# Z

## Zaanaim[[@Headword:Zaanaim]]

             (Heb. Tsaana'yim, צִעֲנִיַם; Sept. . πλεονεκτούντων v.r. ἀναπαυομένων; Vulg. Seniim), the name of a “plain” (אֵלון, εο6ν), more accurately “the oak by (בְּ) Zaannaim,” a tree-probably a sacred tree mentioned as marking the spot hear which Heber the Kenite was encamped when Sisera took refuge in his tent (Jdg 4:11). Its situation is defined as “near Kedesh,” i.e. Kedesh-Naphtali, the name of which still lingers on the high ground north of Safed and west of the lake of el-Huleh usually identified with the Waters of Merom. The Targum gives as the equivalent of the name mishár agganiya, “the plain of the swamp;” and in the well- known passage of the Talmud (Megillah Jeirush. ch. 1) which contains a list of several of the towns of Galilee with their then identifications, the equivalent for “Elon (or Aijalon) be-Zaannaim” is Agniya hak-kodesh. Agne appears to signify a swamp, and can hardly refer to anything but the marsh which borders the lake of Huleh on the north side, and which was probably more extensive in the time of Deborah than it now is. SEE MEROM.

On the other hand, Prof. Stanley has pointed out (Jewish Church, p. 324; Localities, p. 197) how appropriate a situation for this memorable tree is afforded by “a green plain... studded with massive terebinths,” which adjoins on the south the plain containing the remains of Kedesh. The whole of this upland country is more or less rich in terebinths. One such, larger than usual, and bearing the name of Sejar em-Messiah, is marked on the map of Van de Velde as six miles north-west of Kedes. The name Zaanaim, which appears to' signify “removings” (as if a camping ground), has passed away at least no trace of it has yet been discovered (Porter, Handbook, p. 444; Van de Velde, Travels, 2, 418). “From the identity of signification, it has been conjectured to be Bessun, a little east of Tabor. In this plain the black tents of the Bedawin, the modern Kenites, may constantly be seen” (Tristram, Bible Places, p. 278). SEE ZAANANNIM.

## Zaanan[[@Headword:Zaanan]]

             (Heb. Tsaanân, צִאֲנָן; Sept. Σενναάρ; Vulg. in exitu), a place named by Micah (Mic 1:11) in his address to the towns of the Shefelah. This sentence, like others of the same passage, contains a play of words founded on the meaning (or on a possible meaning) of the name Zaanan, as derived from yatsâ, to go forth: “The inhabitress of Tsaanan came not forth.” Both Gesenius and First, however, connect the word with צאֹן, making it mean a place abounding with (or fit for) flocks. The division of the passage shown in the Sept and A.V., by which Zaanan is connected with Beth-ezel, is now generally recognized as inaccurate. It is thus given by Dr. Pusey, in his Commnentaryns,”The inhabitant of Zaanan came not forth. The mourning of Beth-ezel shall take from you its standing.” So also Ewald, De Wette, and Zunz. The place is doubtless identical with ZENAN SEE ZENAN (q.v.).

## Zaanannim[[@Headword:Zaanannim]]

             (Heb. Tsaanannim', צִעֲנִנַּים; Sept. Βεσενανίμ, v.r. Σεεννανίμ; Vulg. Saanunim), a place mentioned only (in this form) in Jos 19:33, and in the Keri or margin of Jdg 4:11; but usually thought to be the more correct form of Zaanaim (q.v.), which occurs in the text of the latter passage. It appears to be derived (if a Hebrew word) from a root (צָעִן, to migrate) signifying to load beasts as nomads do when they change their places of residence (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1177). The rendering of the A. V. is incorrect “And their coast was from Heleph, from Allon to Zaunannimi.” The Hebrew is מֵאִלּוֹן בְּצִעֲנִנַּים, and can only signify from the oak of (or “in”) Zaanannim” (see Keil, ad loc.; Reland, Palaest. p. 717; Keil and Delitzsch, On Jdg 4:11; Porter, Giant Cities of Bashan, p. 268).

## Zaavan[[@Headword:Zaavan]]

             (Heb. Tsaavan', צִעֲוָן, migratory; Septs Zovicaip v.r. ‘ Ι᾿ωακάν; Vulg. Zavan), a Horite chieftain, second named of the three sons of Ezer. (Gen 36:27; 1Ch 1:42, “Zavan”). B.C. post 1927.

## Zabad[[@Headword:Zabad]]

             (Heb. Zabad', זָבָד, gift; Sept. Ζαβέδ v.r. Ζαβέτ or Ζαβάτ. etc.), the name of several Hebrews.

1. One of David's warriors, being son of Nathan and father of Ephlal, in the lineage of Sheshan's daughter Ahlai by the Egyptian slave Jarha (1Ch 2:36-37; 1Ch 11:41). B.C. 1046.

2. An Ephraimite, son of Tahath and father of Shuthelah 2 (1Ch 7:21). B.C. post 1875. 3. The regicide, son of an Ammonitess named Shimeath, who, in conjunction with Jehozabad, the son of a Moabitess, slew king Joash, to whom they were both household officers, in his bed (2Ki 12:21; 2Ch 24:25-26)., In the first of these texts he is called JOZACHAR SEE JOZACHAR (q.v.).

The sacred historian does not appear to record the mongrel parentage of these men as suggesting a reason for their being more easily led to this act. but as indicating the sense which was entertained of the enormity of Joash's conduct that even they though servants to the king, and though only half Jews by birth, were led to conspire against him “for the blood of the sons of Jehoiada the priest.” It would seem that their murderous act was-not abhorred by the people; for Amaziah, the son of Joash did not venture to call them to account till he felt himself well established on the throne, when they were both put to death (2Ki 14:5-6; 2Ch 25:3-4). Joash had become unpopular from his idolatries (2Ch 24:18), his oppression (2Ch 25:22), and, above all, his calamities (2Ch 25:23-25). The assassins were both put to death by Amaziah, but their children were spared in obedience to the law of Moses (Deu 10:14; Deu 10:16). The coincidence between the names Zechariah and Jozachar is remarkable.

4, 5, 6. Three Israelites, “sons” respectively of Zattu (Ezr 10:27), Hashum (Ezr 10:33), and Nebo (Ezr 10:43), who divorced their Gentile wives, married after the return from Babylon. B.C.458.

## Zabadaean[[@Headword:Zabadaean]]

             (Ζαβαδαῖος), the designation of an Arab tribe who were attacked and spoiled by Jonathan, on his way back to Damascus from his fruitless pursuit of the army of Demetrius (1Ma 12:31). Josephus calls them Nabatceans (Ant. 13:5, 10), but he is evidently in error. Nothing certain is known of them. Ewald (Gesch. 4:382) finds a trace of their name in that of  the place Zabada given by Robinson in his lists; but this is too far south, between the Yarmuk and the Zerka. Michaelis suggests the Arab tribe Zobeideh; but they do not appear in the necessary locality. Jonathan had pursued the enemy's army as far as the river Eleltherus (Nahr el-Kebir), and was on his march back to Damascus when he attacked and plundered the Zabadlaans. We must look for them, therefore, somewhere to the north-west of Damascus. Accordingly, on the road from Damascus to Baalbek, at a distance of eight and two-third hours (twenty-six miles) from the former place, is the village of Zebdany, standing at the upper end of a plain of the same name, which is the very center of Antilibanus. The name is possibly a relic of the ancient tribe of the Zabadaeans. According to Burckhardt (Syria. p. 3), the plain “is about three quarters of an hour in breadth and three hours in length; it is called Ard Zebdeni, or the district of Zebdeni; it is watered by the Barrada, one of whose sources is in the midst of it, and by the rivulet called Moiet Zebdeni, whose source is in the mountain behind the village of the same name.” The plain is “limited on one side by the eastern part of the Antilibanus, called here Jebel Zebdent. The village is of considerable size, containing nearly 3000 inhabitants, who breed cattle and the silkworm, and have some dyeing-houses” (ibid.). Not far from Zebdany, on the western slopes of Antilibanus, is another village called Kefi Zebad, which again seems to point to this as the district formerly occupied by the Zabadaeans.

## Zabadaias[[@Headword:Zabadaias]]

             (Ζαβαδαίας), the Greek form (1Es 9:35) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:43) ZABAD SEE ZABAD (q.v.).

## Zabadaias (2)[[@Headword:Zabadaias (2)]]

             (Ζαβδαῖος), the Greek form (1Es 9:21) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:20) ZEBADIAH SEE ZEBADIAH (q.v.).

Zab'bai (Heb. Zabdi', זִבְדַּי, my gift; Sept. Ζαβδί,Ζαβρί, Ζαμβρί, etc.; Vulg. Zabdi, Zabdias), the name of several Hebrews.

1. Son of Zerah and father of Carmi the son of Achan of the tribe of Judah (Jos 7:1; Jos 7:17-18). B.C. ante 1618.

2. Third named of the nine sons of Shimhi (Shimei) the Benjamite (1Ch 8:19). B.C. cir. 1612.

3. A Shiphmite (i.e. inhabitant of Shepham), David's commissary of vineyards and wine-cellars (1Ch 27:27). B.C. 1043.

4. An Asaphite, father of Micha and grandfather of Mattaniah (Neh 11:17); elsewhere called ZACCUR (12, 35) and ZICHRI (1Ch 9:15). B.C. ante 446.

## Zabarella (or De Zabarellis)[[@Headword:Zabarella (or De Zabarellis)]]

             archbishop of Florence and cardinal, the most notable man among the Italians present at the Council of Constance, was born at Padua in 1339. He studied canon law at Bologna, and taught at Padua. During the siege of the city by the Venetians he was deputed to invoke the assistance of France, and, after Padua had surrendered, he was the orator of the fourteen deputies who, in St. Mark's Place in Venice, handed over the Paduani flag. He subsequently migrated to Florence, and engaged in teaching canon law. After a time the town authorities elected him archbishop, but it was found that the pope had already given the place to another. Boniface IX called him to Rome to submit an opinion respecting the best methods for healing the schism in the Church, on which question he wrote the book De Schismatibus Auctoritate Temperatoris Tollendis (Basle, 1565; Strasburg, 1609, 1618), which, together with the preface by Schardius, was placed in the index. He was appointed archipresbyter to the cathedral on his return to Padua, and held a wealthy abbacy for a time, and until the dissolute John XXIII, who favored learned men, called him to Rome and made him archbishop of Florence and cardinal-deacon, with the title of St. Cosmasand Damianus (1411). He had previously earned a scholarly reputation by the numerous books which emanated from his pen.

When arrangements were made for the Council of Constance, Zabarella was one of the papal envoys to the court of emperor Sigismund. In the council itself he, as the youngest cardinal, announced the time of the first session and read the bull of John XXIII, intended to regulate the drift of its business. He joined other cardinals in submitting a memorial relating to a reform in the administration of the papal court, and read the offer by which the pope volunteered to abdicate if the antipopes would renounce their pretensions to his office. When John fled from Constance, Zabarella supported the resolutions affirming the superiority of a general council to a pope; but he nevertheless incurred the censure of the council by an unfairness committed in the interest of the pope, in connection with the reading of resolutions which had been agreed upon, affirming the divine right of the council to require the submission of all people, including the pope, in all matters concerning the faith, the removal of the existing  schism, and the reformation of the Church in head and members, the italicized clause having been omitted by him from the reading. He was eventually sent with a delegation of cardinals to negotiate with John, and obtained from him the unconditional surrender of his pontificate.

Zabarella participated also in the negotiations with Huss, and suggested the drawing up of an exceedingly mild formula of retraction, which the reformer, however, refused to sign. In connection with the schism he delivered a strong argument against pope Benedict, in which he charged the miserable state of the Church upon the obstinacy of its leaders; and when a new pope was to be chosen, he delivered another speech in support of the cardinals' view that the election ought to precede any movement looking towards a reformation of the Church, which was so violent that he predicted it would be the occasion of his death. He soon became dangerously sick, and died September 26, 1417 (others say November 5). It is probable that he would have been chosen pope, instead of Martin V, but for his early death.

Zabarella wrote numerous works of limited extent, e.g. Comment. in Libros Decretal, et Clementinas (Venice, 1602): — Comment. in Clementinas (ibid. 1481, 1487): — Consilia Juris (ibid. 1581): — Variar. Legum Repetitiones (ibid. 1587): — De Schisnatibus (sulpra), etc. See Von d. Hardt, Aktenz d. Conast. Concils, tom. 1; Lenfant, Hist. du. Concil. de Constance, passim; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zabarella, Bartholomew[[@Headword:Zabarella, Bartholomew]]

             nephew and heir to the cardinal, a teacher of canon law at Padua, participant in important consultations at the papal court, and ultimately archbishop of Florence. He died in 1445. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zabarella, Jacob[[@Headword:Zabarella, Jacob]]

             professor at Padua, A.D. 1564 et seq., and author of the book, De Inventione Eterni Motoris. Ideas presented in the book and otherwise, exposed him, before the inquisition, to the charge of doubting the immortality of the soul, from which, however, he was acquitted. He was born at Padua in 1533, and died in 1589. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zabathaites[[@Headword:Zabathaites]]

             the followers of Zabathai Zevi (or Sabatai Sebi), a celebrated Jewish impostor, who appeared at Smyrna about 1666, and, pretending to be the Messiah, promised to deliver the Jews, and re-establish them in more than pristine glory. Multitudes of his nation were deceived by him, and many of his followers pretended to visions and prophetic ecstasies. At length, falling into the hands of the sultan, he ordered him to be placed as a mark for his archers, to prove whether he was vulnerable or not (as he pretended), to avoid which Zevi turned Mohammedan. SEE MESSIAHS, FALSE.

His sect, however, survived, and there is said to be still a remnant of them at Saloniki, who, while they profess to be Mussulmans, observe the Jewish rites in secret, marry among themselves, and all live in the same quarter of the city, without communicating with the Turks, except in commerce, and in the mosques. Zevi, it seems, had also adherents among the Jews of England, Holland, Germany, and Poland, some of which have remained to our own time; and M. Gregoire mentions a musician of this sect who came to Paris so lately as in 1808. See Adams, Hist. of the Jews, pages 316, 528; Gregoire, Hist. 2:309-313. SEE SABBATHAI.

## Zabbai[[@Headword:Zabbai]]

             (Heb. Zabbay', זִבִּי [prob. an error for זִכִּי, Zakkay']; Sept. Ζαβού; Vulg. Zabbai and Zachai), the name of two Hebrews.

1. The father of Baruch, which latter repaired part of the wall of Jerusalem after the Captivity (Nehemiah 3, 20). B.C. ante 446. He is perhaps the same with ZACCAI SEE ZACCAI (q.v.) of Ezra 2, 9.

2. A descendant of Bebai, who divorced his Gentile wife married after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:28). B.C. 458.

## Zabbud[[@Headword:Zabbud]]

             (Heb. Zabbud', זִבּוּד [prob. an error for זִכּוּר, Zakkuir, as in the marg.]; Sept. Ζαβούδ), a “son” of Bigvai who returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:14). B.C. 459. SEE ZACCUR.

## Zabdiel[[@Headword:Zabdiel]]

             (Heb. Zabdiel', זִבְדַּיאֵל, gift of God), the name of three Jews mentioned in the Old Test and Apocrypha.

1. (Sept. Ζαβδιήλ.) The father of Jashobeam, the chief of David's warriors (1Ch 27:2). B.C. ante 1046.

2. (Sept. Ζοχριήλ v.r. Βαδιήλ) Son of Haggedolim (“one of the great men”) and overseer of 128 of the captives returned from Babylon (Neh 11:14). B.C. 459.

3. (Sept. Ζαβδιήλ; Josephus, Ζάβηλος; Vulg. Zabdiel.) An: Arabian chieftain who put Alexander Balas to death (1Ma 11:17; Josephus, Ant. 13:4, 8). According to Diodorus, Balas was murdered by two of the officers who accompanied him (Müller, Fragm. Hist. 2, 16).

## Zabians[[@Headword:Zabians]]

             an ancient sect, said to be Chaldeans, addicted to astrology and star- worship. The word is derived, according to Pococke, from the Aramaic tsabad, the heavenly host, from which same root the word Sabian is taken, but in the different sense of "to change religion." The Zabians were idolaters, (dwelling in the north of Mesopotamia, in the Biblical Haran. An Arabic writer, quoted by Chwolsohn, says that they adopted the name Zabian as being a religion tolerated by the Koran, and so escaped the persecution to which their star-worship would have exposed them. They first gave planetary names to the days of the week; the feast day of each planet being determined by the time of its culmination; hence, also, the alchemists of the Middle Ages, and through them heralds, have borrowed the notion of assigning a particular metal and a particular color to the several planets. In common with other Aramaic races they had a civil year, which began like the Jewish Rosh Ia-Shanah in autumn, and an ecclesiastical year commencing at the vernal equinox. Before the time of Mohammed they offered human sacrifices to the deities which they believed were embodied in the planets. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. SEE SABIANS.

## Zabism[[@Headword:Zabism]]

             the religion of the Zabians (q.v.), or Haranian idolaters. It was formerly understood that they were a distinct race, and that their religion was composed of Chaldaism, Parsaism, Judaism, Christianity, Neo-Platonism, Gnosticism, and cabalistic speculations. This is not, however, strictly true. They might best be described as Syrians, who, partly descended from Greek colonists, had been subject so long to Syrian influences that they became in a manner Syrianized. Their religion was the old heathenism of their fathers, which had, with incredible obstinacy, resisted not only Christianity, but rendered even Mohammedan ill-will harmless by stratagem. But there were certain nonpagan elements which crept into it during the early centuries, and many other additions of later years. We mention, first of all, a number of legends about Biblical personages, from whom they pretend to be descendants. There are also laws of purity and impurity, and of sacrifices, which are very similar to Judaism. Then again, names of Greek and Roman gods, such as Helios, Ares, and Kronos, occur, a circumstance which may be explained from the prevailing tendency of the period of exchanging the names of native divinities for Greek and Roman names. There are also certain metaphysical and physical views incorporated in their creed, which are distinctly traceable to Aristotle, and finally, the Neo-Platonic philosophy of heathenism, as presented by Porphyry, Proclus, Iamblichuls, and others. All these elements, infused into it by the circumstances of the period, do not prevent it from being in reality heathenism.

The sources of information in reference to the creed are written in Arabic, in Hebrew, and in Greek. The Arabic are the most copious; the Hebrew are chiefly, represented by Maimonides; and the Greek are ascribed to various pseudonymous writers, among whom are Aristotle and Hermes Trismegistus. From these, though somewhat various and contradictory, the following facts may be gathered in reference to the creed. The Creator is one in essence, primity, originality, and eternity; but manifold in his manifestations in bodily figures. He is chiefly personified by the seven leading planets, and the good, knowing, and excellent of earthly bodies. But his unity, their claim, is not thereby disturbed; and it is "as if the seven planets were his seven limbs, and as if our seven limbs were his seven spheres, in which he manifests himself, so that he speaks with our tongue, sees with our eyes, hears with our ears, touches with our hands, comes and goes with our feet, and acts through our members."

Zabism expresses the  idea that God is too great and too sublime to occupy himself directly with the affairs of this world; that he therefore has handed over its ruling to the gods, and that he himself only takes the most important things under his special care; and that man is too weak to address himself directly to the highest, and is therefore obliged to direct prayers and sacrifices to the intermediate deities to whom the rule of the world is intrusted. Thus the veneration of the planets, and even the worshipping of idols, is nothing but a symbolical act, the consequence of that original idea. There are many gods and goddesses in Zabism of this intermediate stamp. It is not the planets themselves, but the spirits that direct them, conceived as deities that stand to the spheres in the relation of soul and body. Apart from these there are those gods who cause or represent every action in this world. Every universal natural deed or effect emanates from a universal deity, every partial one from a partial deity that presides over part of nature. These gods know our most secret thoughts, and all our future is open to them.

The female deities seem to have been conceived of as the feeling or passive principle. These gods or intelligences emanate directly from God without his will, as rays do from the sun. They are of abstract forms, free of all matter, and neither made of any substance nor material. They consist chiefly of a light in which there is no darkness, which the senses cannot appreciate, by reason of its immense clearness, which the understanding cannot comprehend, by reason of its extreme delicacy, and which fancy and imagination cannot fathom. Their nature is free from all animal desires, and they themselves are created for love and harmony, friendship and unity. Their existence is full of the highest bliss, by reason of their nearness to the Most High; they have a free choice, and always incline to the good; and are the "lords and gods" of the Zalians, their "intermediators and advocates with the Lord of lords and God of gods." All substances and types of the bodily world emanate from the spiritual world, which is one from which everything flows and to which everything returns, and which is full of light, sublime and pure.

These two worlds correspond to each other, and are to each other like light and shadow. The way to approach these gods, and through them the highest essence, is by purifying the soul from all passions, by keeping a strict guard over one's words and deeds, by fasting, sincere prayer, invocations, sacrifices, fumigations, and incantations. By steadfastly persevering in these and similar acts of devotion, man may reach so high a step of perfection that he may communicate even directly with the Supreme Power. The planets, as the principal representative and intermediate gods, are to be carefully observed, especially as regards (1) the houses and  stations of the planets; (2) their rising and setting; (3) their respective conjunctions and oppositions; (4) the knowledge of their special times and seasons, the hours and days of the ruling of special planets; (5) the divisions of the different figures, forms, climates, and countries, according to their dominant stars — in fact, everything below heaven, according to their belief, was subject in some way to the influence of the stars or the spirits which inhabit them. Every substance and every action, every country and every hour, had its special planetary deity. It is important, therefore, to study carefully the special conjunctions and figures, as well as the special mixtures of incense, which might render the individual numen propitious. Thus, for example, the first hour of Saturday stands under Saturnus, and it is right and advisable at that time to select such prayers, seals, amulets, dresses, and fumigations as might be especially pleasing to that planetary god.

