

NOTES AND QUERIES.

1. *Mount Zion*.—It is proposed to show (1) the precise meaning of Zion or Mount Zion in the Old Testament, and (2) the approximate position of Golgotha thereon.

It has already been pointed out in the *Quarterly Statement*, 1881 p. 94, that six historical passages in the Bible show that Zion, and the stronghold (of Zion) and the City of David are one and the same place, being situated, according to Nehemiah, on Ophel (so called), south of the temple. 1 Maccabees eight times mentions Mount Zion, obviously referring to the temple or sanctuary (here Thrupp errs), but never Zion (*Quarterly Statement*, 1878, p. 182), using instead the term "City of David." Josephus mentions neither Zion nor Mount Zion, and names the City of David (only twice) in one passage, but he often substitutes for it in his *Antiquities* the less precise term Jerusalem. In the poetical and prophetic passages of the Old Testament, both Zion and Mount Zion have often a wider meaning, always, however, limited to the eastern ridge (Mount Moriah), or to its inhabitants, but neither term is used as equivalent to Jerusalem.

I assert this deliberately, after examining all the passages I can find (over 130) in which the terms occur, and after finding, to my surprise, that the stock texts quoted to prove the contrary, with one voice, really support this view.

Some five cases, however, need explanation:—

(1) Is. lxvi, 20, "To my holy mountain Jerusalem." As "the holy mountain" in the Bible doubtless means Mount Zion, my contention seems, at first sight, to fail. The LXX, however, read *city* instead of *mountain*. Jerusalem is repeatedly called the holy city, and Zion oftener the holy mountain. Mountain is obviously a wrong reading.

(2) Is. lii, 8, "When the Lord shall bring again Zion." It is hard to move hills. The Revised Version, however, translates "returneth to Zion."

(3) Zech. ii, 7, "Ho! Zion, escape, thou that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon." The LXX here again give timely aid. "Escape to Zion" (*εἰς Σιών*). The Jews in Babylon are simply urged to return to Zion.

(4) Is. lx, 14, "They shall call thee the City of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." This hardly needs notice. Zion was *literally* the City of David; elsewhere it is called the City of God, and its name may here represent its inhabitants, just as Jerusalem represents its own citizens in the New Testament.

(5) Is. xl, 9, "O Zion that bringest good tidings." As the Revised Version gives, "O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion," the apparent difficulty vanishes.

Writers have urged that poetical parallelism frequently shows that Zion is equivalent to Jerusalem, *e.g.*, "They build up Zion with blood and Jerusalem with iniquity"; again, "Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem, praise thy God, O Zion." (Micah iii, 10; Psalms cxlvii, 12). Similar instances abound. To assert from this that Zion is the same as Jerusalem, seems to me most strange. But if it be clear to Hebrew scholars, perhaps they will point out why the following should not also prove that Zion was Judah, and the cities of Judah, *i.e.*, that a small place was identical with the land of a whole tribe, and also with many cities. Here are the texts to be tested: (a) Jer. xiv, 19, "Hast thou utterly rejected Judah, hath thy soul lothed Zion?" (b) Psalms lxix, 35, "God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah." Also xlviii, 11; xevii, 8.

The only Biblical approach to Zion meaning Jerusalem is in Revised Version, Acts iv, 27, *in this city* (which Alford says answers to "on Mount Zion," Psalms ii, 6), including the Upper City (S.W. hill), in which Herod may have been when Pilate sent Jesus *up* (Bengel, ἀνέπεμψεν) to him (from Antonia). This might suggest that Zion had then begun to lose its limited application to the eastern hill: then, the change advanced further through Josephus, until the Christians of the fourth century applied the name of Zion to the south-west hill alone. As to the Old Testament, Fergusson (I believe) was right in not regarding Zion and Jerusalem as one and the same place. Just as Westminster may be part of London but is not identical with it, so, I maintain, Zion was part of Jerusalem, but never was identical with it. If this conclusion is correct, it remains to be shown that while the sepulchres of David were at the southern extremity of (Mount Zion), the eastern ridge, the tomb of David's son was towards its northern extremity on the ridge, east of the Damascus Gate (*Quarterly Statement*, 1891, p. 255).

2. *Cypriote Weights*.—The differing forms of the Cypriote character, *ro*, to which Mr. Macalister draws attention, are of no import. The round-headed and diamond-headed forms are more common even than the flat-headed. I do not know why he should assume that the coins inscribed *ro* and *ro-s(e)* should each weigh "one rôs." Such an assumption is not at all likely, as no numeral is expressed in either case. The discovery of the new weight in the Maccabean stratum is interesting. The weight itself, however, must be of earlier date, since the Cypriote characters can hardly be later than the age of Alexander the Great.

PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE.

3. *The Bronze Scimitar*.—The bronze scimitar discovered by Mr. Macalister (*Quarterly Statement* for October, 1904, pp. 334, 335), with its flanged handle, has the same shape as an Assyrian scimitar with a similar handle now in the British Museum, which bears the name of Hadad-nirari I (B.C. 1330). The latter has been published in the *Transactions* of the Society of Biblical Archæology, iv, p. 347. The form goes back to that of the Egyptian "khopesh," as depicted, for instance, in a Xth dynasty tomb at Assiût.¹

PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE.

4. *The Egyptian Cylinder*.—Professor Petrie has kindly communicated the following interpretation of the cylinder illustrated



in the *Quarterly Statement*, 1904, p. 336, "the keeper of the horses, beloved of Set, Ara, having future life." The flower after a name is usual from the XIXth to XXVth dynasties, though generally for women's names. The *set* and the "horse" are not clear in the copy, but probably must be read so.

¹ [Prof. Petrie, in a private communication, remarks that the form is Egyptian XIXth dynasty, perhaps borrowed from abroad, although the work is reminiscent of the Assyrian falchion referred to.—ED.]