THE MEANING OF Dipp IN HEBREW.

ETYMOLOGICALLY קַקוֹם should no doubt be 'something which stands up', or a 'place where something stands'; and though in course of time this became weakened to 'site' or 'place', there are many passages in which the word must have a more definite and special sense. Four such passages may be taken as representative : (a) Gen. xii 6 become R.V. the place of Shechem; (b) Gen. xiii 14 שנה R.V. look from the place where thou art; (c) Gen. xxii 4 ניק younder, noining to it); (d) Gen. xxviii 11 . . . ויקר מאבני הכוקום הרוא ויישנע במקום ה. . ויקר מאבני הכוקום הוא N.V. and he lighted upon a certain place . . and he took one of the stones of the place . . and lay down in that place to sleep. He was on his way to Haran, but 'the place' was not Haran (cf. ver. 19).

In these passages $\exists a \notin a$, if it means merely 'place', is intolerably weak. In *a* it is superfluous; in *b* the whole phrase $\exists a \notin a \notin a$ is unnecessary; in *c* it must have been something conspicuous from a distance; as to *d*, you do not light upon a place when you are in a place, and the article shews that (at any rate according to masoretic tradition) it was something definite he found there, not 'a certain place' (and therefore not to be classed with the instances quoted in Ges.-Kautzsch § 126r); we should expect 'he took a stone' and 'he lay down to sleep there', omitting $\exists a \in a \in a$.

As the text stands some special meaning is required for unque. In modern Palestine the corresponding word all is the proper term for a sacred spot under the protection of a nabi' or wali (saint). In the Survey of Western Palestine, Special Papers (London, 1881), p. 258+, Conder says 'the white dome of the Mukâm is the most conspicuous object in a Syrian village. The sacred chapel on the hill-top, or the sacred tree by the road-side, is of constant occurrence.' 'Few who have visited Palestine will doubt that in the Mukâm we see the survival of the Canaanite false worship; and in one case (Sheikh Abu 'Amr) I found beside the chapel a huge platform of unsquared stone and a pit cut in the rock, which seemed not impossibly to be the remains of the ancient altar of this divinity.' The mukâm is ordinarily a little square modern building with a dome, often with a large sacred tree near it, or it may be merely a rude circle of stones. The important thing is the sanctity of it. 'The chapels are sanctuaries in which property can be left with perfect safety.' The anger of the wali is much feared, and his

power may extend for ten or twenty miles round. See also *PEF*., QS., October, 1915, p. 170+.

If $main = \alpha$, this description gives a meaning to the passages quoted above, as well as to others. It must have been something which stands up, a building, tree, pillar, or cairn, not a mere site, as the commentators usually take it. This 'shrine' (for want of a wider term) afforded protection alike from men and demons, so that travellers would naturally encamp in or near it for the night. Thus in a Abram went w as far as the shrine at S and stopped there for the night. In Gen. xii 8 he made a aqua between Bethel and Ai by building an altar and dedicating it to (' called upon the name of') the Lord. This is shewn by b (xiii 3, 4, 14) look from the shrine where thou art camping. In c they saw the shrine from afar, because it was conspicuous on the hill-top. It was a recognized place of sacrifice, with an altar. Abraham the altar, which was already there, but the altar, which was already there, but was out of repair, as things usually are in the East. Most interesting is d. Jacob, on his way from Beersheba to Haran, lighted upon the that is to say, the shrine which was the natural stopping-place on his journey, and which Jacob knew just as the Bedouin know the best camping-places now. He took one of the stones of the shrine (which may have been only a heap or circle of loose stones) for a pillow, and lay down inside the shrine itself. Then follows a vision, which causes Jacob to exclaim in ver. 16 אכן יש יהוה במקום הזה ואנכי לא ידעתיa strong expression of surprise. 'Why ! the Lord is in this shrine. I knew it was sacred to some divinity, but I did not know that the Lord himself was here. This shrine really is to be revered (מה נורא).' We then see how a shrine would develope. In memory of his experience, Jacob dedicated a pillar, gave the shrine a name (it was near a town called in ancient times Luz) and vowed to erect a better building on his return. The writer of Gen. xxviii no doubt had in mind the important sanctuary afterwards existing at Bethel, and was here shewing reasons for its reputation. Perhaps also he was trying to justify the reverence for shrines, which was common in his day as it had been long before and still is.

The association of a temple or sacred place or object with dreams, visions, and supernatural occurrences, has been common at all times and needs no illustration. If then this explanation of dqtd is right, we may expect the same association. In *a* Abram came to the dqtd and in ver. 7 the Lord appeared to him. In *b* he was at the dqtd when the Lord spoke to him. In *c* he was about to sacrifice Isaac on the altar of the dqtd when the angel of the Lord called to him (xxii 11). In *d* Jacob was sleeping in the dqtd he had the vision. So in Gen. xiii 18 Abram built an altar at the oaks of Mamre, which

A. COWLEY.

TWO NOTES ON EUTHALIUS OF SULCI.

I. THE ATHOS-DOCUMENT.

A FEW years ago interest in Euthalius was increased by the publication of a document (*Cod. Laura, Athos* 149, f. 1-4) for which the claim was made that it solved the problems clustering about him. Its superscription ran: Euthaliou $\epsilon \pi i \sigma \kappa o \pi o \Sigma o \nu \lambda \kappa \eta s$ o $\mu o \lambda o \gamma i a \pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \eta s$ o $\rho \theta o \delta o \delta \sigma v$ $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$.¹ A fresh examination of the document is offered in this note.

During the second Session of the Lateran Synod of A.D. 619, Deusdedit of Cagliari, in his indictment of Pyrrhus and the conception $\tau \eta \nu \theta \epsilon a \nu \delta \rho \mu \kappa \eta \nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \iota a \nu$, asked that the $\ell \kappa \theta \epsilon \sigma \mu$ of the Emperor Heraclius should be read. A version of it is preserved in Mansi,² introduced thus:

Η ἕκθεσις Ήρακλείου τοῦ βασιλέως ληφθήτω καὶ ἀναγνωθήτω. καὶ λαβῶν Ἀναστάσιος νοτάριος ῥεγεωνάριος τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου προς τὴν Ῥωμαίαν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐλλάδος ἑρμηνευθεῖσαν φωνῆς ἀνέγνω.

A comparison of this document and the one from Athos shews a series of noteworthy parallels; the chief of which are given below. I denote the Mansi-document A, and the Athos-document B.

Α. πιστεύομεν είς πατέρα και υίον και άγιον πνεθμα.

B. πιστευω εις ενα θν πρα παντοκρατορα και εις τον υιον αυτου τον μονογενη και εις το αγιον πνα.

¹ von Soden Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments (1902) i 1. 637 ff.

² Conciliorum Coll. x 992-998.