In order to address themselves to visible mediators, some of the Zabians are supposed to have directed their devotions to the stars themselves. But they soon found a worship that addressed itself to things that appeared and disappeared in turn very unsatisfactory. Accordingly they manufactured permanent representatives of them in the shape of idols, wrought in as complete accordance as possible with the themurgical rules derived from the nature of the deity to be represented. They were of gold to represent the sun; of silver, to represent the moon. The very temples in which they were placed were of as many corners as were supposed to correspond to the form of certain stars. Zabism teaches that man is composed of contradictory elements, which make him the vacillating, struggling creature he is. Passions and desires rule him and lower him to the level of the brute creation, and lie would utterly lose himself were it not for such religious rites as purifications, sacrifices, and other means of grace, by which he may be enabled to approach the great gods once more and attempt to become like them. The soul of man partakes partly of the nature of the animal soul and partly of that of the angelic soul. The soul never dies, and rewards and punishments will affect only it.

These, however, will not be wrought in any future world, but in this, only at different epochs of existence. Thus all our present joys are rewards for good deeds done by us in former epochs, and the sorrows and griefs we endure spring in the same manner from evil actions we committed at former stages. As to the nature of the general world-soul itself, they say it is primitive, for if it were not so it would be material, as every newly-created being partakes of the material nature.  Kathibi says, "The soul, which is thus an immaterial thing, and exists from eternity, is the involuntary reason of the first types, as God is the first cause of the intelligences. The soul once beheld matter and loved it. Glowing with the desire of assuming a bodily shape, it would not again separate itself from that matter by means of which the world was created. Since that time the soul forgot itself, its everlasting existence, its original abode, and knew nothing more of what it had known before.

But God, who turns all things to the best, united it to matter which it loved, and out of this union the heavens, the elements, and composite things arose. In order that the soul might not wholly perish within matter, he endowed it with intelligence, whereby it conceived its high origin, the spiritual world, and itself. It further conceived through this that it was but a stranger in this world, that it was subject to many sufferings in it, and that even the joys of this world are but the source of new sufferings. As soon as the soul had perceived all this. it began to yearn again for its spiritual home, as a man who is away from his birthplace pines for his homestead. It then also learned that, in order to return to its primitive state, it had to free itself from the fetters of sensuous desires, and from all materialistic tendencies. Free from them all, it would regain its heavenly sphere again, and enjoy the bliss of the spiritual world."

The life of the sect holding this creed was but short. After having first been on terms of great friendship with the ruling powers of Mohammedanism, as well as with Christians and Jews, and having filled many of the highest and most responsible posts at the courts of the caliphs, they were, by degrees, made the butt of fanaticism and rapacity. Mulcted, persecuted, banished at different periods, they disappear from history since the middle of the 11th century. Thus obscurely ended a sect which for two hundred years had produced a host of men pre-eminent in every branch of learning and literature, in philosophy, astronomy, history, natural history, poetry, medicine, and the rest. See Chwolsohn, Die Sabien und die Sabismus (St. Petersburg, 1856, 2 volumes).

## Zabriskie, Francis Nicholls, D.D[[@Headword:Zabriskie, Francis Nicholls, D.D]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Hackensack, N.J., in April, 1832. He graduated from the University of the City of New York in 1850, and from the New Brunswick Seminary in 1855. For three years he was editor of the Initelligencer. He died May 13, 1891. He wrote a Life of Horace Greeley. and several other volumes. See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, 3d ed. page 568.

## Zabriskie, John Lansing[[@Headword:Zabriskie, John Lansing]]

             a venerated clergyman of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, was born in 1779 at Albany, N. Y. He graduated at Union College in 1797, studied theology under Dr. Theodoric Romeyn, and was licensed by the Classis of Albany in 1800. His first settlement was in the united churches of Greenbush and Wynantskill, near Albany, in 180011. In the latter year he removed to Hillsborough (or Millstone), near New Brunswick, N. J., where he ministered until his death, in 1850. His pulpit and parochial labors were said to be greater than those of any other minister of the region. He was a judicious, sensible, wise man; an excellent “old-fashioned” preacher; evangelical, earnest, and practical; a father to his people, and venerated by the ministry. His career was quietly useful, his character unspotted by the world, and his memory is cherished among the godly people of his large and important charge, upon whom he left the permanent stamp of his faithful teachings. He was in person short and stout, with a large head and face, genial in expression, and easy in his manners, With all his habitual gravity and professional air, at times “in his social intercourse he would astonish and excite you by his wit, his sarcasm, and even drollery.” His talents were good, and his attainments in the old theology were respectable. He knew the Gospel, and felt it and preached it with clearness, zeal, and often with great power of immediate impression. See Corinthians win, Manual of the Ref. Church in. America, p. 277,278, (W. J. R. T.)

## Zabud[[@Headword:Zabud]]

             (Heb. Zabud', זָבוּד, given; Sept. Ζαβούθ v.r. Ζαββούθ), son of Nathan the prophet (1Ki 4:5). B.C. 1012. He is described as a priest (A. V. “principal officer”), and as holding at the court of Solomon the confidential post of “king's friend,” which had been occupied by Hushai the Archite during the reign of David (2Sa 15:37; 2Sa 16:16; l Chronicles 27:33). This position, if it were an official one, was evidently distinct from that of counselor, occupied by Ahithophel under David, and had more of the character of private friendship about it, for Absalom conversely calls David the “friend” of Hushai (2Sa 16:17). Azariah, another son of Nathan, was “over all the” (household) “officers” of king Solomon; and their advancement may doubtless be ascribed not only to the young king's respect for the venerable prophet, who had been his instructor, but to the friendship he had contracted with his sons during the course of education. The office, or rather honor, of “friend of the king” we find in all the  despotic governments of the East. It gives high power, without the public responsibility which the holding of a regular office in the State necessarily imposes. It implies the possession of the utmost confidence of, and familiar intercourse with, the monarch, to whose person “the friend” at all times has access, and whose influence is therefore often far greater, even in matters of state, than that of the recognized ministers of government. In the Vat. MS. of the Sept. the word “priest” is omitted, and in the Arabic of the London Polyglot it is referred to Nathan. The Peshito-Syriac and several Hebrew MSS. for “Zabud” read “Zaccur.” The same occurs in the case of ZABBUD).

## Zabulon[[@Headword:Zabulon]]

             (Ζαβουλών)' the Greek form (Mat 4:13; Mat 4:15; Rev 7:8) of the Heb. name ZEBULUN SEE ZEBULUN (q.v.).

## Zaccai[[@Headword:Zaccai]]

             (Heb. Zakkay', זִכִּיpure; Sept. Ζακχαί v.r. Ζακχού), the ancestor of 760 of the Israelites who returned from Babylon (Ezra 2, 9; Neh 7:14). B.C. ante 536. SEE ZABBAI; SEE ZACCHAEUS.

## Zaccaria, Antonio Maria[[@Headword:Zaccaria, Antonio Maria]]

             an Italian monk, founder of the congregation of the Barnabites, was born at Cremona in 1500. He studied at first medicine and philosophy at Padua, and afterwards theology also. Having received holy orders, he settled at Milan, where, in 1525, he joined the fraternity of Eternal Wisdom, and where he soon, in connection with several other members, and with the  sanction of Clement VII, founded a new congregation, of which he was made superior. From their first church, St. Paul's, in Milan, they were originally called the Regular Clerks of St. Paul's (Panlines), Which name they exchanged for Barnabites, when, in 1541, they were presented with the Church of St. Barnabas, in Milan. Zaccaria, who is said to have had the power of prophecy and of working miracles, died, according to his own prediction, July 5, 1539, at Cremona. Of his writings, we mention a compilation from the Church fathers, Detti Notabili Raccolti da Diversi Autori (Venice, 1583; printed in French, Lyons, 1625; Latin, by J.A. Gallicus, Axiomata Sacra). See Arisius, Cremona Literata, 2:88 sq., Biedenfeld, Monchsorden. 1:180; Theol. Universallexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Zacchaeans[[@Headword:Zacchaeans]]

             is a local name for the Gnostics, mentioned by Epiphanius (Haeres. 26:3), but without adding where they were so called.

## Zacchaeus[[@Headword:Zacchaeus]]

             (Ζακχαῖος, for the Heb. Zaccai [q.v.]), the name of two Jews, mentioned the one in the Apocrypha, and the other in the New Test.

1. An officer of Judas Maccabaeus left with two others to besiege the citadel of Zion (2Ma 10:19). Grotius, from a mistaken reference to 1 Macc. 5, 56, wishes to read καὶ τὸν τοῦ Ζαχαρίου.

2. The name of a tax-collector near Jericho, who, being short in stature, climbed up into a sycamore tree, in order to obtain a sight of Jesus as he passed through that place. Luke only has related the incident (19, 1-10). Zacchaeus was a Jew, as may be inferred from his name and from the fact that the Savior speaks of him expressly as “a son of Abraham” (υἱὸς Α᾿βραάμ). So the latter expression should be understood, and not in a spiritual sense; for it was evidently meant to assert that he was one of the chosen race, notwithstanding the prejudice of some of his countrymen that his office under the Roman government made him an. alien and outcast from the privileges of the Israelite. The term which designates this office (ἀρχιτελώνης) is unusual, but describes him, no doubt, as the  superintendent of customs or tribute in the district of Jericho, where he lived, as one having a commission from his Roman principal (manceps, publicaous) to collect the imposts levied on the Jews by the Romans, and who in the execution of that trust employed subalterns (the ordinary τελῶναι), who were accountable to Dim, as he in turn was accountable to his superior, whether he resided at Rome, as was more commonly the case, or in the province itself. SEE PUBLICAN.

The office must have been a lucrative one in such a region, and it is not strange that Zacchaeus is mentioned by the evangelist as a rich man (ουτος ην πλούσιος). Josephus states (Ant. 15:4, 2) that the palm-groves of Jericho and its gardens of balsam were given as a source of revenue by Antony to Cleopatra, and, on account of their value, were afterwards redeemed by Herod the Great for his own benefit. The sycamore-tree is no longer found in that neighborhood (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 1, 559); but no one should be surprised at this, since “even the solitary relic of the palm-forest, seen as late as 1838” which existed near Jericho, has now disappeared (Stanley, Sinai and Pal. p 307). The eagerness of Zacchaeus to behold Jesus indicates a deeper interest than that of mere curiosity. He must have had some knowledge, by report at least, of the teachings of Christ, as well as of his wonder-working power, and could thus have been awakened to some just religious feeling, which would make him the more anxious to see the announcer of the good tidings, so important to men as sinners.

The readiness of Christ to take up his abode with him, and his declaration that “salvation” had that day come to the house of his entertainer, prove sufficiently that “He who knows what is in man” perceived in him a religious susceptibility which fitted him to be the recipient of spiritual blessings. Reflection upon his conduct on the part of Zacchaeus himself appears to have revealed to him deficiencies which disturbed his conscience, and he was ready, on being instructed more fully in regard to the way of life, to engage to “restore fourfold” for the illegal exactions of which he would not venture to deny (εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφάντησα) that he might have been guilty. At all events, he had not lived in such a manner as to overcome the prejudice which the Jews entertained against individuals of his class, and their censure fell on him as well as on Christ when they declared that the latter had not scorned to avail himself of the hospitality of “a man that was a sinner.” The Savior spent the night probably (μεῖναι, ver. 5, and καταλῦσαι, 1Ma 5:56, are the terms used) in the house of Zacchaeus, and the next day pursued his journey to Jerusalem. He was in the caravan from Galilee, which was going up thither to keep the Passover.  The entire scene is well illustrated by Oosterzee (Lange, Bibelwerk, 3, 285).

We read in the Rabbinic writings also of a Zacchaeas who lived at Jericho at this same period, well known an his own account, and especially as the father of the celebrated rabbi Jochanan ben-Zachai (see Sepp, Leben Jesu, 3, 166). This person may have been related to the Zacchaeus named in the sacred narrative. The family of the Zacchaei was an ancient one, as well as very numerous. They are mentioned in the books of Ezra (Ezr 2:9) and Nehemiah (Neh 7:14) as among those who returned from the Babylonian captivity under Zerubbabel, when their number amounted to seven hundred and sixty. For the modern traditions respecting Zacchaeus's house, see Robinson (Bibl. Res. 2, 543). According to ecclesiastical tradition, Zacchaeus eventually became bishop of Caesarea in Palestine (Const. Nat. Apost. 7:46; comp. Clement, Recogn. 3, 65 sq.). See Sturemberg, Zacchaeus Illustratus, in the Symbol. Duisb.; Kresse, De Sycamoro Zacchcei (Lips. 1694); Crossman, Hist. of Zacchaeus (Lond. 1854); and the literature referred to by Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. col. 1031, 1032. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Zacchur[[@Headword:Zacchur]]

             (1Ch 4:26). SEE ZACCUR.

## Zacchur or Zaocur[[@Headword:Zacchur or Zaocur]]

             (Heb. Zakkun', זִכּוּר, mind full; Sept. Ζακχούρ v.r. Ζακούρ 0r Ζακχώρ), the name of several Hebrews. SEE ZABBUD.

1. A Simeonite, son of Hamuel and father of i.e. Shimei whose posterity became numerous [1Ch 4:26, A. V. “Zacchur”). B.C. considerably ante 1612.

2. The father of Shimea, which latter was the Reubenite “spy” sent oat to explore Canaan the second time (Num 13:4). B.C. ante 1618.

3. A Levite, third named of the four “sons of Merari by Jaaziah” (1Ch 24:27). B.C. 1043.

4. First named of the four sons of Asaph as Levitical musicians in the arrangement of David (1Ch 25:2; 1Ch 25:10; Neh 12:35). B.C. 1043.

5. Son of Imri and builder of part of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Nehemiah 3, 2). B.C. 446. 6. Son of Mattaniah and father of the Hanan  whom Nehemiah appointed to distribute the treasures (Neh 13:13). B.C. ante 410.

7. A Levite who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:12). B.C. 410.

## Zachalios[[@Headword:Zachalios]]

             an ancient Babylonish writer, is mentioned by Pliny (Hist. Nat. 37:10) as the author of a book on gems and their magical powers, which was dedicated to the king Mithridates. "It was evidently a writing belonging to that Graeco-Babylonian literature which was so widely developed during the centuries bordering on the Christian aera, and which had the same connection with the real Chaldaean doctrines as the Grecian literature of the hermetical books had with the doctrine of ancient Egypt" (Lenormont, Chaldaean Magic, page 176).

## Zacharia, Gotthilf Traugott[[@Headword:Zacharia, Gotthilf Traugott]]

             a German theologian, was born at Tauchardt, in Thuringia, in 1729, and studied at Konigsberg and Halle, being the pupil, associate, and amanuensis in the latter place of the learned Baumgarten. He was called in 1760 to the newly founded University of Bützow, in 1765 to Göttingen, and in 1775 to Kiel, where he died two years afterwards. His reputation as a scholar rests principally upon the Biblische Theolagie, oder Untersuchung des Grundes der vornehmsten biblischen Lehren (1771-75, 4 pts. 3 sections, with Suppl. by Volborth [17861). The work occupied the supranaturalistic ground held by Baumgarten, professing a belief in revelation and miracles, but applying the historico-critical method of interpretation to the proofs' deduced from Scripture, and either eliminating them altogether or depriving them of any considerable force.

The end of the divine economy of redemption is represented as being the blessedness which Christ will bestow, which consists in the fruits of his atonement. The necessity for an atonement is, however, said to conflict with the idea of the freedom of the divine will. A progressive economy of grace is spoken of, but is shown in its outward manifestations in the mere enumeration of historical events only. It is said to have been God's first design to establish faith in the true God, and to reveal nothing respecting Christ until the truth respecting God should have been sufficiently impressed on the minds of men. The work evidently does not deserve the encomiums bestowed on it by Nitzsch, Schenkel, etc. Zacharila published, besides, paraphrastic expositions of the epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Hebrews, etc., which were favorably received and repeatedly published. See Thiess, Gelehrtengesch. der Universitdt Kiel, pt. 2; Döring, Die gelehrten. Theologen Deutschlands, pt. 4; Shenkel, in Stud. u. Krif. (Aufgabe der Bibl. Theol.), 1852, No. 1; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zacharia, Just Friedrich[[@Headword:Zacharia, Just Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian. was born at Haina, in Gotha, in 1704. He studied at Jena and Kiel, was appointed at the latter place, in 1735, professor of Oriental languages, in 1742 elected to the chair of Biblical antiquities, and in 1747 to that of theology. He died March 8, 1773. He published, Dissertatio seu Commentatio Solemnis, Comma Secundam Quinti Hoseae Capitis Explicans (Kiloni, 1731): — Progr. de Usu Linguae Ebraece in Philosophia (ibid. 1736): — Diss. de Ritibous Scholasticis Judaorum-  (ibid. 1745). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 4:767 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:540. (B.P.)

## Zachariah[[@Headword:Zachariah]]

             (a, 2Ki 14:29; 2Ki 15:8; 2Ki 15:11; 2Ki 18:2). SEE ZECHARIAH.

## Zacharias[[@Headword:Zacharias]]

             (Ζαχαρίας), the Greek form of the Heb. name Zechariah; applied to several men in the Apocrypha and New Test., besides those mentioned in the Old Test.: the priest in Josiah's reign.(l Esdr. 1:8), the lesser prophet (1Es 6:1; 1Es 7:3) the adviser of Ezra (1Es 8:44; comp. Ezr 8:16), the “son” of Pharosh (1Es 8:30; comp. Ezr 8:3), the “son” of Bebai. (1Es 8:37; comp. Ezr 8:11), a “son” of Elam (1Es 9:27; comp. Ezr 10:26), and one (1Es 1:15) who is properly called Heman (2Ch 35:15), and another (Eapaianc, 1Es 5:8) properly called Azariah, or Seraiah (Ezr 2:2; Neh 7:7).

1. Son of Barachias, who, our Lord says, was slain by the Jews between the altar and the Temple (Mat 23:35; Luk 11:51). There has been much dispute who this Zacharias was. There is no reason to identify him with the Zechariah son of Jeberechiah mentioned in 1Sa 8:2. It is singular that Josephus (War, 4:5,4) mentions another Zacharias, son of Baruch, who was slain by the Jews in the Temple shortly before the last siege of Jerusalem began (see Whiston's note, ad loc.). From the time of Origen, who relates that the father of John the Baptist was killed in the Temple, many of the Greek fathers have maintained that this is the person to whom our Lord refers. The name of the father of Zacharias not being mentioned by Luke, some unwarrantably suppose that the name of Barachias crept into the text of Matthew from a marginal gloss, a confusion having been made between Zacharias, the son of Jehoiada, and Zacharias the prophet, the son of Barachias (Berechiah). There can be little or no doubt that the allusion is to Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (2Ch 24:20-21). As the book of Chronicles-in which the murder of this Zechariah occurs-closes the Hebrew canon, this assassination was the last of the murders of righteous men recorded in the Bible, just as that of Abel was the first (see Renan, Vie de Jesus, p. 353). SEE ZECHARIAH.

2. Father of Joseph, a leader in the first campaign of the Maccabaean war (1 Macc. 5, 18, 56-62).

3. Father of John the Baptist (Luke 1, 5, etc.). B.C. ante 8.

## Zacharias (2)[[@Headword:Zacharias (2)]]

             pope from A.D. 741 to 752. He induced the Lombard king Luitprand to restore the cities taken from Rome in 739, to conclude a truce for twenty  years, and subsequently to desist from the siege of Ravenna and restore all the territory taken from the exarchate. He was equally successful in influencing Luitprand's successor, Rachis, as respects the interruption of his conquests, and even received that monarch and his queen and daughter into the number of his clergy (749) after their abdication of the throne. He also consecrated Carloman to the clerical office (747). He advised the Byzantine emperor Copronymus to replace the images in the churches. Boniface, the apostle to the Germans, found in Zacharias an energetic and able manager of-the interests of Rome, and became his agent in the elevation of the Carlovingian dynasty. Zacharias held a synod in 743 at which fifty-nine bishops were present, and which dealt with questions of discipline. He translated the Dialogues of Gregory the Great into Greek, and purchased the liberty of many slaves destined by the Venetians for Africa. See Jaff, Regesta Pontificum; Migne, Patrologie, tom. 89; Würtwein and Giles, collections of Boniface's letters, St. Bonij. Opera (Lond. 1845), vol. 1; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s v.

## Zacharias Scholasticus Bishop Of Mitylene[[@Headword:Zacharias Scholasticus Bishop Of Mitylene]]

             in the island of Lesbos, was present at the Synod of Constantinople (A.D. 536) which deposed Anthimus, the patriarch of Alexandria. Zacharias had studied philosophy at Alexandria, and for some time practiced as an advocate at Berytus. He is the author of Amnmosius sive de Mundi Opificio, a dialogue in which he defends the Christian view of creation and government of the world against objections to it raised from the point of view of the Greek philosophy. It was first published at Paris in 1619. The best edition is that by Jean Fr. Boissonade, AEneas Gazaeus et Zacharias Mityleniaeus, de Immortalitate Animae et Mundi Consummatione (Paris, 1836). He also wrote, Disputatio contra Ea, quae de Duobus Principiis a Manichaeo quodam Scripta et Projecta in Viam Publicam Reperit Justinianus Imperator (Latin interpretation by Turriano, in Bibl. Pat. Max. Lugd. 9:794). See Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philos. 2:528; Ritter, Geschichte der christl. Philosophie, 2:495, Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Zacharias, Bishop Of Anagni[[@Headword:Zacharias, Bishop Of Anagni]]

             Italy, was sent in A.D. 860, as one of the legates of pope Nicholas I, to Constantinople with letters of reply to those of the emperor Michael and the patriarch Photius, making overtures to the Church of Rome for sympathy and cooperation. See Neander, Hist. of the Church, 3:562.

