 : 13.

³³ Cf. 1 Chr 16 : 39; 21 : 29; 2 Chr 14 : 2, 4; 15 : 17; 17 : 6; 20 : 33; 21 : 11; 28 : 4, 25; 31 : 1; 32 : 12; 33 : 3.

³⁴ Exod 30 : 27; 31 : 8; 35 : 15; 37 : 25; 1 Chr 6 : 34; 28 : 18; 2 Chr 26 : 16, 19.