## Zacharias, Daniel, D.D[[@Headword:Zacharias, Daniel, D.D]]

             an esteemed minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Washington County, Md., Jan. 14, 1806. He united with the Church under the Rev. James Ross Reily, and soon afterwards commenced his classical studies, preparatory to the ministry, at the Hagerstown Academy, and finished the same in Canonsburg, Pa. Subsequently he entered the Seminary of the Reformed Church, then located in Carlisle, where he completed his theological course under the Rev. Lewis Mayer, D.D. He was licensed and ordained in 1828, and located in York County. In 1830 he took charge of the Reformed Church in Harrisburg, where he continued to labor until 1835, when he removed to Frederick City, Md. Here he labored with great acceptance and success to the close of his long and useful life. He died March 31,1873. Dr. Zacharias was a man of superior natural endowments, high culture, amiable disposition, and more than ordinary pulpit abilities. “Few men have been so loved by their congregations, or have so grown into the affections of the community in which they lived.” As a public speaker he was greatly admired, and universally esteemed as a most excellent pastor, genial companion, and trusty friend. He was chosen president of the District Synod in 1835, and of the General Synod in 1866. He aided materially in compiling the hymn- book of the Reformed Church, and also in getting up its present Order of Worship. See Ref. Church Mess. April 9. 1873. (D. Y. H.)

## Zachary[[@Headword:Zachary]]

             (Zacharias), a mode of Anglicizing (2 Esdr. 1, 40) the name of the prophet ZECHARIAH.

## Zacher[[@Headword:Zacher]]

             (Heb. Ze'ke; זֶכֶר, in pause Za'ker, זָכֶר, memorial; Sept. Ζαχούρ v.r. Ζακχούρ), last named of the eight sons of Jehiel the founder of Gibeon, by his wife Maachah (1Ch 8:31); elsewhere (1Ch 9:37) called Zechariah (q.v.).

## Zacuto, Abraham[[@Headword:Zacuto, Abraham]]

             SEE SAKKUTO, ABRAHAM.

## Zacynthian Manuscript[[@Headword:Zacynthian Manuscript]]

             (designated as Z) is a palimpsest uncial fragment in the library of the British and Foreign Bible Society in London, which, under an evangelistary, written on coarse vellum in or about the 13th century, contains large portions of Luke's gospel down to 11:33, in full, well-formed characters, but surrounded by, and often interwoven with, large extracts from the Lectors, in a hand which cannot be earlier than the 8th century. It was obtained from Zante in 1821. The entire volume must have originally been a large folio (14 inches by 11), of which eighty-six leaves and three half- leaves survivne. The readings are very valuable. They were communicated  to dean Alford for the fourth edition of his New Test. by Dr. Tregelles, who has since (1861) collated and published it in full. See Scrivener, Introd. to the New Test. page 126; Christian Remembrancer, January 1862; Journ. of Sac. Lit. January 1862, page 495. SEE MANUSCRIPT.

## Zadok[[@Headword:Zadok]]

             (Heb. Tsadok', צָדוֹק, righteous; Sept. Ζαδώκ v.r. Σαδδούκ, Σαδώκ, etc.; Josephus Σάδωκος, Ant. 7:2, 2, etc.), the name of several Hebrews, and one that also appears occasionally in the post-Biblical history. The associate of Judah the Gaulonite, the well known leader of the agitation against the census of Quirinus, was a certain Pharisee named Zadok (Josephus, Ant. 18:1,1), and the sect of the Sadducees (q.v.) is reputed to have derived both its name and origin from a person of the same name, a disciple of Antigonus of Soho. (See Lightfoot, Hebr and Talm. Exerc. on Mat 3:8; Renan, Vie de Jesus, p. 216.) A “Sadoc” (Σαδώκ) finally occurs in our Savior's genealogy (Mat 1:14). It is, moreover, worth noticing that the New-Test. name Justus (Act 1:23; Act 18:7; Col 4:11) is the literal translation of Zadok. Zedekiah, Jehozadak, may likewise be compared.

1. Son-of Ahitub, and one of the two chief priests in the time of David, Abiathar (q.v.) being the other. B.C. 1023. Zadok was of the house of Eleazar the son of Aaron (1Ch 24:3). The first mention of him is in 1Ch 12:28 where we are told that he joined David at Hebron, after Saul's death, with twenty-two captains of his father's house, and apparently with nine hundred men (4600-3700, 1Ch 12:26-27). Up to this- time, it may be concluded, he had adhered to the house of Saul. But henceforth his fidelity to David was inviolable. When Absalom revolted, and David fled from Jerusalem, Zadok and all the Levites bearing the ark accompanied him, and it was only at the king's express command that they returned to Jerusalem and became the medium of communication between the king and Hushai the Archite (2Sa 15:17). When Absalom was dead; Zadok and Abiathar were the persons who persuaded the elders of  Judah to invite David to return (19, 11). When Adonijah, in David's old age set up for king, and had persuaded Joab and Abiathar the priest to join his party, Zadok was unmoved, and was employed by David to anoint Solomon to be king in his room (1 Kings 1). For this fidelity he was rewarded by Solomon, who “thrust out Abiathar from being priest unto the Lord,” and “put in Zadok the priest” in his room (1Ki 2:27; 1Ki 2:35). From this time, however, we hear little of him. It is said in general terms, in the enumeration of Solomon's officers of state, that Zadok was the priest (1Ki 4:4; 1Ch 29:22), but no single act of his is mentioned. Even in the detailed account of the building and dedication of Solomon's Temple his name does not occur, though Josephus says that “Zadok the high-priest was the first high-priest of the Temple which Solomon built”‘ (Ant. 10:8, 6). In 2Sa 15:27 Zadok is named a seer; but we have no further or more particular information as to the revelations, which were granted to him. SEE PRIEST.

We have no means of knowing how the high-priesthood passed out of the line of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, who was the elder son of Aaron, into the line of Eli, who was descended from Ithamar, Aaron's younger son; but we do known the doom pronounced by Jehovah, that the unworthy house of Eli should be dispossessed. No doubt much confusion had ensued upon the death of Eli's two sons, and the capture of the ark by the Philistines; of this we have abundant evidence: (1) in the unsettled position of the tabernacle, till we find David honoring it at Gibeon; (2) in the want of interest in the ark, till he brought it up to Mount Zion; and (3) in the absence of any fixed center of worship, so that Samuel sacrificed in different places, according to the irregular manner of that period of transition in which he presided. Saul apparently attempted to extirpate the high-priestly house of Eli, on account of what he reckoned the treason of Abimelech (1Sa 13:17-23), so that only' his son Abiathar escaped; and the following chapter narrates how-this young man came to David, carrying with him the high-priest's ephod, and how Jehovah acknowledged him as the true high-priest, inquiring of God, on behalf of that fugitive, who was the true king of Israel. The only conjecture we feel disposed to make is that king Saul may at this time have declared that Abiathar was an outlaw, who had forfeited the high-priesthood, and may have declared that the office reverted to the house of Eleazar, to which Zadok belonged; there might be a stroke of policy in his thus restoring the constitution of the priesthood according to the law of Moses, analogous to his slaughter of  the Gibeonites, “in his zeal to the children of Israel arid Judah” (2Sa 21:2).

If so, it is easy to see how the two rival royal houses had their rival priestly houses too; and how, at the end of the civil war, David's policy of gradual and amicable reconstruction would lead him to acknowledge both high priests, especially after Zadok's hearty adhesion to David's interest. Perhaps, in memory of his early military service, Zadok had a place among the princes of the tribes assigned him by David, as ruler over the Aaronites (1Ch 27:17). In later times we usually find two priests, the ihigh-priest anti the second priest (2Ki 25:18), and there does not seem to have been any great difference in their dignity. So, too, Luk 3:2. Zadok and Abiathar were of nearly equal dignity (2Sa 15:35-36; 2Sa 19:11). Hophni and Philiehas, again, and Eleazar and Ithamar, are coupled together, and seem to have been holders of the office, as it were, in commission. The duties of the office, too, were, in the case of Zadok and Abiathar, divided. Zadoik ministered before the tabernacle at Gibeon (1Ch 16:39); Abiathar had the care of the ark at Jerusalem; not, however, exclusively, as appears from 1Ch 15:11; 2Sa 15:24-25; 2Sa 15:29. Hence, perhaps, it may be concluded that from the first there was a tendency to consider the office of the priesthood as somewhat of the nature of a corporate office, although some of its functions were necessarily confined to the chief member of that corporation; and if so, it is very easy to perceive how superior abilities, on the one hand, and infancy or incapacity, on the other, might operate to raise or depress the members of this corporation respectively. Zadok seems to have been succeeded in the priesthood by his son Azariah (1Ki 4:2), strictly speaking his son's son, if we observe 1Ch 6:8-9, and 2Sa 15:27. That it continued without derangement in his family may be inferred by the genealogies, and from the incidental reference to “Azariah the chief priest, of the house of Zadok,” in Hezekiah's time (2Ch 31:10). The language in Eze 40:46; Eze 43:19; Eze 44:15; Eze 48:11 bears high testimony to the faithfulness of the priests, the sons of Zadok; so mulch so that the prophet takes no notice of any priests besides them. SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

2. Father of Jerusha, who was the wife of king Uzziah and mother of king Jotham (2Ki 15:33; 2Ch 27:1). B.C. 755.

3. According to the genealogy of the high priests in 1Ch 6:12, there was a second Zadok, son of a second Ahitub, son of Amariah; and he is there given as the father of Shallum. B.C. cir. 700. He seems also to be  referred to in 9:11; Neh 11:11. Some critics are disposed to regard this name as an interpolation by a copyist's error; but the person in question seems to be the high-priest called Hosaiah in the Seder Olam, and Odeas (᾿Ωδέας) by Josephus (Ant. 10:8, 6). SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

4. Son of Baana, who repaired a portion of the wall in the time of Nehemiah (Neh 3:4). B.C. 446. He is probably the same as is in the list of those that sealed the covenant in Neh 10:21, as in both cases his name follows that of Meshezabeel. But if so, we know that he was not a priest, as his name would at first sight lead one to suppose, but one of “the chief of the people,” or laity. With this agrees his patronymic Baana, which indicates that he was of the tribe of Judah; for Baanah, one of David's mighty, men, was a Netophathite (2Sa 23:29), i.e. of Netophah, a city of Judah. The men of Tekoah, another city of Judah, worked next to Zadok. Meshullam of tie house of Meshezabeel, who preceded him in both lists (Neh 3:4; Neh 10:20-21) was also of the tribe of Judah (11, 24). Intermarriages of the priestly house with the tribe of Judah were more frequent than with any other tribe.

5. Son of Immer, a priest who repaired a portion of the wall over against his own house (Neh 3:29). B.C. 446. He belonged to the 16th course (1Ch 24:14), which was one of those that returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:37).

6. A scribe, one of the three principal treasurers appointed by Nehemiah (Neh 13:13). B.C. 410. He was perhaps identical with No. 4 or 5 above.

## Zahab[[@Headword:Zahab]]

             SEE GOLD.

## Zahalon, Abraham Ben- Isaac[[@Headword:Zahalon, Abraham Ben- Isaac]]

             a Jewish writer of Spain, who flourished in the 16th century, is the author of, מרפא לנפש, or Healing of the Soul, an ascetical work, treating on repentance (Venice, 1595 ): — יד חרועים, on the Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan calendar (ibid. 1594-95): — ישע אלהים, a grammatical and pedagogical commentary on the book of Esther (ibid. 1595). See Furst,. Bibl. Jud. 3:541; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon, s.v.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico Degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl.), page 333. (B.P.)

## Zahalon, Jacob Ben-Isaac[[@Headword:Zahalon, Jacob Ben-Isaac]]

             a Jewish writer of Rome, was born in 1630, and died at Ferrara in 1693. Besides a large medical work), אוצר החיים, he left, in MS., a commentary on Isaiah, entitled יעקב ס ישועות: — a commentary on Ecclesiastes, קהלת יעקב: disquisitions on Daniel, על דניאל דרושים:— homiletical expositions on the Pentateuch, ליעקב תתן אמת: — a commentary on the Song of Songs, ירנה צהלה, etc. See Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 3:541, Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico Degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl.), page 332. (B.P.)

## Zaham[[@Headword:Zaham]]

             (Heb. id., זִהִם, in pause זָהִם, rancidity or fatness; Sept. Ζαάμ v.r. Ζάλάμ and ῾Ροολάμ; Vulg. Zoom), last named of the three sons of Rehoboam' by one of his wives (2 Chronicles 12:19), named Abihail (q.v.), according to the common version, but, as Keil maintains, (Comment. ad loc.) by Mahath (Abihail being the mother of the latter). B.C. 973.

## Zahn[[@Headword:Zahn]]

             a German philanthropist, was a mason of Bunzlau, who wandered about as an orphan in childhood, and learned to read at the age of twenty-four. He carried on a little school in his own house for the benefit of orphans. He made the first movement towards the establishment of an orphan-house in Bunzlau, and went to Berlin to solicit the royal sanction. The corner-stone was laid in 1755. Zahn became the first superintendent, but died of the plague in 1756. The institution was conducted from that time by Ernest  Gottlieb Woltersdorf. See Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:146.

## Zaimon[[@Headword:Zaimon]]

             (Heb. Tsalmon', צִלְמוֹן, shady; Sept. Σελμών v.r. Σελλών, etc.; Vulg. Selmon), the name of a man and of a hill.

1. An Ahohite, one of David's warriors (2Sa 23:28), called in the parallel passage (1Ch 11:29) ILAI SEE ILAI (q.v.), which Kennicott prefers (Dissert. p. 187). SEE DAVID.

2. A mountain (הִר) or wooded eminence in the immediate neighborhood of Shechem, from which Abimelech and his people cut down the boughs with which he suffocated and burned the Shechemites who had taken refuge in the citadel (Jdg 9:48). The reading of the Sept. here ( ῾Ερμών) is remarkable both in itself and in the fact that the two great MSS, agree in a reading so much removed from the Hebrew; but it is impossible to suppose that Hermnon (at any rate, the well-known mountain of that name) is referred to in the narrative nofAbimelech. The rabbins mention a place of the same name, but evidently far from the necessary position (Schwarz, Palest. p. 137). The name Suleimijeh is attached to the S.E. portion of Mount Ebal (see the map of Dr. Rosen, Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenl. Gesell. 14:634), and Jebel Sleiman is the name of a high conspicuous summit S.W. of and linked with Mount Gerizim, having on it a tomb attributed by Mohammedan tradition to Sleiman el-Earsi (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 354). The only high mountains around Shechem are Ebal and Gerizim, and Zalmon may be another name for one of these. The name of Dalmanutha has beensupposed by some to be a corruption of that of Tsalmon (Otho, Lex. Rabb. s.v. “Dalmanutha”).

It is usually supposed that this hill is mentioned in Psa 68:14 (A.V. “Salmon”); and this is probable, though the passage is peculiarly difficult, and the precise allusion intended by the poet seems hopelessly lost. Commentators differ from each other; and Fürst, within 176 pages of his Handworterbuch, differs from himself ( שֶׁלֶגand צִלְמון). Indeed, of six distinguished modern commentators — De Wette, Hitzig, Ewald, Heigstenberg, Delitzsch, and Hupfeld — no two give distinctly the same meaning; and Mr. Keble, in his admirable version of the Psalms, gives a translation which, though poetical, as was to be expected, differs from any one of those suggested by these six scholars. . The literal translation of the words תִּשְׁלֵג בְּצִלְמוֹןis “Thou wouldst make it snow,” or “It would snow,” with liberty to use the verb either in the past or in the future sense. As, notwithstanding ingenious attempts, this supplies no satisfactory meaning, recourse is had to a translation of a comparative character, “Thou makest it white as snow,” or “It is white as snow” words to which various metaphorical meanings have been attributed. The allusion which, through the Lexicon of Gesenius, is most generally received is that the phrase refers to the ground being snow-white with bones after a defeat of the Canaanitish kings, and this may be accepted by those who will admit that bleaching bones would be left upon a battle-field. At the same time, it is to  be remembered that the figure is a very harsh one, and that it is not really justified by passages quoted in illustration of it from Latin classical writers, such as “campique ingentes sibus albent” (Virgil, -En. 12:36) and “humanis ossiIbus albet humus” (Ovid, Fast. 1, 558), for in these cases the worn “bones” is actually used in the text, and is not left to be supplied by the imagination. Granted, however, that an allusion is made to bones of the slain, there is a divergence of opinion as to whether Salmon was mentioned simply because it had been the battle-ground of some great defeat of the Canaanitish kings, or whether it is only introduced as an image of snowy whiteness.

Of these two explanations, the first would be, on the whole, most probable; for Salmon cannot have been a very high mountain, as the highest mountains near Shechem are Ebal and (Gerizim, and of these Ebal, the highest of the two, is only 1028 feet higher than the city (see Robinson's Gesezius, p. 895 a). If the poet had desired to use the image of a snowy mountain, it would have been more natural to select Hermon, which is visible from the eastern brow of Gerizim, is about 10,000 feet high, and is covered with perpetual snow. Still it is not meant that this circumstance by itself would be conclusive, for there may have been particular associations in the mind of the poet unknown to us which led him to prefer Salmon Smith. It is perhaps not too great a stretch of fancy in this highly figurative Psalm to suppose that the hill in question, being near Shechem, in the center of the country, may have been (or conceived as being) the scene of a severe engagement in the conquest of Canaan; and the prostrate bodies of the slain foe, covered with their white Oriental garments, are pictured like snow upon the distant background of the dark mountain-side. The use of the Heb future points out the conceptual character of the statement, and justifies the translation as a metaphor, “It seemed to snow.”

## Zair[[@Headword:Zair]]

             (Heb. Tsair', צָעַיר, small, as often; Sept. Σιώρ; Vulg. SeirCa), a place named in 2Ki 8:21, in the account of Joram's expedition against the Edomites, as one to which he went with all his chariots. There he and his  force appear to have been surrounded, and only to have escaped by cutting their way through in the night. This is not, however, the interpretation of the Jewish commentators, who take the word הִסֹּבֵיבto refer to the neighboring parts of the country of Edom (see Rashi, On 2Ch 21:9).

The parallel account in Chronicles (2Ch 21:9) agrees with this, except that the words “to Zair” are omitted, and the words “with his princes” inserted. This is followed by Josephus (Ant. 9:5, 1). The omitted and inserted words have a certain similarity both in sound and in their component letters, צָעַירָהand עַםִשָׂרָיו; and on this it has been conjectured that the latter were substituted for the former either by' the error of a copyist or intentionally, because the name Zair was not elsewhere known (see Keil, Comment. on 2Ki 8:21). Others, again, as Movers (Chronik, p. 218) and Ewald (Gesch. 3, 524), suggest that Zair is identical with Zoar ( צערor צוער). Certainly in the Middle Ages the road by which an army passed from Judea to the country formerly occupied bit Eldom lay through the place which was then believed to be Zoar, below Kerak, at the south-east quarter of the Dead Sea (Fulcher, Gesta Dei, p. 405), and so far this is in favor of the identification; but there is no other support to it in the MS. readings either of the original or the versions. A third conjecture, grounded on the readings of the Vulg. (Seira) and the Arab. version (Sa'i'), is that Zair is an alteration for Seir (שעיר), the country itself of the Edomites (Thenius, Kurzgef. exeget. Handb.). The objection to this is that the name of Seir appears not to have been knovwn. to the author of the book of Kings,

## Zair (2)[[@Headword:Zair (2)]]

             Conder suggests (Hand-book to the Bible, page 427) that this is "perhaps the ruin Zueireh on the south-west shore of the Dead Sea." Zallwein, GREGORIUS, a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Obervinchtach, in the Palatinate, October 20, 1712. In 1733 he joined the order of the Benedictines, and received holy orders in 1737. In 1744 he was elected prior of the monastery at Wessobrunn, and shortly afterwards was called to Strasburg, in Carinthia, as professor of theology, Church history, and canon law. In 1749 he was called to the Salzburg University, and died August 9, 1766. Of his publications, we mention, Fontes Originarii Juris Canonici, etc. (Salzburg, 1754-55): — Jus Ecclesiasticum Particulare Germanice ab Era Christi usque ad Carolumn IX Imp. (ibid. 1757): — Collectiones Juris Ecclesiastici Antiqui et Novi, etc. (ibid. 1760): — Principia Juris Ecclesiastice Universalis et Particularis Genrmanica (1763 sq. 4 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 4:770; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:8. (B.P.)

## Zalaph[[@Headword:Zalaph]]

             (Heb. Tsalaph', צָלָ, wound; Sept. Σελέφ v.r. Σελέ and Ε᾿λέφ; Vulg. Seleph). the father of Hanun, which latter rebuilt part of the wall of Jerusalem after the Exile (Nehemiah 3, 30). B.C. ante 446.

## Zalmonah[[@Headword:Zalmonah]]

             (Heb. Tsalmonah, צִלְמֹנָה; shady; Sept. Σελμωνᾶ; Vulg. Salmona), the name of a desert station (the 45th) of the Israelites, which they reached between leaving Mount Hor and camping at Punon, although they must have turned the southern, point of Edomitish territory by the way (Num 33:41). It therefore lay on the south-east side of Edom, but hardly so far north as Maan, a few miles east of Petra, as Ranumer thinks. More probably Zalmonah may be in the Wady el-Amunn, which runs into the Wady Ithm, close ton where Elath anciently stood. SEE EXODE.

## Zalmunna[[@Headword:Zalmunna]]

             (Heb. Tsalmunna', צִלְמנָּע, apparently from צל, shadow, and מָנִע, to withhold; i.e. deprived of protection; Sept and Josephus, Σαλμανά,) last named of the two “kings” of Midian, whose capture and death by the hands of Gideon himself formed the land act of his great conflict with Midian (Jdg 8:5-21 Psa 83:11). B.C. 1361. SEE ZEBA. The distinction between the “kings” (מְלָכַים, melakim) and the “princes” (שָׂרַים, sarnl) of the Midianites on this occasion is carefully maintained throughout the narrative (Jdg 8:5; Jdg 8:12; Jdg 8:26). “Kings” of Midian are also mentioned in Num 31:8; but when the same transaction is referred to in Jos 13:21, they are designated by a different title (נְשַׂאַים, nesim; A.V. “princes”). Elsewhere (Num 22:4; Num 22:7) the term elders ( זְקֵנַיםzekenin) is used, answering in signification, if not in etymology, to the Arabic sheik. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to tell how far these distinctions are accurate, and how far they represent the imperfect acquaintance which the Hebrews must have had with the organization of a people with whom, except during the orgies of Shittim, they appear to have been always more or less at strife and warfare (1Ch 5:10; 1Ch 5:19-22). The unintelligibility of the names is in favor of their being correctly retained rather than the reverse. It should not be overlooked that they are not, like Oreb and Zeeb, attached also to localities, which always throws a doubt on the name when attributed in a person as well. Josephus inverts the distinctions. He styles Oreb and Zeeb βασιλεῖς, and Zebah and Zalmunna ἡγεμόνες (Ant. 5, 7, 5). The vast horde which Gideon repelled must have included many tribes under the general designation of” Midianites, Amalekites, children of the East,” and nothing would be easier or more natural than for the Hebrew scribes who chronicled-the events to confuse one tribe with another in so minute a point as the title of a chief. In the great Bedawin tribes of the present day, who occupy the place of Midian and Amelek, there is no distinctive appellation answering to the melek and sair of the Hebrew narrative; differences in rank and power there are as between the great chief, the acknowledged head of the parent tribe, and the lesser chiefs who lead the sub-tribes into which it is divided, and who are, to a great extent, independents of him. But the one word sheik is employed for all. The great chief is the sheik el-kebir; the others aremia el-massheiks, of the sheiks, i.e. of sheiks rank. SEE MIDIANITE.

## Zambri[[@Headword:Zambri]]

             (Ζαμβρί, Vulg. Zamri. the Greek form (1 Macc. 2, 26) of the Heb. name (Numbers 25, 14) ZIMRI SEE ZIMRI (q.v.).

## Zambris[[@Headword:Zambris]]

             (Ζαμβρίς v.r. Ζαμβρί), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:34) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:42) AMARIAH SEE AMARIAH (q.v.).

## Zamora, Alphonso[[@Headword:Zamora, Alphonso]]

             SEE ALPHONSO DE ZAMIORA.

## Zamoth[[@Headword:Zamoth]]

             (Ζαμώθ v.r. Ζαμόθ, Vulg. Zathoim), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:28) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:27) ZATTU SEE ZATTU (q.v.).

## Zampieri, Domenico[[@Headword:Zampieri, Domenico]]

             (commonly known as Domenichino), an eminent Italian artist, was born at Bologna in 1581, and received his first instructions from Denis Calvart, but, on account of severe treatment by that master, he was removed to the Academy of the Caracci. His great talents did not develop themselves so early as in many other painters, and his studious and thoughtful manner drew from his fellow-students the appellation of the Ox; but Annibale Caracci testified of his abilities by saying to his pupils, "This Ox will in time surpass you all, and be an honor to the art of painting." In the first contest of the students for a prize after he entered the academy, Domenichino was triumphant; but this triumph, instead of rendering him confident and presumptuous, only stimulated him to greater assiduity, and he pursued his studies with such patient and constant application that he made such progress as to win the admiration of some of his contemporaries and to beget the hatred of others.

After leaving the school of the Caracci, he  visited Parma, Modena, and Reggio, to study the works of Correggio and Parmiggiano; and soon after returning to Bologna he went to Rome, where he commenced his brilliant career. Cardinal Agucchi was the first to patronize him, and he employed him in his palace, and commissioned him to paint three pictures for the Church of St. Onofria, representing subjects from the life of St. Jerome. He was employed about this time to assist Annibale Caracci in his great works in the Farnesian Gallery at Rome, and he executed a part of them from the cartoons of Caracci. He also painted in the loggia in the garden, from his own designs, the Death of Adonis, in which he represented Venus springing from her car to succor her unfortunate lover.

He was employed by cardinal Borghese to assist in decorating the Church of San Gregorio, in which his Flagellation of St. Andrea is so justly celebrated. Cardinal Farnese next employed him to paint some frescos in a chapel in the abbey of Grotto Farrata, where he executed several subjects from the life of St. Nilo; one of these, representing the cure of a diemoniac, is considered one of the finest productions at Rome. Soon after this he executed his famous Communion of St. Jerome, painted for the principal altar of San Girolamo della Cavitc. a work which has immortalized his name, and which was accounted, next to the Transfiguration of Raphael, the finest picture of Rome. This work has experienced some removals, but has been returned to its original place and copied in mosaic to preserve the design, the original having suffered from the effects of time. His next great work was in the Church of San Lodovico, representing the life of St. Cecilia. His great success and increasing fame had by this time so excited the envy and hatred of his contemporaries that he was constrained to leave Rome in disgust.

He therefore returned to Bologna, where he resided several years in the quiet practice of his profession, and executed some of his most admired works, particularly the Martyrdom of St. Agnes, for the church of that saint, and the Madonna del Rosario, both of which were engraved by Gerard Audran for the Louvre at Paris by order of Napoleon. The fame of Domenichino was now so well established that intrigue and malice could not suppress it, and pope Gregory XV invited him back to Rome, and appointed him principal painter and architect to the pontifical palace. Cardinal Montalto employed him, to decorate the vault of' San Andrea della Valle, where he represented the four evangelists, with angels, in such a masterly manner that they were the admiration of Italy and the study of artists. He also painted in the chapel of cardinal Bandini, in the Church of San Sylvestro, in the Quirinal, four pictures — Queen Esther before Ahasuerus, Judith with  the Head of Holofernes, David Playing on the Harp before the Ark, and Solomon and his Mother, Bathsheba, Seated on a Throne — which were esteemed among his finest works. Soon after he painted the Four Cardinal Virtues in the Church of San Carlo Catenari.

He was next invited to Naples to paint the chapel of St. Januarius. He executed one of his most admired works in the Palazzo della Torre, representing the dead Christ supported on the knees of the Virgin, together with Mary Magdalene and others. But his life soon became so embittered by the jealousy and hatred of his rivals that he quitted Naples in disgust, and returned once more to Bologna, where he died. in 1641. His work as an architect began with the superintendence of the pontifical palace under Gregory XV, but he executed various other works, particularly two designs for the Church of San Ignazio, at Rome. He was not, however, allowed to complete this edifice, but his designs were combined by the Jesuit Grassi in another edifice. Thereupon Domenichino refused to furnish additional plans, and the building was transferred to Algardi. In Santa Maria Trastevere he designed the rich and ingenious entablature, also the chapel, called Della Madonna di Strada Cupa. He also designed the greater part of the elegant villa Belvidere at Frascati, and designed and erected the picturesque villa Lodoviso at Rome, the gardens of which he laid out with a number of verdant walks, and divided the grove with exquisite taste. No better proof of his great merits as an artist can be desired than the fact that upwards of fifty of his works have been engraved by Gerard Audran, Raphael Morghen, and other famous engravers, and that many of them have been frequently copied. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, pages 265, 1119; Milizia, Lives of Celebrated Architects, 2:152.

## Zamzummim[[@Headword:Zamzummim]]

             (Heb. Zamzummim', זִמְזמַּים; Sept. Ζομζομμείν v.r. Ζοχομμίν, Vulg. Zomzommim, A.V. “Zamzummims”), the Ammonitish name for the people who by others (though who they were does not appear) were called Rephaim (q.v.) (Deu 2:20 only). They are described as having originally been a powerful and numerous nation of giants — “great, many, and tall” — inhabiting the district which at the time of the Hebrew conquest was in the possession of the Ammonites, by whom the Zamzummim had a long time previously been destroyed. Where this district was it is not, perhaps, possible exactly to define; but it probably lay in the neighborhood of Rabbath-Ammon (the present Amman), the only city of the Ammonites of which the name or situation is preserved to us, and therefore eastward of that rich undulating country from which Moab had been forced by the Amorites (the modern Belka), and of the numerous towns of that country whose ruins and names are still encountered.

From a slight similarity between the two names, and from the mention of the Emim in connection with each, it is usually assumed that the Zamzummim are identical with the Zuzim (q.v.) (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 410 a; Ewald, Gesch. 1, 308, note; Knobel, On Gen 14:5). Ewald further supports this by identifying Ham (q.v.), the capital city of the Zuzim (Gen 14:5), with Ammon. But at best the identification is very conjectural.

Various attempts have been made to explain the name: as, by comparison with the Arabic zamzam, “long-necked;” or samsam, “strong and big”  (Simonis, Onomast. p. 135); or as “obstinate,” from זָמִם(Luther), or as “noisy,” from זַמְזִם(Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 419), or as onomatopoetic, intended to imitate the unintelligible jabber of foreigners. Michaelis (Supplem. No. 629) playfully recalls the likeness of the name to that of the well Zen-zem at Mecca, and suggests thereupon that the tribe may have originally come from Southern Arabia. Notwithstanding this banter, however, he ends his article with the following discreet words, “Nihil historiae, nihil originis populi novirmus fas sit etymolo gium aeque ignorare.” See Journ. Sac. Lit. 1852, p. 366.

## Zanchi, Jerome[[@Headword:Zanchi, Jerome]]

             a clergyman and theologian of the German Reformed Church, was born at Alzano, in the territory of Bergamo, February 2, 1516, and was the son of the historian Zanchi. He entered the Augustilian order of regular canons in 1531, engaged in philosoplical and theological studies, and, on their completion, came with his friend, count Celso Martinengo of Brescia, to the monastery of Lucca, where Vermigli was teaching, and where they became acquainted with the writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Bullitnger, and Calvin. They soon afterwards came into notice as evangelical preachers, and were compelled to flee — Martinengo to Milan and Geneva, where he became pastor of the Italian Church, in 1552, and Zanchi to Switzerland and Geneva, in 1551.

In 1553 Zanchi accepted a  professorship of the Old Test. at Strasburg, where Marbach and other Lutherans were his colleagues, the association involving him in controversies upon the doctrines of the antichrist, predestination, and the perseverance of the saints, which began in 1561, and were superficially settled by arbitrators, who drew up a formal agreement, which was signed by all the clergy and professors of the city, Zanchi, however, appending a reservation to his signature intended to prevent his being compelled to teach what he did not receive as the truth. Calvin and other reformed theologians, however, censured the yielding temper which Zanchi had exhibited, and thus induced him to speak his sentiments more positively. This naturally renewed the strife and involved disagreeable consequences, from which he was glad to escape by accepting a call to Chiavenna as pastor of the Italian congregation. He had previously declined repeated calls to a similar post at Lysons., False teachers and uneasy Italian agitators troubled him at Chiavenna, and in 1564 a pestilence interrupted the services of his Church and compelled his retirement to a mountain near Piuri, where he occupied himself with writing a sketch of his controversy with Marbach, which afterwards appeared under the title of Miscellanaea (1566, 4to).

In 1568 he became professor of theology at Heidelberg, and rapidly earned the first place among the scholars of the theological faculty. His advice was sought by persons in every quarter and upon all the debated questions of the day, e.g., the sacraments, the Trinity, the mediation of Christ, and replies in great number were written to inquirers, sometimes in the name of the faculty, and often in his own name, all tending to the confirmation of the teachings of Reformed orthodoxy. He was equally zealous and influential in the work of introducing a strict discipline in the churches of the palatinate. Of larger theological works written by him in this period we mention De Tribus Elohim, etc. (1572), which is chiefly important as collocating the grounds upon which the antitrinitarians based their opinions; De Natum Dei, etc.; a sort of speculative philosophy of religion, in which the doctrine of predestination especially is carried to its logical consequences; and De Operibus Dei inftra Spatium Sex Dierum Creatis, a cosmology in which dogmatic hypotheses and physical facts are intermingled-interesting as showing the amount of knowledge possessed, or supposed to be possessed, respecting nature and natural forces in that day. A fourth work, De Primi Hominis Lapsu, etc., was begun at Heidelberg, but not completed.

A Lutheran prince succeeded to the throne of the Palatinate, and Zanchi was dismissed. The newly established University of Neutstadt-on-the-Hardt .received him, and made him its  professor of the New Test. in 1578, and this post he retained until he died, November 19, 1590, though he had been invited to return to Heidelberg when the Palatinate was restored to Calvinism. In 1577 he was required to write a confession by the deputies of the Reformed churches, then assembled at Frankfort, which confession was intended to be opposed to the Formula of Concord. This work became the basis of the Harmonia Conf. Fidei Orthodoxarum of Beza and Danaeus (1581). His children collected his works and published them after his dea, th, though no complete edition appeared prior to that of Geneva (1619, 3 volumes, fol. 8 parts). These works rank among the leading sources of the Rleformed theology of his time, but are already tainted with the scholastic spirit. See Schmid, in Stud. u. Krit. 1859; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zanchius, Basil[[@Headword:Zanchius, Basil]]

             a learned Italian monk and writer, was born at Bergamo in 1501. His real name was Peter, which he exchanged for Basil when he became a canon regular. He studied at Rome and various other places, but resided for the greater part of his life at Rome, where he died in 1560. He was the subject of persecution, for some cause not clearly ascertained, and died in prison. He, was one of the best Latin poets of his age. His Latin poems were first printed at Rome in 1540, and were often reprinted. He also wrote observations on all the books of Scripture (Rome, 1553). He published Epithetoum Commentarii: (1542), a second edition of which appeared under the title Dictionarium Poeticum et Epitheta Veterum Poetarum, etc. (1612).

## Zanoah[[@Headword:Zanoah]]

             (Heb. Zano'ach, זָנוֹחִ[Neh 11:30, זָנֹחִ], prob. marsh), the name of two towns in the tribe of Judah.

1. (Sept. Ζανώ) v.r. Τανώ, Vulg. Zano.) A place in the lowland (Shephelah), named in connection with Zoreah and Jarmuth (Jos 15:34), in the group occupying the north-western corner of the district. SEE JUDAH. The name recurs in its old connection in the lists of Nehemiah, both of the towns which were reinhabited by the people of Judah after the Captivity (Neh 11:30), and of those which assisted in repairing the wall of Jerusalem (Jos 3:13). Jerome says (Onomnast. s.v. “Zanohua”) that it was still called Zanua in his day, and lay in the region of Eleutheropolis on the way to Jerusalem. The name and position tolerably correspond to those of Zanu'a, a site which was pointed out to Dr. Robinson from Beit Nettif (Bib. Res. 2, 16), and which in the maps of Van de Velde and of Tobler (Dritte Wamderung) is located on the north side of the Wady Ismail, two miles east of Zareah, and four miles north of Yarmuk. Rabbi Schwarz inaccurately calls it Zamea (Palest. p. 102).

2. (Sept. [in Joshua, taking in the following name] Ζανωακείμ v.. Ζακαναείμ, Vulg. Zanoel; in Chronicles Ζαμών, Vulg. Zanoa.) A town in the highland district, the mountain proper (Jos 15:56), named in the same group with Maon, Carmel, Ziph, and other places known to lie south of Hebron. It is (as Van de Velde suggests, Memoir, p. 354) not improbably identical with Sanute which is mentioned by Seetzen (Reisen, 3, 29) as below Senula, and appears to be about ten miles south of Hebron. At the time of his visit it was the last inhabited place to the south. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 2, 204, note) gives the name differently, Za'nfutah; and it will be observed that, like Zanu'ah above mentioned, it contains the  Ain, which the Hebrew name does not. The English engineers found (Quar. Report. of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,” Jan. 1875, p. 15) an ancient site called Khirbet Sanut (written with an Elif= א), situated immediately west of Khirbet Yekin (the Cain of the context), which Tristram prefers as the representative of this Zanoah (Bible Places, p. 62).

In the genealogical lists of the tribe of Judah in 1 Chronicles, Jekuthiel is said to have been the father (i.e. founder or rebuilder) of Zanoah (4, 18); and, as far as the passage can be made out, some connection appears to be intended with “Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh.” This mention of Bithiah probably points to some colonization of the place by Egyptians or by Israelites directly from Egypt. In Seetzen's account of Sanuite (Za'nfitah) there is a curious token of the influence which events in Egypt still exercised on the place (Reisen, 3, 29). Here it is also mentioned with Socho and Eshtemoa, both of which places are recognizable in the neighborhood of Za'nutah. The Jewish interpreters considered the, whole of this passage of 1 Chronicles 4 to refer to Moses, and interpret each of the names which- it contains as titles of him. “He was chief of Zanoach,” says the Targum, “because for his sake God put away (זָנִח) the sins of Israel.”

## Zanoah (2)[[@Headword:Zanoah (2)]]

             (1) In the plain of Judah. The present Khurbet Zanua lies one and a half miles north of Belt Nettif and two and a half south-east of Ain Shems (Beth-Shemeh), and is "a large and important ruin on highground, mainly east of the road; but remains are also found on the hill-top to the west," consisting of chambers with arched entrances, foundations of housewalls, traces of mills, cave-tombs, etc. (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:128).

(2) In the hills of Judah. The modern Khurbet Zanuta lies four and a half miles south-west of Es-Semua (Eshtemoa), and one and a half north-west of Attu, and consists of "heaps of stones and foundations, fallen pillars, caves and cisterns on a hill" (described in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:410 sq.) .

## Zanolini, Antonio[[@Headword:Zanolini, Antonio]]

             a Jewish writer of the 18th century, is the author of, Quaestiones e Scripture Sacra (Padua, 1725): — Lexicon Hebraicum (ibid. 1732): — Lexicon Chaldaico-Rabbinicum (ibid. 1747): — Ratio Institutioque Addiscendae Linguae Chald.-Rabb.-Talmudicae cum Singularum Dialectorum Exemplis etiam Latinitate Donatis, etc. (ibid. 1750). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:542 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 4:312; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, s.v. (B.P.)

## Zanti, Abraham[[@Headword:Zanti, Abraham]]

             a Jewish physician, philosopher, and poet, was born in 1670, and died, rabbi of Venice, in 1729. He is the author of כהנת אברהם, or a metrorhythmic paraphrase of the Psalms (Venice, 1719). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:543; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 335. (B.P.).

## Zanzalus, Jacob[[@Headword:Zanzalus, Jacob]]

             (called also Baradaeus), a monk of the 6th century, became conspicuous by reviving the Monophysite (q.v.) sect of the Eutychians (q.v.). They had been reduced to a very small number, but these had ordained Zanzalus bishop of Edessa,'and by his zeal and unceasing toil he left the sect, at his death in A.D. 588, in a flourishing condition in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Egypt, and other countries. These are known as Jacobites (q.v.).

## Zaphnath-Paaneah[[@Headword:Zaphnath-Paaneah]]

             (Heb. Tsaphenath' Paane'äch, צָפְנִת פִּעְנחִ; Sept. Ψονθομφανήχ, Vulg. Salvator mundi), a name given by Pharaoh to Joseph (Gen 41:45). SEE JOSEPH.

I. Form of the Word. — Various forms of this name, all traceable to the Hebrew or Sept. original, occur in the works of the early Jewish and Christian writers, chiefly Josephus, from different MSS and editions of whose Antiquities (2, 6, 1) no less than eleven forms have been collected following both originals, some variations being very corrupt; but from the translation given by Josephus it is probable that he transcribed the Hebrew. Philo (De Nominun Mut. [ed. Col. 1613], p. 819 c) and Theodoret (1, 106, ed. Schulz) follow the Sept., and Jerome the Hebrew. The Coptic version nearly transcribes the Sept., psonthomphaneck.

In the Hebrew text the name is divided into two parts. Every such division of Egyptian words being in accordance with the Egyptian orthography as Noammon, Pi-beseth, Poti-Pherah we cannot, if the name be Egyptian,  reasonably propose any change in this case; if the name be Hebrew, the same is certain. There is no prima facie reason for any change in the consonants.

The Sept. form seems to indicate the same division, as the latter part, φανήχ, is identical with the second part of the Hebrew, while what precedes is different. There is again no prinza faide reason for any change from the ordinary reading of the name. The cause of the difference from the Hebrew in the earlier part of the name must be discussed when we come to examine its meaning.

II. Proposed Etymologies of the Word, This name has been explained as Hebrew or Egyptian, and always as a proper name. It has not been supposed to be an official title, but this possibility has to be considered.

1. The rabbins interpreted Zaphnath-paaneah as Hebrew, in the sense “revealer of a secret.” This explanation is as old as Josephus (κρυπτῶν εὑρετήν, Ant. 2, 6, 1), and Theodoret also follows it (τῶν ἀποῤήτων ἑρμηνευτήν 5, 1,106, Schulz). Philo offers an explanation, which, though seemingly different, may be the same (ἐν ἀποκρίσει στόμα κρίνον; but Mangey conjectures the true reading to be ἐν ἀποκρύψει στόμα ἀποκρινόμενον, loc. cit.). It must be remembered that Josephus perhaps, and Theodoret and Philo certainly, follow the Sept. form of the name. We dismiss the Hebrew interpretation as unsound in itself and demanding the improbable concession that Pharaoh gave Joseph a Hebrew name.

2. Isidore, though mentioning the Hebrew interpretations, remarks that the name should be Egyptian, and offers an Egyptian etymology: “Joseph... hunc Pharao Zaphanath Phaaneca appellavit, quod Hebraice absconditorum repertorem sonat… tamen quia hoc nomen ab AEgyptio ponitur, ipsius linglume.debet habere rationem. Interpretatur ergo Zaphanath Phaaneca AEgyptio sermone salvator mundi” (Orig. 7:7, vol. 3, p. 327, Arev.). Jerome adopts the same rendering.

3. Modern scholars have looked to the Coptic for an explanation of this name, Jablonski and others proposing as the Coptic of the Egyptian original psot-m-phenet, etc., of “the preservation (or preserver) of the age.” This is evidently the etymology intended by Isidore and Jerome. — Smith. See Jablonski, Opusc. c. 207-216; Rosellini, Mon. Storici, 1, 185; Champollidn, Gramm. p. 380; Pezron, Lex. Copt. p. 207; Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.

III. Comparison with Egyptian Elements. —

1. The Hebrew Form. — This, after eliminating the Masoretic vowels, is Z- ph-n-th ‘P-'-n-ch, which transcribed in hieroglyphics, stands thus:

The first syllable, zaf, signifies “provisions;” the second, nat, is the preposition “of;” p is the definite article “the;” and the last syllable, anch, means “life.” The whole name, therefore, may well be translated “food of the living.”

2. The Septuagint Form. — This is more difficult of rendering. The most literal transcription of the Greek ψονθομφανηχ, omitting the vowels as unessential, i.e. p-s-n-t-m-p-n-'-n-ch, would be in hieroglyphics thus:

This means “he who gives joy to the world,” a sense evidently taken by Jerome in the Vulg., who lived while the Egyptian was yet vernacular, and who renders it “savior of the world” (see the Speaker's Commentary [Amer. ed.], 1, 480 sq.).

## Zaphon[[@Headword:Zaphon]]

             (Heb. Tsaphon', צָפוֹן, north, as often; Sept.'Σαφών v.r. Σαφάν; Vulg. Saphon), the name of a place mentioned (in connection with Beth-aram, Bethnimrah, and Succoth) in the enumeration of the allotment of the tribe of Gad (Jos 13:27). It is one of the places in “the valley” (i.e. of the Jordan), which appear to have constituted the “remainder (יֶתֶר) of the kingdom of Sihon” apparently referring to the portion of the same kingdom previously allotted to Reuben (Jos 13:17-21). The enumeration appears to proceed from south to north, and from the mention of the Sea of Chinneroth it is natural to infer that Zaphon was near that lake. The Talmud (Gemara Jerus. Shebiith, 6) identifies it with the ancient Amathus (q.v.), the remains of which are still called Amateh on Wady Rejib (Schwarz, Palest. p. 232), and this position is not an improbable one.

In Jdg 12:1 the word rendered “northward” (tsaphonah) may with equal accuracy be rendered “to Zaphon.” This rendering is supported by the Alexandrian copy of the Sept. (Κεφεινά) and a host of other MSS.,  and it has consistency on its side, since the Ephraimites were marching eastward rather than northward. SEE JEPHTHAH.

## Zara[[@Headword:Zara]]

             (Ζαρά), the Greek form (Matthew 1, 3) of the Heb. name ZERAI SEE ZERAI (q.v.), the son of Judah.

## Zara (2)[[@Headword:Zara (2)]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Zaraces[[@Headword:Zaraces]]

             (Ζαράκης v.r. Ζαραῖος; Vulg. Zaraceles), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 1:38) of the Heb. name of the brother of Joacim (Jehoiakin), king of Judah, probably ZEDEKIAH SEE ZEDEKIAH (q.v.).

## Zarah[[@Headword:Zarah]]

             (Gen 38:30; Gen 46:12). SEE ZERAH.

## Zaraias[[@Headword:Zaraias]]

             (Ζαραίας), the Greek form of ZERHIAAHA (a, 1Es 8:2; comp. Ezr 7:1; b, 1Es 8:31; comp. Ezr 8:4) or (corruptly) ZEBADIAH (1Es 8:34; comp. Ezr 8:8).

## Zareah[[@Headword:Zareah]]

             (Neh 11:29). SEE ZORAH.

## Zareathite[[@Headword:Zareathite]]

             (1 Chronicles 2, 53). SEE ZORATHITE.

## Zared[[@Headword:Zared]]

             (Numbers 21, 12). SEE ZERED.

## Zaremba, Felician Martin Von[[@Headword:Zaremba, Felician Martin Von]]

             a famous missionary, was born at Zaroy, in the Russian government of Grodno, in Lithuania, March 15, 1794. He studied at Dorpat for a political career. In 1816 he was made doctor of philosophy, and in 1817 engaged at St. Petersburg in the college for foreign affairs. In the same year he concluded to give up everything and to work in the service of his Master. He went to Basle in 1818, and having spent there nearly three years, was appointed to commence missionary operations in Grusia. Having received his ordination in 1821, he went to Shusha, which became the nucleus for his operations. In 1830 he was obliged to leave his post on account of feeble health, and returned to Basle. In 1835 he again returned to his post, but, on his way, an imperial ukase forbade further operations. All representations were in vinn, and Zaremba, the first and last missionary of  the Basle Society, left Shusha in 1838 for Basle. From 1839 to 1864 he travelled through Europe in behalf of his society, but in 1865 he was struck with apoplexy. He died May 31, 1874. See Der evangelische Heidenbote, 1874, No. 7. (B.P.)

## Zarephath[[@Headword:Zarephath]]

             (Heb. Tsarephath', צ רַפִת, smelting place; Sept and New Test. Σαρεπτά [in Obad. τὰ Σαρεπτά; v.r. in 1 Kings, Σεφθά]; Josephus, Σαρεφθά; “Sarepta,” Luk 4:26), a town which derives its claim to notice from having been the residence of the prophet Elijah during the latter part of the drought, and where he performed the miracle of multiplying the barrel of meal and cruse of oil, and where he raised the widow's son to life (1Ki 17:9-10). Beyond stating that it was near to, or dependent on, Zidon (לְצַידוֹן), the Bible gives no clew to its position. It is mentioned by Obadiah (1Ki 17:20), but merely as a Canaanitish (that is, Phoenician) city. Josephus (Ant. 8:13, 2), however, states that it was “not far from Sidon and Tyre, for it lies between them.” To this Jerome adds (Onomast. s.v. “Sarefta”) that it “lay on the public road,” that is, the coast-road. Both these conditions. are implied in the mention of it in the itinerary of Paula by Jerome (Epit. Paulae, § 8), and both are fulfilled in the situation of the modern village of Surafend, a name which, except in its termination, is almost identical with the ancient Phoenician (comp. Pliny, 5, 17; Jerome, Ep. 108, ad Eustoch.).

There were many vineyards there (Sidon. Apoll. Carm. 17:16; Fulgent. Mythol. 2, 15). The Crusaders made Sarepta a Latin bishopric in the archiepiscopate of Sidon, and erected near the port a small chapel over the reputed site of Elijah's miracle (William ch of Tyre, 19:14; Jacob of Vitry, ch. 44). In the Middle Ages it .was a strongly fortified place (Wilken, Kreuzzige, 2, 208). The locality has been visited and described in recent times by Robinson (Bibl. Res. 2, 475), Thomson (Land and Book, ch. 12), and others. It appears to have changed its place, at least since the 11th century, for it is now more than a mile from the coast, high up on the slope of a hill (Robinson, p. 474), whereas at the time of the Crusades it was on the shore. Of the old town considerable indications remain. One group of foundations is on a headland called Ain elKentarah; but the chief remains are south of this, and extend for a mile or more, with many fragments of columns, slabs, and other architectural features. The Roman road is said to be up usually perfect there (Beamont, Diary, etc., 2, 186). The site of the chapel erected by the Crusaders on the spot then reputed to be the site of the widow's house is probably still preserved (see the citations of Robinson). It is near the water's edge, and is now marked by a wely and  small khan dedicated to el-Khud, the well-known personage who unites, in the popular Moslem faith, Elijah and St. George. A grotto at the foot of the hill on which the modern village -stands is' now shown as the residence of Elijah (Yan de Velde, Syr. and Palest. 1, 102). See Maundrell, Travels, p. 63; Korte, Reis. p. 307; Nau, Voyage Nouv. p. 544; Pococke, East, 2, 85; Raumer, Palastina, p. 140; Richter, Walf. p. 72; Russegger, 3, 145; Cobius, De Sarepta (Viteb. 1728), SEE PHOENICIA.

## Zaretan[[@Headword:Zaretan]]

             (Heb. Tsarethan', צ רְתָן, perhaps splendor; in Joshua Sept. wholly omits; Vulg. Satthan; in 1Ki 7:46 Sept. Σιαράμ v.r. Σειρά; Vulg. Sarthan; A. V. ‘“Zarthan;” with הdirective, Zarethandnah, ז רְתָנָה, in 4:12; Sept. Σαρθάν v.r. Σεραρθάν and Ε᾿σλιανθάν; Vulg. Sarthana; A. V. “Zartanah”), a town or locality mentioned by this name three times, and apparently several times also under similar names. It' is first named in the account of the passage of the Jordan by the Israelites (Joshua 3, 16) as defining the position of the city Adam, which was beside (מַצָּד) it. It is next mentioned in the list of Solomon's commissariat districts as “close to” (אֵצֶל) Bethshean, that is, in the upper part of the Jordan valley and “beneath” (מַתִּחִת לְ8) Jezreel (1Ki 4:12). It is again mentioned in connection with Succoth as a clayey place where Solomon cast metal in the circle (כַּכָּר, kikkar, “plain,” i.e. ghor) of the Jordan (7, 46). In the parallel passage to this last (2Ch 4:17) ZEREDATHAH SEE ZEREDATHAH (q.v.) is substituted for Zarthan, and this again is not impossibly identical with the ZERERAH SEE ZERERAH (q.v.) of the story of Gideon (Jdg 7:22). All these spots agree in proximity to the Jordan, and the associated places somewhat aid us in discovering the general locality. Bethshean is the present Beisan, Succoth is probably the present Salkut, and Adam is; doubtless, represented by the modern Adamieh ford. Van de Velde (Memoir, 1354) inclines to identify Zaretan with Surtabah, a lofty and isolated hill which projects from the main highlands into the Jordan valley, about seventeen miles north of Jericho (comp. De Saulcy, Dead Sea, 2, 31); but the names are not closely alike, and this peak has another ancient appellation. SEE SARTABA. Schwarz probably refers to the same spot when he declares that the name should be read Sartaph, and that the town in question was so called “because it lay near Mount Sartaf, five English miles west of the Jordan” (Palest. p. 162).  Mr. Drake (in the Quar. Report of the “Palestine Explor. Fund,” Jan. 1875, p. 31) thinks that the reading Siaram (Σιαράμ) of the Alexandrian MS. at 1Ki 7:46 points to a “Tell Sarem, a very conspicuuiils and unusually large mound three miles south of Beisan;”but this reading is very precarious. According to Tristram (Bible Places, p. 228), “the name lingers in Ain Zahrah and Tulull Zahrah, three miles west of Beisan, indicating that Zaretan was the designation of a district rather than a place.”

## Zareth-shahar[[@Headword:Zareth-shahar]]

             (Heb. Tse'reth hash-Sha'char, צַרֶת הִשִּׁהִר, splendor of the dawn; Sept. Σὰρθ καὶ Σιώρχ v.r. Σεραδὰ καὶ Σιών; Vulg. Sereth Assahar), a place in the tribe of Reuben, situated in the mountain ha-Emek (A. V. “Mount of the Valley”), i.e. in the abrupt edge of the Jordan or Dead Sea valley (Jos 13:19, where it is mentioned between Sibmah and Bethpeor). Seetzen (Reisen, 2, 369) proposes to identify it with a spot called Sard at the mouth of the Wady Zer'ka Main, about a mile from the edge of the Dead Sea.' In this Tristram coincides, and he describes the spot as being in keeping with its poetical name, “the inconsiderable ruins of Zara” occupying a little oasis embayed in the shore of the sea, where the river runs through steep banks shaded by oleanders and palms, with numerous hot and somewhat sulphurous springs (Bible Places, p. 351). A place Shakuir is marked on Van de Velde's map, about six miles south of es- Salt, at the head of the valley of the Wady Seir, which might possibly represent the latter part of the name more exactly.

## Zarhite[[@Headword:Zarhite]]

             (Heb. Zarchi', זִרְחַי, Sept. Ζαραϊv v.r. Σαραϊv, A. V. “Zarhites”), the patronymic of the family of Zerah son of Judah (Num 26:20; Jos 7:17 1Ch 27:11; 1Ch 27:13), and also of that descended from Zerah son of Simeon (Num 26:13).

## Zartanah[[@Headword:Zartanah]]

             [some Zarta'nah] (1Ki 4:12). SEE ZARETAN.

## Zarthan[[@Headword:Zarthan]]

             (1Ki 7:46). SEE ZARETAN.

## Zathoi[[@Headword:Zathoi]]

             (Sept. Ζαρθοή‘; Vulg. Zachues), a Greek form (1Es 8:32) of the Heb. name ZATTU SEE ZATTU (which is apparently omitted in Ezr 8:5).

## Zathui[[@Headword:Zathui]]

             (Sept. Ζαθουί v.r. Ζατού'; Vulg. Demu), a Greek form (1Es 5:12) of the Heb. name (Ezr 2:8) ZATTU SEE ZATTU (q.v.).

## Zatthu[[@Headword:Zatthu]]

             (Neh 10:14). SEE ZATTU.

## Zattu[[@Headword:Zattu]]

             (Heb. Zattu', זִתּוּא, pleasant; Sept. Ζαθουιά v.r. Ζαθθουά, Ζατθουά, etc.; Vulg. Zethua, Zethu), an Israelite whose “sons” to the number of 945 (or 845) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 8; Neh 7:13); and another company of them returned with Ezra, although his name has accidentally dropped out of the text in Ezr 8:5, as we learn from the Sept and the Apocryphal parallel (1Es 8:32), which both read “of the sons of Zathoe, Zechenias son of Aziel [orJezelus]” (Keil, Comment. ad loc.). B.C. ante 536. Several of these descendants renounced their Gentile wives (Ezr 10:27).

## Zavan[[@Headword:Zavan]]

             (1Ch 1:42). SEE ZAAVAN.

## Zayit [[@Headword:Zayit ]]

             SEE OLIVE.

## Zaza [[@Headword:Zaza ]]

             (Heb. Zaza', זָזָא, perhaps projection; Sept. Ζαζάη v.r. Ο᾿ζαζά, Ο᾿ζάμ, etc.; Vulg. Ziza), last named of the two sons of Jonathan of the family of Jerahmeel the Judahite (1 Chronicles 2, 33). B.C. post 1618.

## Zeal[[@Headword:Zeal]]

             a passionate ardor for any person or cause. The word in Hebrew is, קנְאָהkinah, from קָנָא, kanah, "to flush" with passion.The Sept. usually renders it by ζῆλος (the New Test. term), which is derived from ζέω, "to be hot." Thus we say, "a fiery zeal." The psalmist says (Psa 69:9), "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me," or consumed me like fire (see Bauer, De Messiae Zelo pro Domo Dei, Viteb. 1744). Zeal is an earnestness arising either from good or evil motives (2Sa 21:2; 1Co 14:12; Col 4:13). Thus Phinehas was commended because he was zealous for Jehovah (Num 25:11-13); but Jehu, when he slew the priests of Baal and the family of Ahab, was zealous in order to gain public applause, (2Ki 10:16-31). Zeal may be misdirected, or it may be honorable (Php 3:6; Gal 4:17-18; Tit 2:14; Psa 69:9; Joh 2:17). Zeal is attributed in Scripture to God as well as to man (2Ki 19:31; Isa 9:7; Eze 5:13). There are a various kinds of zeal, as

(1) an ignorant zeal (Rom 10:2-3);

(2) a persecuting zeal (Php 3:6);

(3) a superstitious zeal (1 Kings 18; Gal 1:14);

(4) a hypocritical zeal (2Ki 10:16);

(5) a contentious zeal (1Co 11:16);

(6) a partial zeal (Hos 7:8);

(7) a temporary zeal (2Ki 12:13; Gal 4:15);

(8) a genuine zeal, which is a sincere and warm concern for the glory of God, and the spiritual welfare of mankind (Gal 4:18; Rev 3:19).  This last is generally compounded of sound knowledge, strong faith, and disinterested regard; and will manifest itself by self-denial, patient endurance, and constant exertion.

The motives to true zeal are

(1) the divine command (Rev 3:19);

(2) the example of Christ and the end of his death (Joh 2:17; Act 10:38; Tit 2:14);

(3) the importance of his service;

(4) the advantage and pleasure it brings to the possessor;

(5) the instances and honorable commendation of it in the Scriptures: Moses, Phineas, Caleb, David, Paul, etc. (Gal 4:18; Rev 3:15, etc.); (6) the incalculable good effects it produces on others (Jam 5:20). See Reynolds and Orton on Sacred Zeal; Massillon, Charges; Evans, Christian Temper, sermon 37; Hughes, Channing, and Chapin, Sermon on Zeal; Mason, Christ. Mor. sermon 28; Natural History of Enthusiasm. SEE FAITH; SEE FANATICISM; SEE JEALOUSY,

## Zealots[[@Headword:Zealots]]

             (ζηλωταί) were, in a technical Jewish sense, the followers of Judas the Gaulonite, or Galilsean (q.v.). Josephus speaks of them as forming the "fourth sect of Jewish philosophy," and as distinguished from the Pharisees chiefly by a quenchless love of liberty and a contempt of death. Their leading tenet was the unlawfulness of paying tribute to the Romans, as being a violation of the theocratic constitution. This principle, which they maintained by force of arms against the Roman government, was soon converted into a pretext for deeds of violence against their own countrymen, and during the last days of the Jewish polity the Zealots were lawless brigands or guerrillas, the pest and terror of the land. After the death of Judas, and of his two sons, Jacob and Simon (who suffered crucifixion), they were headed by Eleazar, one of his descendants, and were often denominated Sicari, from the use of a weapon resembling the.Roman sica (Joseph. Ant. 18:1; War, 4:1-6; 7:8; see Lardner,  Credibility, part 1, book 1, chapter 6, 9; Kitto, Palestine, pages 741, 751). SEE ZELOTES.

## Zebachim[[@Headword:Zebachim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Zebadiah[[@Headword:Zebadiah]]

             (Heb. Zebaayah', זְבִדְיָה[thrice in the prolonged form Zebadya'hu, זַבִדְיָהיּ1Ch 26:2; 2Ch 17:8; 2Ch 19:11], gift of Jehovah; Sept. Ζαβαδία or Ζαβαδίας v r Ζαβδίας or Ζαβδία etc.), the name of several Israelites. SEE ZABIEL.

1. A Benjamite of the “sons” of Beriah (1Ch 8:15). B.C. cir. 1618.

2. A Benjamite of the “sons” of Elpaal (1Ch 8:17). B.C. cir. 1618.

3. One of the two sons of Jeroham of Gedor, a Benjamite who joined the fortunes of David in his retreat at Ziklag (1Ch 12:7). B.C. 1054.

4. A Levite, third son of Meshelemiah the Korhite (1Ch 26:2). B.C. 1043.

5. Son of Asahel (Joab's brother), and commander with his father of the fourth contingent of David's troops (1Ch 27:7). B.C. 1014.

6. One of the two Levites who were sent with others in the third year of Jehoshaphat to teach the law in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:8). B.C. 910.

7. The son of Ishmael and prince of the house of Judah in the reign of Jehoshaphat, who, in conjunction with Amariah the chief priest, was appointed to the superintendence of the Levites, priests and chief men who had to decide all causes, civil and ecclesiastical, which were brought before them (2Ch 19:11). B.C. 895. They possibly may have formed a kind of court of appeal, Zebadiah acting for the interests of the king, and Amariah being the supreme authority in ecclesiastical matters.

8. Son of Michael of the “sons” of Shephatiah, who returned with Ezra from Babylon with eighty male relatives (Ezr 8:8). B.C. 459.

9. A priest of the “sons” of Immer, who divorced his Gentile wife married after the Exile (Ezr 10:20). B.C. 458.

## Zebah[[@Headword:Zebah]]

             (Heb. Ze'bach, זֵבִה sacrifice, as often; Sept. Ζεβεέ; Josephus, Ζεβή; Vulg. Zebee), first named of the two “kings” of Midian who appear to have commanded the great invasion of Palestine, and who finally fell by the hand of Gideon himself. B.C. 1361. He is always coupled with Zalmunna, and is mentioned in Jdg 8:5-21; Psa 83:11). SEE ZALMUNNA. It is a remarkable instance of the unconscious artlessness of the narrative contained in Jdg 6:33 to Jdg 8:28 that no mention is made of any of the chiefs of the Midianites during the early part of the story or indeed until Gideon actually comes into contact with them. We then discover (Jdg 8:18) that while the Bedawin were ravaging the crops in the valley of Jezreel, before Gideon's attack, three or more of his brothers had been captured by the Arabs and put to death by the hands of Zebah and Zalmunna themselves. But this material fact is only incidentally mentioned, and is of a piece with the later references by prophets and psalmists to other events in the same struggle, the interest and value of which have been alluded to under OREB (q.v.).

Psa 83:12 purports to have preserved the very words of the cry with which Zebah and Zalmunna rushed up at the head of their hordes from the Jordan into the l'axurianit growth of the great plain — “Seize these goodly pastures!”

While Oreb and Zeeb, two of the inferior leaders of the incursion, had been slain, with a vast number of their people, by the Ephraimites at the central fords of the Jordan (not improbably those near Jisr Damieh), the two kings had succeeded in making their escape by a passage farther to the north (probably the ford near Bethshean), and thence by the Wady Yabis, through Gilead, to Karkor, a place which is not fixed, but which lay doubtless high up on the Hauran. Here they were reposing with 15,000 men, a mere remnant of their huge horde, when Gideon overtook them. Had they resisted, there is little doubt that they might have easily overcome the little band of “fainting” heroes who had toiled after them up the tremendous passes of the mountains; but the name of Gideon was still full of terror, and the Bedawin were entirely unprepared for his attack: they fled in dismay, and the two kings were taken. SEE GIDEON.

Then came the return down the long defiles leading to the Jordan. We see the cavalcade of camels, jingling the golden chains and the crescent-shaped  collars or trappings hung round their necks. High aloft rode the captive chiefs clad in their brilliant kefiyehs and embroidered abbayehs, and with their “collars” or “jewels” in nose and ear, on neck and arm. Gideon probably strode on foot by the side of his captives. They passed Penuel, where Jacob had seen the vision of the face of God; they passed Succoth; they crossed the rapid stream of the Jordan; they ascended the highlands west of the river, and at length reached Ophrah, the native village of their captor (Josephus, Ant. 5, 6, 5). Then, at last, the question which must have been on Gideon's tongue during the whole of the return, found a vent. There is no appearance of its having been alluded to before, but it gives, as nothing else could, the key to the whole pursuit. It was the death of his brothers, “the children of his mother,” that had supplied the personal motive for that steady perseverance, and had led Gideon on to his goal against hunger, faintness, and obstacles of all kinds. “What manner of men were they which ye slew at Tabor?” Up to this time the sheiks may have believed that they were reserved for ransom; but these words, once spoken, there can have been no doubt what their fate was to be. They met it like noble children of the desert without fear or weakness. One request alone they make that they may die by the sure blow of the hero himself “and Gideon arose and slew them;” and not till he had revenged his brothers did any thought of plunder enter his heart then, and not till then, did he lay hands on the treasures which ornamented their camels. SEE MIDIANITE.

## Zebaim[[@Headword:Zebaim]]

             (Heb. with the art. hats-Tsebaïm' הִצְּבָיַthe gazelles, as often; Sept. υίοὶ Α᾿σεβωείμ v.r. Α᾿σεβωείν; Vulg. Asebainn; in Nehemiah hats-Tsebaïm', הִצְּבָיַי; Sept. υἱοὶ Σαβαείμ; Vug. Sabaim), apparently the name of the native place of the “sons of Pochereth,” who are mentioned in the catalogue of the families of “Solomon's slaves” as having returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59). On the other hand, the compound name Pochereth hat-Tsebaïm is considered by some to have no reference to place, but to signify the “snarer or hunter of roes” (Gesenius, Thesaur. — p. 1102 b; Bertheau, Exeq. Handb. Ezr 2:57), designating doubtless an individual SEE POCHERETH.

## Zebedee, or rather Zebedaeus[[@Headword:Zebedee, or rather Zebedaeus]]

             (Ζεβεδαῖος, the Greek form apparently of Zabdi or Zebediah), a fisherman of Galilee, the father of the apostles James the Great and John  (Mat 4:21), and the husband of Salome (Mat 27:56; Mar 15:40). He probably lived either at Bethsaida or in its immediate neighborhoods It has been inferred from the mention of his “hired servants” (1, 20), and from the acquaintance between the apostle John and Annas the high-priest (Joh 18:15), that the family of Zebedee were in easy circumstances (comp; 19:27), although not above manual labor (Mat 4:21). While the name of Zebedee frequently occurs as a patronymic, for the sake of distinguishing his two sons from others who bore the same names, he appears only once in the Gospel narrative namely, in Mat 4:21-22; Mar 1:19-20 where he is seen in his boat with his two sons mending their nets. A.D. 26. On this occasion he allows his sons to leave him, at the bidding of the Savior, without raising any objection, although it does not appear that he was himself ever of the number of Christ's disciples. His wife, indeed, appears in the catalogue of the pious women who were in constant attendance on the Savior towards the close of his ministry, who watched him on the cross, and ministered to him even in the grave (Mat 27:55-56; Mar 15:40; Mar 16:1; comp. Mat 25:20; Luk 8:3). It is reasonable to infer that Zebedee was dead before this time. SEE JOHN (the Apostle).

## Zebin[[@Headword:Zebin]]

             SEE ALEXANDER.

## Zebina[[@Headword:Zebina]]

             (Heb. Zebina', זְבַינָא, purchase; Sept. Ζαβνίν v.r. Ζεβεννάς; Vulg. Zabina), one of the “sons” of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife taken after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:43). B.C. 458.

## Zeboiim[[@Headword:Zeboiim]]

             (Gen 14:2; Gen 14:8). SEE ZEBOIM.

## Zeboim[[@Headword:Zeboim]]

             a name which occurs in two distinct forms in the original, denoting different localities.

1. (Heb. Tseboini', צְבֹאַים. gazelles, as often, Hos 11:8; or shorter, Tseboïm', צַבֹיַם[marg. צְבוֹיַם], Gen 10:19; or  צְבֹיַים [marg. צַבוֹיַם], Gen 14:2; Gen 14:8 [A.V. “Zeboïm”]; Deu 29:23; Sept. Σεβωείμ v.r. Σεβοείμ; Vulg. Zeboïm), one of the five cities destroyed by divine visitation in the vale of Siddim (Hos 11:8), mentioned immediately after Admah (Gen 10:19; Deu 29:23), and ruled over by a separate king, Shemeber (Gen 14:2; Gen 14:8). De Saulcy finds the site of Zeboïm in the Talda Sebaan, a name which he reports as attached to extensive ruins on the high ground between the Dead Sea and Kerak (Dead Sea, 1, 383); but the position as well as the elevation is improbable, and the ancient spot is most likely beneath the water of the southern bay of the sea. SEE SODOM; SEE ZOAR.

2. (Heb. with the art. hats-Tseboïm', הִצַּבֹעַים, the hyenas; Sept. Ζαμαείν v.r. Σαβίμ, Σεβοείμ, etc.; Vulg. Seboimn), the name of a valley (גֵּי), i.e. a ravine or gorge, apparently east of Michmash, mentioned in 1Sa 13:18, where it is described with a curious minuteness, which is unfortunately no longer intelligible. The road running from Michmash to the east is specified as “the road of the border that looketh to the ravine of Zeboim towards the wilderness.” The wilderness (midbar) is no doubt the district of uncultivated mountaintops and sides which lies between the central district of Benjamin and the Jordan valley, and here apparently the ravine of Zeboim should be sought. In that very district there is a wild gorge, bearing the name of Shuk ed-Duba, “ravine of the hyena,” up which runs the path from Jericho to Mukhmas (Conder, Tent Work in Palest. 3, 16). It is represented on the new Ordnance Map as running for a short distance N.E. of Ain Dûk. The same place or a town adjacent seems to be mentioned in Neh 11:34 (where it occurs without the art. prefixed)-confounding it, nevertheless, with the Zeboïm of Genesis-as occupied after the Captivity. Rabbi Schwarz, however, maintains that the two places are different, and, while locating the valley as above (Palest. p. 156), he identifies the Zeboïm of Nehemiah with “the village Zuba, situated on .a high mount, three English miles west of Jerusalem” (ibid. p. 134). He adds,” In [the Talmudical tract] Challah, 4:10 is mentioned the Mount. Zeboim.” He doubtless refers to the ruined village Soba, about six miles west of Jerusalem, near Eshtaol; but this has little probability.

## Zebub[[@Headword:Zebub]]

             SEE FLY.

## Zebudah[[@Headword:Zebudah]]

             (Heb. Zebidah', זְבַידָה; marg. Zebudath', זְוּדָהbestowed; Sept. Ι᾿ελδάφ v.r. Εἰελδάθ, Ι᾿ελλα, etc.; Vulg. Zebida), the daughter of Pedaiah of Rumah, wife of Josiah and mother of king Jehoiakim (2Ki 23:36). B.C. 633.

## Zebul[[@Headword:Zebul]]

             (Heb. Zebul', זְבל, habitation; Sept. Ζεβούλ; Josephus, Ζέβουλος), the chief man (שִׂר, A. V. “ruler”) of the city of Shechem at the time of the contest between Abimelech and the native Canaanites (Jdg 9:28; Jdg 9:30; Jdg 9:36; Jdg 9:38; Jdg 9:41). B.C. 1319. He governed the town as the “officer” (פָּקַיד; Sept. ἐπίσκοπος; Josephus, ζένος Ant. 5, 7, 4]) of Abimelech while the latter was absent; and he took part against the Canaanites by shutting them out of the city when-Abimelech was encamped outside it. His conversation with Gaal, the Canaanitish leader, as they stood in the gate of Shechem watching the approach of the armed bands, gives Zebul a certain individuality among the many characters of that time of confusion. SEE ABIMELECH.

## Zebulonite[[@Headword:Zebulonite]]

             (Heb. Zebuloni', זְבוּלֹנַי; Sept. Ζαβουλωνίτης v.r. Ζαβουνίτης), the patronymic designation of a member of the tribe of Zebulon (Num 26:27, “Zebulunite;” Jdg 12:11-12).

## Zebulun[[@Headword:Zebulun]]

             (Hee. Zebulun', once [Jdg 1:30] fully זְבוּלוּן, usually זְבוּלן or [Gen 30:20; Gen 35:23; Gen 46:14; Jdg 4:6; Jdg 5:18; Jdg 6:35; 1Ch 2:1; 1Ch 6:63; 1Ch 6:77; 1Ch 12:33; 1Ch 12:40; 2Ch 30:10-11; 2Ch 30:18; Psa 68:27; Isa 9:1] זְבלוּן, habitation; Sept., New Test., and Josephus, Ζαβουλών; Vulg. Zabulon; A.V. “Zabulon,” Mat 4:13; Mat 4:15; Rev 7:8), the name of a man and of the tribe descended from him, and also of a city in Palestine.

1. The sixth and last son of Leah, and the tenth born to Jacob (Gen 35:23; Gen 46:14; 1Ch 2:1). His birth is recorded in Gen 30:19-20, where the origin of the name is, as usual, ascribed to an  exclamation of his mother— “Now will my husband dwell with me (yizbeleni), for I have borne him six sons!” and she called his name Zebulun.” B.C. 1914. This paronomasia is not preserved in the original of the “Blessing of Jacob,” though the language of the A.V. implies it. The word rendered “dwell” in Gen 49:13 is יַשְׁכֹּן, with no relation to the name Zebulun. The Sept. puts a different point on the exclamation of Leah: “My husband will choose me” (αἱρετιεῖ με). This, however, hardly implies any difference in the original text. Josephus (Ant. 1, 19, 8) gives only a general explanation: “a pledge of goodwill towards her.” In the order of birth, Zebulun followed his brother Issachar, with whom, in the history of the tribes and in their allotted territories in Canaan, he was closely connected (Deu 33:18). His personal history does not appear to have contained a single incident worthy of record; and his name is not once mentioned except in the genealogical lists. In the Jewish traditions he is named as the first of the five who were presented by Joseph to Pharaoh- Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher being the others (Targ. Pseudo-Jon. On Genesis 47, 2).

At the time of the descent of Jacob into Egypt, Zebulun had three sons — Sered, Elon, and Jahleel (Gen 46:14) — who became the founders of the three great families into which the tribe was divided (Num 26:26). Though the first generation was so small, this tribe ranked fourth in numbers among the twelve, when the census was taken at Mount Sinai, in the year of the Exode; Judah, Dan, and Simeon being more numerous. During the wilderness journey it increased from 57,400 males to 60,500; but it held just the same relative place among the twelve — Judah, Dan, and Issachar being before it when the census was made on the plains of Moab (Num 26:27).

History is almost as silent regarding the acts of the tribe during the long period of Egyptian bondage and the desert march as it is regarding the patriarch Zebulun himself. During the journey from Egypt to Palestine, the tribe of Zebulun formed one of the first camp, with Judah and Issachar (also sons of Leah), marching under the standard of Judah. The head of the tribe at Sinai was Eliab son of Helon (Num 7:24); at Shiloh, Elizaphan son of Parnach (Num 34:25). Its representative among the spies was Gaddiel son of Sodi (Num 13:10). The only point worthy of note previous to its settlement in Palestine is the fact that, on the solemn proclamation of the law, Zebulun was among the six tribes  stationed on Mount Ebal to pronounce the curses (Deu 27:13).

The position and physical character of Zebulun's destined territory in the Land of Promise had been sketched in' the prophetic blessings of Jacob and Moses. Looking down into a far-distant age, Jacob exclaimed, as his son stood by his bedside, “Zebulun shall dwell on the shore (חוֹ, choph, a cove, the modern Haifa) of seas; and he shall be for a shore of ships; and his side will be to Zidon” (Gen 49:13). Though Issachar was an elder brother, Jacob seems to have already noticed and acknowledged the political superiority of Zebulun by placing him first in order. This superiority was afterwards more fully displayed in the blessing of Moses, which, though embracing both tribes, appears as if addressed to Zebulun alone— “And of Zebulun he said, Rejoice, Zebulun, in thy going out; and, Issachar, in thy tents. They shall call the people unto the mountain; there they shall offer sacrifices of righteousness; for they shall suck of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand” (Deu 33:18-19).

Zebulun's territory was one of the richest and most beautiful sections of Western Palestine. Its allotment was the third of the second distribution (Jos 19:10). Joshua defines its borders with his usual minuteness, though, in consequence of the disappearance of many old cities, it cannot now be entirely identified. Its position, however, and general extent, are clear enough. Asher and Naphtali bounded it on the north, and Issachar on the south. It stretched nearly across the country from the Sea of Galilee on the east, to the maritime plain of Phoenicia on the west; embracing a strip of Esdraelon, a little of the plain of Akka, the whole of the rich upland plain of Battauf (equal in fertility, and almost equal in extent, to that of Jezreel, and with the immense advantage of not being, as that was, the highroad of the Bedawin); with a part of the fertile tableland between it and the great basin of the Sea of Galilee; and, last, not least, it included sites so strongly fortified by nature that in the later struggles of the nation they proved more impregnable than any in the whole country. The sacred vicinity of Tabor, Zebulun appears to have shared with Issachar (Deu 33:19), and it and Rimmon were allotted to the Merarite Levites (1Ch 6:77). The beautiful wooded hills and ridges extending from Tabor, by Nazareth and Sefuriyeh, to the plain of Akka, were also in Zebulun.

It touched Carmel on the south-west; and though it did not actually reach to the shore of the Mediterranean, its sides joined the narrow maritime territory of Phoenicia,  to which Jacob, according to common Eastern custom, gives the name of its chief city, Zidon— “And his side (יָרֵךְ, thigh, i.e. flank) will be to Zidon.” Its opposite extremity resting on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, the words of Jacob were fulfilled: “Zebulun shall dwell on the coast of seas.” His fishermen on the Sea of Galilee, and his merchants navigating the Mediterranean, in company with their Phoenician neighbors, illustrate remarkably the other blessings: “He shall be for a shore of ships;” “he shall rejoice in his goings out.” Possessing thus a rich agricultural country, abundance of wood, and an outlet for commercial enterprise, both in the Mediterranean and in the Sea of Galilee, the future state and history of Zebulun were influenced and molded by external circumstances. The four Northern tribes Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali were in a great measure isolated from their brethren. The plain of Esdraelon, almost unceasingly swept by the incursions of hostile nations, separated them from Ephraim and Judah; while the deep Jordan valley formed a barrier on the east. Isolation from their brethren, and their peculiar position, threw them into' closer intercourse with their Gentile neighbors — the old mountaineers whom they were never able entirely to expel (Jdg 1:30), and especially the commercial Phoenicians. Their national exclusiveness was thus considerably modified; their manners and customs were changed; their language gradually assumed a foreign tone and accent (Mat 26:73); and even their religion lost much of its original purity (2Ch 30:10; 2Ch 30:18). “Galilee of the Gentiles” and its degenerate inhabitants came at length to be regarded with distrust and scorn by the haughty people of Judah (Isa 9:1; Mat 4:15; Mat 26:73).

The four Northern tribes formed, as it were, a state by themselves (Stanley, Jewish Church, 1, 266); and among them Zebulun became distinguished for warlike spirit and devotion. ‘In the great campaign and victory of Barak it bore a prominent part (Jdg 4:6; Jdg 4:10). Deborah, in her triumphal ode, says, “Zebulun and Naphtali were a people that jeoparded their lives unto the death in the high places of the field” (Jdg 5:18). It would appear, besides, that their commercial enterprise led them to a closer and fuller study of the arts and sciences than their brethren. “They thus at an early period acquired the reputation of literary accomplishment; and the poet sang of them.” From Zebulun are the men who handle the pen of the scribe “ (Jdg 5:14; Kalisch, On Genesis, p. 753). One of these scribes may have been Elon, the single judge produced by the tribe, who is recorded as having held office for ten years (Jdg 12:11-12). This combination of  warlike spirit with scientific skill seems to be referred to once again in a more extended field of action. The sacred historian mentions that in David's army there were, “Of Zebulun, such as went forth to battle, expert in war, with all instruments of war, fifty thousand, which could keep rank; not of double heart” (1Ch 12:33). They were generous, also, and liberal, as well as brave and loyal; for they contributed abundantly of the rich products of their country-meal, figs, raisins, wine, oil, oxen, and sheep to the wants of the army (1Ch 12:40). The head of the tribe at this time was Ishmaiah ben-Obadiah (1Ch 27:19). The “way of the sea” (Isa 9:1), the great road from Damascus to the Mediterranean, traversed a good portion of the territory of Zebulun, and must have brought its people into contact with the merchants and the commodities of Syria, Phoenicia, and Egypt. Its inhabitants, in consequence took part in seafaring concerns (Josephus, Ant. 5, 1, 22). In the Testament of Zabulon (Fabricius, Pseudepir, V.T. 1, 630-645) great stress is laid on his skill in fishing, and he is commemorated as the first to navigate a skiff on the sea. It is satisfactory to reflect that the very latest mention of the Zebulunites is the account of the visit of a large number of them to Jerusalem to the Passover of Hezekiah, when, by the enlightened liberality of the king; they were enabled to eat the feast, even though, through long neglect of the provisions of the law, they were not cleansed in the manner prescribed by the ceremonial law (2Ch 30:10-11; 2Ch 30:18).

The tribe of Zebulun, though not mentioned, appears to have shared the fate of the other Northern tribes at the invasion of the country by Tiglath- pileser (2Ki 17:18; 2Ki 17:24 sq.). From this time the history of distinct tribes ceases. With the exception of the Levites, the whole were amalgamated into one nation; and, on the return from exile, were called Jews. The land of Zebulun, however, occupied a distinguished place in New Test. times. It formed the chief scene of our Lord's life and labors. Nazareth and Cana were in it; and it embraced a section of the shore of the Sea of Galilee, where so many of the miracles of Christ were performed, and so many of his discourses and parables spoken. Then was fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah: “The land Zabulon, and the land Nephthalim, the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles: the people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up” (9, 1, 2; Mat 4:15-16). In the visions of Ezekiel (Eze 48:26-33) and of John (Rev 7:8) this tribe finds its due mention. See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF. The following is a list  of all the Biblical local cities in this tribe, with their probable identifications:

BethlehemTownBeit-LahmCanaDoKanah el-Jelil?DabbashethDoJebata.DimnahDoSee RIMMON.Gath-hepher, or Gittah- hepherDoEl-Meshad.HannathonDo[El-Mugheir]?IdalahDoJeda?JaphiaDoYafaKartah, or KattahDoEl-Harti?KirjathaimDoSee KARTAH.KitronDoSee KARTAH.MadonDoKefr Menda?Nahalal, Nahallal, or NahalolDoMalul?NeahTown[Nimrin]?Rimmon (Remmon- methoar)DoRumanehRumahDoTell Rumah?SaridDo[Ruins. N.W. of el- Mezraah]?ShimronDoSemunieh?2. A place on the eastern border of the tribe of Asher, between Beth-dagon and the valley of Jiphthah-el (Jos 19:27); perhaps the modern Abilin, a village “perched upon a high and sharp hill, on the south side of the wady of the same name” (Robinson, Later Res. p. 103). In this passage the word has usually been regarded as referring to the tribe by that name, as if Asher's boundary at this point coincided with that of Zebulun, whereas they were identical along the whole line named. SEE TRIBE.

## Zebulunite[[@Headword:Zebulunite]]

             (Num 26:27). SEE ZEBULONTTE.

## Zechariah[[@Headword:Zechariah]]

             (Heb. Zekaryah', זְכִרְיָה, remembered of Jehovah; occasionally [1Ch 5:7; 1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:24; 1Ch 24:25; 1Ch 26:2; 1Ch 26:1; 1Ch 26:14; 1Ch 27:21; 2Ch 20:14; 2Ch 21:2; 2Ch 26:5; 2Ch 29:13; 2Ch 35:8] in the prolonged form Zekarya'hu, זְכִרַיָהוּ; Sept., N.T., and Josephus, Ζαχαρίας), the name of many Hebrews, besides Zacharias (q.v.), the father of John the Baptist.

1. (Sept. Ζακχούρ v.r. Ζαχχούρ.) Ninth named of the ten sons of Jehiel, the father or founder of Gibeon (1Ch 9:37). B.C. cir. 1618. In 1Ch 8:31 he is called ZACHER SEE ZACHER (q.v.).

2. Son of Meshelemiah, or Shelemiah, a Korhite, and keeper of the north gate of the tabernacle of the congregation (1Ch 9:21) in the arrangement of the porters in the reign of David. B.C. 1043. In 1Ch 26:2; 1Ch 26:14, he is described. as “one counseling with understanding.”

3. A Levite in the Temple band as arranged by David, appointed to play “with psalteries on Alamoth” (1Ch 15:20; comp. 16:5). He was of the second order of Levites (1Ch 15:18), a porter or gate-keeper, and may possibly be the same as the preceding or the following.

4. One of the priests who blew with the trumpets in the procession which accompanied the ark from the house of Obed-edom (1Ch 15:24). B.C. 1043.

5. Son of Isshiahi or Jesiah, a Kohathite Levite descended from Uzziel (1Ch 24:25). B.C. 1043. 6. Fourth son of Hosah of the children of Merari (1Ch 26:11). B.C. 1043.

7. (Sept. Ζαδαίας v.r. Ζαβδίας.) A Manassite, whose son Iddo was chief of his tribe in Gilead in the reign of David (1Ch 27:21). B.C. 1014.

8. The son of Benaiah and father of Jahaziel, which last was a Gershonite Levite in the reign of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20:14). B.C. ante 912.

9. Third named of the five princes of Judah in the reign of Jehoshaphat who were sent with priests and Levites to teach the people the law of Jehovah (2Ch 17:7). B.C. 910.

10. Fourth named of the seven sons of king Jehoshaphat (2Ch 21:2). B.C. 887.

11. (Sept. Αζαρίας.) Son of the high-priest Jehoiada, in the reign of Joash, king of Judah (2Ch 24:20), and therefore the king's cousin. B.C. 838. After the death of Jehoiada, Zechariah probably succeeded to his office, and in attempting to check the reaction in favor of idolatry which immediately followed, he fell a victim to a conspiracy formed against him by the king, and was stoned with stones in the court of the Temple. His dying cry was not that of the first Christian martyr, “Lord, lay not this sin to their charge” (Act 7:60), but, “The Lord look upon it, and require it” (2Ch 24:20-22). The memory of this unrighteous deed lasted long in Jewish tradition. In the Jerusalem Talmud (Taanith, fol. 69, quoted by Lightfoot, Temple Service, ch. 36) there is a legend told of eighty thousand young priests who were slain by Nebuzaradan for the blood of Zechariah, and the evident hold which the story had taken upon the minds of the people renders it probable that “Zacharias son of Barachias,” who was slain between the Temple and the altar (Mat 23:35), is the same with Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, and that the name of Barachias as his father crept into the text from a marginal gloss, the writer confusing this Zechariah either with Zechariah the prophet, who was the son of Berechiah, or with another Zechariah, the son of Jeberechiah (Isa 8:2). See Castens, De Zacharita Berechice Filio (Lips. 1720); Huth, Ccedes Abelis et Zachariae (Erlang. 1756); and the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, 2, 673. SEE ZACHARIAS.

12. A prophet in the reign of Uzziah who appears to have acted as the king's counselor, but of whom nothing is known (2Ch 26:5). B.C. 807. The chronicler in describing him makes use of a most remarkable and unique expression— “Zechariah, who understood the seeing of God,” or, as our A.V. has it, “who had understanding in the visions of God” (comp. Dan 1:17). As no such term is ever employed elsewhere in the description of any prophet, it has been questioned whether the reading of the received text is the true one. The Sept., Targum, Syriac, Arabic, Pashi, and Kimchi, with many of Kennicott's MSS., read ביראת, “in the fear of,” for בראות, and their reading is most probably the correct one. — Smith.

13. (Sept. Ζαχαρία) A chief of the Reubenites at the time of the captivity by Tiglath-pileser (1 Chronicles 5, 7). B.C. cir. 740.

14. The father of Abijah, or Abi, Hezekiah's mother (2Ch 29:1); mentioned also in 2Ki 18:2 (Sept. Ζαγχαῖος, A. V. “Zachariah”). B.C. ante 726.

15. Second named of the “sons” of Asaph the minstrel, who in the reign of Hezekiah took part with other Levites in the purification of the Temple (2Ch 29:13). B.C. 726.

16. The son of Jeberechiah, who was taken by the prophet Isaiah as one of the “faithful witnesses to record,” when he wrote concerning Maher-shalal- hash-baz (Isa 8:2). B.C. 723. He was not the same as Zechariah the prophet, who lived in the time of Uzziah and died before that king, but he may have been the Levite of that name who in the reign of Hezekiah assisted in the purification of the Temple (2Ch 29:13). As Zechariah the prophet is called the son of Berechiah, with which Jeberechiah is all but identical, Bertholdt (Einleit. 4:1722, 1727) conjectured that some of the prophecies attributed to him, at any rate ch. 9-11, were really the production of Zechariah, the contemporary of Isaiah, and were appended to the volume of the later prophet of the same name (Gesenius, Der Proph. Jesaia, 1, 327). Another conjecture is that Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah is the same as Zechariah the father of Abijah, the queen of Ahaz (Poli Synopsis, ad loc.); the witnesses summoned by Isaiah being thus men of the highest ecclesiastical and civil rank.

17. The son of Jeroboam II, being the fourteenth king of Israel, and the last of the house of Jehu. There is a difficulty about the date of his reign. We are told that Amaziah ascended the throne of Judah in the second year of Joash king of Israel, and reigned 29 years (2Ki 14:1-2). He was succeeded by Uzziah or Azariah in the 27th year of Jeroboam II, the successor of Joash (2Ki 15:1), and Uzziah reigned 52 years. On the other hand, Joash king of Israel reigned 16 years (2Ki 13:10), was succeeded by Jeroboam, who reigned 41 years (2Ki 14:23), and he by Zechariah, who came to the throne in the 38th year of Uzziah king of Judah (2Ki 15:8). Thus we have (1) from the accession of Amaziah to the 38th of Uzziah 29+38=67 years; but (2) from the second year of Joash to the accession of Zechariah (or at least to the death of Jeroboam) we have 15+41 =56 years. Further, the accession of Uzziah, placed in the 27th year of Jeroboam, according to the above reckoning, occurred in the 15th. This latter synchronism is confirmed, and that with the 27th year of  Jeroboam contradicted, by 2Ki 14:17, which tells us that Amaziah king of Judah survived Joash king of Israel by 15 years. Most chronologers assume an interregnum of 11 years between Jeroboam's death and Zechariah's accession, during which the, kingdom was suffering from the anarchy of a disputed succession, but this does not solve the difference between  2Ki 14:17 and 2Ki 15:1. We are reduced to understand the number 27 in 2Ki 15:1 as referring to the years of Jeroboam's viceroyship on the occasion of his father's war with Syria (2Ki 13:14-25). SEE CHRONOLOGY.

Josephus (Ant. 9:10, 3) places Uzziah's accession in the 14th year of Jeroboam, a variation of a year in these synchronisms being unavoidable, since the Hebrew annalists in giving their dates do not reckon fractions of years. But in any case we must place Zechariah's accession early in B.C. 770. His reign lasted only six months. He was killed in a conspiracy of which Shallum (q.v.) was the head, and by which the prophecy in 10:30 was accomplished. We are told that during his brief term of power he did evil, and kept up the calf-worship inherited from the first Jeroboam, which his father had maintained in regal splendor at Bethel (Amo 7:13). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

In the English version of 2Ki 15:10 we read “And Shallum the son of Jabesh conspired against him and smote him before the people, and slew him, and reigned in his stead.” And so the Vulg., “percussitque eum palam et interfecit.” But in the Sept we find Κεβλαάμ instead of before the people, i.e. Shallum and Keblaam killed Zechariah. The common editions read ἐν Κεβλαάμ meaning that Shallum killed Zechariah in Keblaam; but no place of such a name is known, and there is nothing in the Hebrew to answer to ἐν. The words translated before the people, Κεβλαάμ, palam, are קָבָל עָ. Ewald (Geschichte, 3, 598) maintains that קָבָל never occurs in prose [Is not the objection rather that the word is Chaldee? It occurs repeatedly in Daniel (Dan 2:31; Dan 3:3; Dan 5:1; Dan 5:5; Dan 5:10), and also in the Chaldee portions of Ezra (Ezr 4:16; Ezr 6:13)], and that עָםwould be = הָעָם if the Latin and English translations were correct. He also observes that in 2Ki 15:14; 2Ki 15:25; 2Ki 15:30, where almost the same expression is used of the deaths of Shallum, Pekahiah, and Pekah, the words before the people are omitted. Hence he accepts the translation in the Vatican MS. of the Sept., and considers that Kabalam or Κεβλαάμ was a fellow- conspirator or rival of Shallum, of whose subsequent fate we have no information. On the death of Zechariah, Shallum was made king, but after reigning in Samaria for a month only, was in his turn dethroned and killed  by. Menahem. To these events Ewald refers the obscure passage in Zec 11:8 : “Three shepherds also I cut off in one month, and my soul abhorred them” — the three shepherds being Zechariah, Kabalam, and Shallum. This is very ingenious: we must remember, however, that Ewald, like certain English divines (Mede, Hammond, Newcome, Seeker Pyve Smith), thinks that the latter chapters of the prophecies of Zechariah belong to an earlier date than the rest of the book. SEE ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF.

18. A Kohathite Levite in the reign of Josiah, who was one of the overseers of the workmen engaged in the restoration of the Temple (2Ch 34:12). B.C. 628.

19. Second named of the three rulers of the Temple in the reign of Josiah (2Ch 35:8). B.C. 628. He was probably, as Bertheau conjectures, “the second priest” (comp. 2Ki 25:18).

20. Son of Shiloni and father of Joiarib among the descendants of Perez (Neh 11:5). B.C. long ante 536.

21. A priest, son of Pashur and father of Amzi (Neh 11:12). B.C. long ante 536.

22. Son of Amariah and father of Uzziah, of the family of Perez (Neh 11:4). B.C. ante 536.

23. The representative of the priestly family of Iddo in the days of Joiakim the son of Jeshua (Neh 12:16). B.C. 536. He was possibly the same as Zechariah the prophet the son of Iddo.

24. The eleventh in order of the twelve minor prophets.

1. Of his personal history we know but little. He is called in his prophecy the son of Berechiah and the grandson of Iddo, whereas in the book of Ezra (5:1; 6:14) he is said to have been the son of Iddo. Various attempts have been made to reconcile this discrepancy. Cyril of Alexandria (Pref. Comment. ad Zechariah) supposes that Berechiah was the father of Zechariah according to the flesh, and that Iddo was his instructor, and might be regarded as his spiritual father. Jerome, too, according to some MSS., has in Zec 1:1, “filium Barachia, filium Addo,”as if he supposed that Berechiah and Iddo were different names of the same person, and the same mistake occurs in the Sept. τὸν τοῦ Βαραχίου υἱὸν  Α᾿δδώ. Gesenius (Lex. s.v. בֵּן) and Rosenmüller (On Zechariah 1, 1) take בִּרin the passages in Ezra to mean: “grandson,” as in Gen 29:5 Laban is termed “then son,” i.e. “grandson,” of Nahor. Others, again, have suggested that in the text of Ezra no mention is made of Berechiah, because he was already dead, or because Iddo was the more distinguished person, and the generally recognized head of the family. Knobel thinks that the name of Berechiah has crept into the present text of Zechariah from Isa 8:2, where mention is made of a Zechariah “the son of Jeberechiah,” which is virtually the same name (Sept. Βαραχίου) as Berechiah. His theory is that ch. 9-11 of our present book of Zechariah are really the work of the older Zechariah (Isa 8:2); that a later scribe finding the two books, one bearing the name of Zechariah the son of Iddo, and the other that of Zechariah the son of Berechiah, united them into one, and at the same time combined the titles of the two, and that hence arose the confusion which at present exists. This, however, is hardly a probable hypothesis. It is surely more natural to suppose, as the prophet himself mentions his father's name, whereas the historical books of Ezra and Nehemiah mention only Iddo, that Berechiah had died early, and that there was now no intervening link between the grandfather and the grandson. The son, in giving his pedigree, does not omit his father's name: the historian passes it over as of one who was but little known or already forgotten. This view is confirmed if we suppose the Iddo here mentioned to have been the Iddo the priest who, in Neh 12:4, is said to have returned from Babylon in company with Zerubbabel and Joshua. He is there said to have had a son Zechariah (Neh 12:16), who was contemporary with Joachim the son of Joshua; and this falls in with the hypothesis that owing to some unexplained cause-perhaps the death of his father Zechariah became the next representative of the family after his grandfather Iddo. Zechariah, according to this view, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel before him, was priest as well as prophet. He seems to have entered upon his office while yet young (נִעִר Zec 2:4; comp. Jer 1:6), and must have been born in Babylon, whence he returned with the first caravan of exiles under Zerubbabel and Joshua.

It was in the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, that he first publicly discharged his office. B.C. 519. In this he acted in concert with Haggai, who must have been considerably his senior if, as seems not improbable, Haggai had been carried into captivity, and hence had himself been one of those who had seen “the house” of Jehovah “in her first glory”  (Hag 2:3). Both prophets had the same great object before them; both directed all their energies to the building of the second Temple. Haggai seems to have led the way in this work, and then to have left it chiefly in the hands of his younger contemporary. The foundations of the new building had already been laid in the time of Cyrus, but during the reigns of Cambyses and the pseudo Smerdis the work had been broken off through the jealousies of the Samaritans. When, however, Darius Hystaspis ascended the throne (521) things took a more favorable turn. He seems to have been a large-hearted and gracious prince, and to have been well- disposed towards the Jews. Encouraged by the hopes, which his accession held out, the prophets exerted themselves to the utmost to secure the completion of the Temple. From this time, for a space of nearly two years, the prophet's voice was silent, or his words have not been recorded. But in the fourth year of king Darius, in the fourth day of the ninth month, there came a deputation of Jews to the Temple, anxious to know whether the fast-days which had been instituted during the seventy years captivity were still to be observed.

On the one hand, now that the captivity was at an end, and Jerusalem was rising from her ashes such set times of mourning seemed quite out of place. On the other hand, there was still much ground for serious uneasiness; for some time after their return they had suffered severely from drought and famine (Hag 1:6-11), and who could tell that they would not so suffer again? The hostility of their neighbors had not ceased; they were still regarded with no common jealousy; and large numbers of their brethren had not yet returned from Babylon. It was a question, therefore, that seemed to admit of much debate. It is impossible not to see of how great moment, under such circumstances, and for the discharge of the special duty with which he was entrusted, would be the priestly origin of Zechariah.

Too often the prophet had to stand forth in direct antagonism to the priest. In an age when the service of God had stiffened into formalism, and the priests lips no longer kept knowledge, the prophet was the witness for the truth, which lay beneath the outward ceremonial, and without which the outward ceremonial was worthless. But the thing to be dreaded now was not superstitious formalism, but cold neglect. There was no fear now lest in a gorgeous temple, amid the splendors of an imposing ritual and the smoke of sacrifices ever ascending to heaven, the heart and life of religion should be lost. The fear was all the other way, lest even the body, the outward form and service, should be suffered to decay. The foundations of the Temple had indeed been laid, but that was all (Ezr 5:16). Discouraged by-the opposition which they had  encountered at first, the Jewish colony had begun to build, and were not able to finish; and even when the letter came from Darius sanctioning the work, and promising his protection, they showed no hearty disposition to engage in it. At such a time no more fitting instrument could be found to rouse the people, whose heart had grown cold, than one who united to the authority of the prophet the zeal and the traditions of a sacerdotal family. Accordingly, to Zechariah's influence we find the rebuilding of the Temple in a great measure ascribed. “And the elders of the Jews builded,” it is said, “and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo” (Ezr 6:14).

It is remarkable that in this juxtaposition of the two names both are not styled prophets-not “Haggai and Zechariah the prophets,” but “Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo.” Is it an improbable conjecture that Zechariah is designated by his father's (or grandfather's) name, rather than by his office, in order to remind us of his priestly character? Be this as it may, we find other indications of the close union which now subsisted between the priests and the prophets. Various events connected with the taking of Jerusalem and the captivity in Babylon had led to the institution of solemn fast-days; and we find that when a question arose as to the propriety of observing these fast-days, now that the city and the Temple were rebuilt, the question was referred to “the priests which were in the house of Jehovah, and to the prophets” a recognition not only of the joint authority, but of the harmony subsisting between the two bodies, without parallel in Jewish history. The manner, too, in which Joshua the high-priest is spoken of in this prophecy shows how lively a sympathy Zechariah felt towards him.

Later traditions assume, what is indeed very probable, that Zechariah took personally an active part in providing for the liturgical service of the Temple. He and Haggai are both said to have composed psalms with this view. According to the Sept., Psalm 137:145; according to the Peshito, 125, 126; according to the Vulg., 111, are psalms of Haggai and Zechariah. The triumphant “hallelujah,” with which many of them open, was supposed to be characteristic of those psalms which were first chanted in the second Temple, and came with an emphasis of meaning from the lips of those who had been restored to their native land The allusions, moreover, with which these psalms abound, as well as their place in the Psalter, leave us in no doubt as to the time when they were composed, and lend confirmation to the tradition respecting their authorship. If the later Jewish accounts (the Talmudic tract Megillah, 17:2; 18:1; Rashi ad Baba  Bathra, 15:1) may be trusted, Zechariah, as well as Haggai, was a member of the great synagogue. The patristic notices of the prophet are worth nothing. According to these, he exercised his prophetic office in Chaldea, and wrought many miracles there; ‘returned to Jerusalem at an advanced age, where he discharged the duties of the priesthood, and where he died and was buried by the side of Haggai (Pseudepiph. De Proph. c. 21; Dorotheus, p. 144; Isidorus, c. 51).

2. The genuine writings of Zechariah help us but little in our estimation of his character. Some faint traces, however, we may observe in them of his education in Babylon. Less free and independent than he would have been had his feet trodden from childhood the soil.

“Where each old poetic mountain Inspiration breathed around,”

he leans avowedly on the authority of the older prophets, and copies their expressions. Jeremiah especially seems to have been his favorite, and hence the Jewish saying that “the spirit of Jeremiah dwelt in Zechariah.” But in what may be called the peculiarities of his prophecy he approaches more nearly to Ezekiel and Daniel. Like them, he delights in visions; like them, he uses symbols and allegories rather than the bold figures and metaphors which lend so much force and beauty to the writings of the earlier prophets; like them, he beholds angels ministering before' Jehovah and fulfilling his behests on the earth. He is the only one of the prophets who speaks of Satan. That some of these peculiarities are owing to his Chaldean education can hardly be doubted. It is at least remarkable that both Ezekiel and Daniel, who must have been influenced by the same associations, should in some of these respects so closely resemble Zechariah, widely as they differ from him in others.

Even in the form of the visions a careful criticism might perhaps discover some traces of the prophet's early training. Possibly the “valley of myrtles” in the first vision may have been suggested by Chaldaea rather than by Palestine. At any rate, it is a curious fact that myrtles are rarely mentioned in the history of the Jews before the Exile. They are found, besides this passage of Zechariah, in Isa 41:19; Isa 55:13, and in Neh 8:15. The forms of trial in the third vision, where Joshua the high-priest is arraigned, seem borrowed from the practice of Persian rather than Jewish courts of law. The filthy garments in which Joshua appears are those which the accused must assume when brought to trial. The white robe put upon  him is the caftan or robe of honor, which to this day in the East is put upon the minister of state who has been acquitted of the charges laid against him. The vision of the woman in the Ephah is also Oriental in its character. Ewald refers to a very similar vision in Tod's Rajasthan, 2, 688. Finally, the chariots issuing from between two mountains of brass must have been suggested, there can scarcely be any doubt, by some Persian symbolism. SEE ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF.

25. The leader of the one hundred and fifty “sons” of Pharosh who returned with Ezra (Ezr 8:3). B.C. 459.

26. The leader of the twenty-eight “sons” of Bebai, who came up from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:11). B.C. 459,

27. One of the chiefs of the people whom Ezra summoned in council at the river Ahava, before the second caravan returned from Babylon (Ezr 8:16). B.C. 459. He stood at Ezra's left hand when he expounded the law to the people (Neh 8:4).

28. (Sept. Ζαχαρία.) One of the family of Elam, who had married a foreign wife after the Captivity (Ezr 10:26). B.C. 458.

29. One of the priests, son of Jonathan, who blew with the trumpets at the dedication of the city wall by Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh 12:35; Neh 12:41). B.C. 446.

## Zechariah, Book Of[[@Headword:Zechariah, Book Of]]

             The time and personal circumstances of the prophet whose name this book bears have been considered above. It remains to discuss the prophecies themselves, and especially their authenticity. Their peculiar character and obscurity of interpretation also call for a somewhat full treatment.

I. Contents. — The book naturally falls into two principal divisions, which, as will be seen more fully in the sequel, are marked not only by certain peculiarities of expression, but obviously by the absence of any historical data in the latter portion such as are given in the former.

(I.) The first part, embracing ch. 1-8, divides itself into three sections by the chronological indications given respectively in Zec 1:1; Zec 1:7, and Zec 7:1; and these are still further subdivided by the recurrence of the phrase “the word of the Lord came unto me.” This part, therefore,  consists, first, of a short introduction or preface, in which the prophet announces his commission; then of a series of visions, descriptive of all those hopes and anticipations of which the building of the Temple was the pledge and sure foundation; and finally of a discourse, delivered two years later, in reply to questions respecting the observance of certain established fasts.

1. The short introductory oracle (Zec 1:1-6) is a warning voice from the past. The prophet solemnly reminds the people, by an appeal to the experience of their fathers, that no word of God had ever fallen to the ground; and that therefore, if with sluggish indifference they refused to co- operate in the building of the Temple, they must expect the judgments of God. This warning manifestly rests upon the former warnings of Haggai.

2. In a dream of the night there passed before the eyes of the prophet a series of nine (essentially seven) visions, followed by an emblematical scene, descriptive in their different aspects of events, some of them shortly to come to pass, and others losing themselves in: the mist of the future (Zec 1:7 to Zec 6:15). These visions are obscure, and accordingly the prophet asks their meaning. The interpretation is given, not as to Amos by Jehovah himself, but by an angel who knows the mind and will of Jehovah, who intercedes with him for others, and by whom Jehovah speaks and issues his commands; at one time he is called “the angel who spake with me” [or “by me”] (Zec 1:9); at another, “the angel of Jehovah” (Zec 1:11-12; Zec 3:1-6).

(1.) In the first vision (Zec 1:8-17) the prophet sees, in a valley of myrtles, a rider upon a roan horse, accompanied by others who, having been sent forth to the four quarters of the earth, had returned with the tidings that the whole earth was at rest (with reference to Hag 2:20). Hereupon the angel asks how long this state of things shall last, and is assured that the indifference of the heathen shall cease, and that the Temple shall be built in Jerusalem. This vision seems to have been partly borrowed from Job 1:7, etc.

(2.) The second vision (Zec 2:1-13, A.V. Zec 1:18 to Zec 2:13) explains how the promise of the first is to be fulfilled, and is composed of three separate emblems. The four horns are the symbols of the different heathen kingdoms in the four quarters of the world, which have hitherto combined against Jerusalem. The four carpenters or smiths symbolize their destruction. The measuring line betokens the vastly extended area of Jerusalem, owing to  the rapid increase of the new population. The old prophets, in foretelling the happiness and glory of the times which should succeed the Captivity in Babylon, had made a great part of that happiness and glory, to consist in the gathering together again of the whole: dispersed nation in the land given to their fathers. This vision was designed to teach that the expectations thus raised the return of the dispersed of Israel should be fulfilled; that Jerusalem should be too large to be compassed about by a wall, but that Jehovah himself would be to her a wall of fire, a light and defense to the holy city, and destruction to her adversaries. A song of joy, in prospect of so bright a future, closes the scene.

The next two visions (ch. 3, 4) are occupied with the Temple, and with the two principal persons on whom the hopes of the returned exiles rested.

(3.) The permission granted for the rebuilding of the Temple had, no doubt, stirred afresh the malice and the animosity of the enemies of the Jews. Joshua the high-priest had been singled out, it would seem, as the especial object of attack, and perhaps formal accusations had already been laid against him before the Persian court. The prophet, in vision, sees him summoned before a higher tribunal, and solemnly acquitted; despite the charges of the Satan or Adversary. This is done with the forms still usual in an Eastern court. The filthy garments in which the accused is expected to stand are taken away, and the caftan or robe of honor is put upon him in token that his innocence has been established. Acquitted at that bar, he need not fear, it is implied, any earthly accuser. He shall be protected, he shall carry on the building of the Temple, he shall prepare the way for the coming of the Messiah, and upon the foundation stone laid before him shall the seven eyes of God, the token of his ever-watchful providence, rest.

(4.) The succeeding vision (ch. 4) supposes that all opposition to the building of the Temple shall be removed. This sees the completion of the work. It has evidently a peculiarly impressive character; for tile prophet, though his dream still continues, seems to himself to be awakened on of it by the angel who speaks to him. The candlestick (or, more properly, chandelier) with seven lights (borrowed from the candlestick of the Mosaic tabernacle, Exo 25:31 sq.) supposes that the Temple is already finished. The seven pipes which supply each lamp answer to the seven eyes of Jehovah in the preceding vision (Zec 3:9), and this sevenfold- supply of oil denotes the presence and operation of the Divine Spirit, through whose aid Zerubbabel will overcome all obstacles; so that as his  hands had laid the foundation of the house, his hands should also finish it (Zec 4:9). The two olive branches of the vision, belonging to the olive-tree standing by the candlestick, are Zerubbabel himself and Joshua.

The next two visions (Zec 5:1-11) signify that the land, in which the sanctuary has just been erected, shall be purged of all its pollutions.

(5.) First, the curse is recorded against wickedness in the whole land (not in the whole earth, as in the A.V.), Zec 5:3; that due solemnity may be given to it, it is inscribed upon a roll, and the roll is represented as flying, in order to denote the speed with which the curse will execute itself.

(6.) Next, the unclean thing, whether in the form of idolatry or any other abomination, shall be utterly removed. Caught and shut up as it were in a cage, like some savage beast, and pressed down with a weight as of lead upon it so that it cannot escape, it shall be carried into that land where all evil things have long made their dwelling (Isa 34:13); the land of Babylon (Shinar, Zec 5:11), from which Israel had been redeemed.

(7.) The night is now waning fast, and the morning is about to dawn (Zec 6:1-8). Chariots and horses appear, issuing from between two brazen mountains, the horses like those in the first vision; and these receive their several commands and are sent forth to execute the will of Jehovah in the four quarters of the earth. The four chariots are images of the four winds, which, according, to Psa 104:4, as servants of God, fulfill his behests, and of the one that goes to the north it is particularly said that it shall let the Spirit of Jehovah rest there is it a spirit of anger against the nations, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, or is it a spirit of hope and desire of return, in the hearts of those of the exiles who still lingered in the land of their captivity? Stahelin, Maurer, and others adopt the former view, which seems to be in accordance with the preceding vision; Ewald gives the latter interpretation, and thinks it is supported by what follows.

Thus the cycle of visions is completed. Scene after scene is unrolled till the whole glowing picture is presented to the eye. All enemies crushed; the land re-peopled, and Jerusalem girt as with a wall of fire; the Temple rebuilt, more truly splendid than of old, because more abundantly filled with a Divine Presence; the leaders of the people assured in the most signal manner of the Divine protection; all wickedness solemnly sentenced, and the Iliad forever purged of it such is the magnificent panorama of hope  which the prophet displays to his countrymen. Very consolatory must such a prospect have seemed to the weak and disheartened colony in Jerusalem. For the times were dark and troublous. According to recent interpretations of newly discovered inscriptions, it would appear that Darius I found it no easy task to hold his vast dominions. Province after province had revolted both in the east and in the north, whither, according to the prophet (Zec 6:8), the winds had carried the wrath of God and if the reading Mudraja, i.e. Egypt, is correct (Lassen gives Kurdistan), Egypt must have revolted before the outbreak mentioned in Herod. 7:1, and have again been reduced to subjection. To such revolt there may possibly be an allusion in the reference to “the land of the south” (Zec 6:6). It would seem that Zechariah anticipated, as a consequence of these perpetual insurrections, the weakening and overthrow of the Persian monarchy and the setting-up of the kingdom of God, for which Judah, in faith and obedience, was to wait (Zec 6:9-15).

(8.) Immediately on these visions there follows a symbolical act (Zec 6:9-15). Three Israelites had just returned from Babylon, bringing with them rich gifts to Jerusalem, apparently as contributions to the Temple, and had been received in the house of Josiah the son- of Zephaniah. Thither the prophet is commanded to go whether still in a dream or not is not very clear and to employ the silver and the gold of their offerings for the service of Jehovah. He is to make of them two crowns, and to place these on the head of Joshua the high-priest a sign that in the Messiah who should build the Temple the kingly and priestly offices should be united. This, however, is expressed somewhat enigmatically, as if king and priest should be perfectly at one, rather than that the same person should be both king and priest. These crowns, moreover, were to be a memorial in honor of those by whose liberality they had been made, and should serve at the same time to excite other rich Jews still living in Babylon to the like liberality. Hence their symbolical purpose having been accomplished, they were to be laid up in the Temple.

3. It is remarkable, as has already been noticed, that the question relating to the fast days (Zec 7:1-3) should have been addressed to priests and prophets conjointly in the Temple. This close alliance between two classes hitherto so separate, and often so antagonistic, was one of the most hopeful circumstances of the times. Still Zechariah, as chief of the prophets, has the decision of this question. Some of the priests, it is evident (Zec 7:7), were inclined to the more gloomy view; but not so the prophet. In  language worthy of his position and his office, language which reminds us of the most striking passages of his great predecessor (Isa 58:5-7), he lays down the same principle that God loves mercy rather than fasting, and truth and righteousness rather than sackcloth and a sad countenance. If they had perished, he reminds them it was because their hearts were hard while they fasted; if they would dwell safely, they must abstain from fraud and violence, and not from food (Zec 7:4-14).

Again, he foretells, but not now in vision, the glorious times that are near at hand when Jehovah shall dwell in the midst of them, and Jerusalem be called a city of truth. He sees her streets thronged by old and young, her exiles returning, her Temple standing in all its beauty, her land rich in fruitfulness, her people a praise and a blessing in the earth (Zec 8:1-15). Again, he declares that “truth and peace” (Zec 8:16; Zec 8:19) are the bulwarks of national prosperity. And, once more reverting to the question which had been raised concerning the observance of the fasts, he announces, in obedience to the command of Jehovah, not only that the fasts are abolished, but that the days of mourning shall henceforth be days of joy, the fasts be counted for festivals. His prophecy concludes with a prediction that Jerusalem shall be the center, of religious worship to all nations of the earth (Zec 8:16-23).

(II.) The remainder of the book consists of two sections of about equal length, ch. 9-11 and 12-14, each of which has an inscription. They have the general prophetic tone and character, and in subject they so far harmonize with 1-8 that the prophet seeks to comfort Judah in a season of depression with the hope of a brighter future.

1. In the first section he threatens Damascus and the sea-coast of Palestine with misfortune; but declares that Jerusalem shall be protected, for Jehovah himself shall encamp about her (where 9:8 reminds us of 2. 5). Her king shall come to her; he shall speak peace to the heathen, so that all weapons of war shall perish; and his dominion shall be to the ends of the earth. The Jews who are still in captivity shall return to their land; they shall be mightier than Javan (or Greece); and Ephraim and Judah once more united shall vanquish all enemies. The land too shall be fruitful as of old (comp. Zec 8:12). The Teraphim and the false prophets may indeed have spoken lies; but upon these will the Lord execute judgment, and then he will look with favor upon his people and bring back both Judah and Ephraim from their captivity. The possession of Gilead and Lebanon is  again promised as the special portion of Ephraim; and both Egypt and Assyria shall be broken and humbled.

The prophecy now takes a sudden turn. An enemy is seen approaching from the north, who, having forced the narrow passes of Lebanon, the great bulwark of the northern frontier, carries desolation into the country beyond. Hereupon the prophet receives a commission from God to feed his flock, which God himself will no more feed because of their divisions. The prophet undertakes the office, and makes to himself two staves (naming the one Favor and the other Union), in order to tend the flock, and cuts off several evil shepherds whom his soul abhors; but observes, at the same time, that the flock will not be obedient. Hence he throws up his office; he breaks asunder the one crook in token that the covenant of God with Israel was dissolved. A few, the poor of the flock, acknowledged God's hand herein; and the prophet, demanding the wages of his service, receives thirty pieces of silver, and casts it into the house of Jehovah. At the same time, he sees that there is no hope of union between Judah and Israel, whom he had trusted to feed as one flock, and therefore cuts in pieces the other crook, in token that the brotherhood between them is dissolved.

2. The second section (ch. 12-14) is entitled “The burden of the word of Jehovah for Israel.” But Israel is here used of the nation at large, not of Israel as distinct from Judah. Indeed, the prophecy, which follows, concerns Judah and Jerusalem. In this the prophet beholds the near approach of troublous times, when Jerusalem should be hard pressed by enemies. But in that day Jehovah shall come to save them “the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of Jehovah” (Zec 12:8), and all the nations which gather themselves against Jerusalem shall be destroyed. At the same time, the deliverance shall not be from outward enemies alone. God will pour out upon them a spirit of grace and supplications, so that they shall bewail their sinfulness with a mourning greater than that with which they bewailed the beloved Josiah in the valley of Megiddo. So deep and so true shall be this repentance, so lively the aversion to all evil, that neither idol nor false prophet shall again be seen in the land If a man shall pretend to prophesy, “his father and his mother that begat him shall thrust him through when he prophesied, fired by the same righteous indignation as Phinehas was when he slew those who wrought folly in Israel (Zec 12:1-13; Zec 12:6).”  Then follows a short apostrophe to the sword of the enemy to turn against the shepherds of the people; and a further announcement of searching and purifying judgments; which, however, it must be acknowledged, is somewhat abrupt. Ewald's suggestion that the passage Zec 13:7-9 is here out of place, and should be transposed to the end of chap. 11 is certainly ingenious, and does not seem improbable.

The prophecy closes with a grand and stirring picture. All nations are gathered together against Jerusalem, and seem already sure of their prey. Half of their cruel work has been accomplished, when Jehovah himself appears on behalf of his people. At his coming all nature is moved; the Mount of Olives on which his feet rest cleaves asunder; a mighty earthquake heaves the ground, and even the natural succession of day and night is broken. He goes forth to war against the adversaries of his people. He establishes his kingdom over all the earth. Jerusalem is safely inhabited, and becomes rich with the spoils of the nations. All nations that are still left shall come up to Jerusalem, as the great center of religious worship, there to worship “the King, Jehovah of hosts,” and the city from that day forward shall be a holy city.

II. Integrity. — Mede was the first to call this in question. The probability that the later chapters (from the 9th to the 14th) were by some other prophet seems first to have been suggested to him by the citation in Matthew. He says (Epist. 31):

“It may seem the evangelist would inform us that those latter chapters ascribed to Zachary (namely, 9th, 10th, 11th, etc.) are indeed the prophecies of Jeremy, and that the Jews had not rightly attributed them.... Certainly, if a man weighs the contents of some of them, they should in likelihood be of an elder date than the time of Zachary namely, before the Captivity for the subjects of some of them were scarce in being after that time. And the chapter out of which St. Matthew quotes may seem to have somewhat much unsuitable with Zachary's time; as, a prophecy of the destruction of the Temple, then when he was to encourage them to build it. And how doth the sixth verse of that chapter suit with his time? There is no scripture saith they are Zachary's; but there is scripture saith they are Jeremy's, as this of the evangelist.”

He then observes that the mere fact of these being found in the same book as the prophecies of Zechariah does not prove that they were his; difference of authorship being allowable in the same way as in the collection of Agur's Proverbs under one title with  those of Solomon, and of Psalms by other authors with those of David. Even the absence of a fresh title is, he argues, no evidence against a change of author. “The Jews: wrote in rolls or volumes, and the title was but once. If aught were added to the roll, ob similitudinem argumenti, or for some other reason, it had a new title, as that of Agur; or perhaps none, but was ἀνώνυμον.” The utter disregard of anything like chronological order in the prophecies of Jeremiah, where “sometimes all is ended with Zedekiah; then we are brought back to Jehoiakim, then to Zedekiah again” makes it probable, he thinks, that they were only hastily and loosely put together in those distracted times. Consequently, some of them might not have been discovered till after the return from the Captivity, when they were approved by Zechariah, and so came to be incorporated with his prophecies. Mede evidently rests his opinion, partly on the authority of Matthew, and partly on the contents of the later chapters, which he considers require a date earlier than the Exile. He says again (Epist. 11):

That which moveth me more than the rest is in ch. 12 which contains a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, and a description of the wickedness of the inhabitants, for which God would give them to the sword and have no more pity on them. It is expounded of the destruction by Titus; but methinks such a prophecy was nothing seasonable for Zachary's time (when the city yet, for a great part, lay in her ruins, and the Temple had not yet recovered hers), nor agreeable to the scope of Zachary's commission, who, together with his colleague Haggai, was sent to encourage the people lately returned from captivity to build their temple, and to instaurate their commonwealth. Was this a fit time to foretell the destruction of both, while they were but yet a building? and by Zachary, too, who was to encourage them Would not this better befit the desolation by Nebuchadnezzar?” Archbishop Newcome went further. He insisted on the great dissimilarity of style as well as subject between the earlier and later chapters. And he was the first who advocated the theory which Bunsen calls one of the triumphs of modern criticism, that the last six chapters of Zechariah are the work of two distinct prophets. His words are:

“The eight first chapters appear by the introductory parts to be the prophecies of Zechariah, stand in connection with each other, are pertinent to the time when they were delivered, are uniform in style and manner, and constitute a regular whole. But the six last chapters are not expressly assailed to Zechariah; are unconnected with those which precede; the three first of them are unsuitable in many parts to the time when Zechariah lived;  all of them have a more adorned and poetical turn of composition than the eight first chapters; and they manifestly break the unity of the prophetical book ... I conclude from internal marks in Zec 9:10-11 that these three chapters were written much earlier than the time of Jeremiah and before the captivity of the tribes. Israel is mentioned in Zec 9:1; Zec 11:14 (but that this argument is inconclusive, see Mal 2:11); Ephraim 9:10, 13; 10:7; and Assyria Zec 10:10-11... They seem to suit Hosea's age and manner.... The 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters form a distinct prophecy, and were written after the death of Josiah; but whether before or after the Captivity, and by what prophets, is uncertain, though I incline to think that the author lived before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians.”

In proof of this he refers to Zec 13:2, on which he observes that the “prediction that idols and false prophets should cease at the final restoration of the Jews seems to have been uttered when idolatry and groundless pretensions to the spirit of prophecy were common among the Jews, and therefore before the Babylonish Captivity.” A large number of critics have followed Mede and archbishop Newcome in denying the later date of the last six chapters of the book. In England, bishop Kidder, Whiston, Hammond, and more recently Pye Smith and Davidson; in Germany Flügge, Eichhorn, Bauer, Bertholdt, Augusti, Forberg, Rosenmüller, Gramberg, Credner, Ewald, Maurer, Knobel, Hitzig, and Bleek, are agreed in maintaining that these later chapters are not the work of Zechariah the son of Iddo.

On the other hand, the later date of these chapters has been maintained among British writers, by Blayney and Henderson, and on the Continent by Carpzov, Beckhaus, Jahn, Koster, Hengstenberg, Havernick, Keil, De Wette (in later editions of his Einleitung; in the first three he adopted a different view), and Stahelin.

Those who impugn the later date of these chapters of Zechariah rest their arguments on the change in style and subject after the 8th chapter, but differ much in the application of their criticism. Rosenmüller, for instance (Schol. in Proph. Miln. 4:257), argues that ch. 9-14 are so alike in style that they must have been written by one author. He alleges in proof his fondness for images taken from pastoral life (Zec 9:16; Zec 10:2-3; Zec 11:3-5; Zec 11:7-9; Zec 11:11; Zec 11:15; Zec 11:17; Zec 13:7-8). From the allusion to the earthquake (Zec 14:5; comp. Amo 1:1), he thinks the  author must have lived in the reign of Uzziah, Davidson (in Horne's Introd. 2, 982) in like manner declares for one author, but supposes him to have been the Zechariah mentioned in Isa 8:2, who lived in the reign of Ahaz. Eichhorn, on the other hand, while also assigning (in his Einleitung, 4:444) the whole of ch. 9-14 to one writer, is of opinion that they are the work of a later prophet who flourished in the time of Alexander. Others again, as Bertholdt, Gesenius, Knobel, Maurer, Bunsen, and Ewald, think that ch. 9-11 (to: which Ewald adds Zec 13:7-9) are a distinct prophecy from ch. 12,15, and separated from them by a considerable interval of time. These critics conclude from internal evidence that the former portion was written by a prophet who lived in the reign of Ahaz (Knobel gives 9 and 10 to the reign of Jotham, and 11 to that of Ahaz), and most of them conjecture that he was the Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah (or Berechiah) mentioned in Isa 8:2. Ewald, without attempting to identify the prophet with any particular person, contents himself with remarking that he was a subject of the Southern kingdom (as may be inferred from expressions such as that in 9:7, and from the Messianic hopes which he utters, and in which he resembles his countryman and contemporary Isaiah); and that, like Amos and Hosea before him, though a native of Judah, he directs his prophecies against Ephraim. There is the same general agreement among the last-named critics as to the date of the section 12-14. They all assign it to a period immediately previous to the Babylonian Captivity, and hence the author must have been contemporary with the prophet Jeremiah. Bunsen identifies him with Urijah, the son of Shemaiah, of Kirjath-jearim (Jer 26:20-23), who prophesied “in the name of Jehovah” against Judah and Jerusalem.

According to this hypothesis, we have the works of three different prophets collected into one book, and passing under one name: (a) Ch. 9- 11, the book of Zechariah I, a contemporary of Isaiah, under Ahaz, about 736; (b) ch. 12-14, author unknown (or perhaps Urijah, a contemporary of Jeremiah), about 607 or 606; (c) ch. 1-8, the work of the son (or grandson) of Iddo, Haggai's contemporary, about 520-518. We have then, two distinct theories before us. The one merely affirms that the last six chapters of our present book are not from the same author as the first eight. The other carries the dismemberment of the book still further, and maintains that the last six chapters are the work of two distinct authors who lived at two distinct periods of Jewish history. The arguments advanced by the  supporters of each theory rest on the same grounds. They are drawn partly from the difference in style, and partly from the difference in the nature of the contents, the historical references, etc., in the different sections of the book; but the one sees this difference only in ch. 9-14 as compared with ch. 1-8; the other sees it also in ch. 12-14 as compared with ch. 9-11. We must accordingly consider (1) the difference generally in the style and contents of ch. 9-14 as compared with ch. 1-8; (2) the differences betweens ch. 12- 14 as compared with ch. 9-11.

(A.) Arguments against the Integrity of the Book. The difference in point of style between the latter and former portions of the prophecy is admitted by all critics. Rosenmüller characterizes that of the first eight chapters as “prosaic, feeble, poor,” and that of the remaining six as “poetic, weighty, concise, glowing.” But without admitting so sweeping a criticism, and one, which the verdict of abler critics on the former portion has contradicted, there can be no doubt that the general tone and character of the one section are in decided contrast with those of the other. “As he passes from the first half of the prophet to the second,” says Eichhorn, “no reader can fail to perceive how strikingly different are the impressions which are made upon him by the two. The manner of writing in the second portion is far loftier and more mysterious; the images employed are grander and more magnificent; the point of view and the horizon are changed. Once the Temple and the ordinances of religion formed the central point from which the prophet's words radiated, and to which they ever returned; now these have vanished. The favorite modes of expression, hitherto so often repeated, are now, as it were, forgotten. The chronological notices which before marked the day on which each several prophecy was uttered now fail us altogether: Could a writer all at once have forgotten so entirely his habits of thought? Could he so completely disguise his innermost feelings? Could the world about him, the mode of expression, the images employed, be so totally different in the case of one and the same writer?” (Einleit. 4:443, § 605).

(I) Ch. 1-8 are marked by certain peculiarities of idiom and phraseology which do not occur afterwards. Favorite expressions are: “The word of Jehovah came unto,” etc. (Zec 1:7; Zec 4:8; Zechariah 6, 9; Zec 9:7; Zec 14:8; Zec 8:1-18); “Thus saith Jehovah (God) of hosts” (14,16,17; 2:11; 8:2, 4:6, 7, 9,14; 18, 20, 23); “And I lifted up mine eyes and saw” (Zec 1:18; Zechariah 2, 1; Zechariah 5, 1; Zec 6:1): none of these modes of expression are to be met within ch. 9-14. On the other hand, the phrase “In that day” is entirely confined to the later  chapters, in which it occurs frequently. The form of the inscriptions is different. Introductions to the separate oracles such as those in Zec 9:1; Zec 12:1, do not present themselves in the earlier portion. Zechariah, in several instances, states the time at which a particular prophecy was uttered by him (Zec 1:1; Zec 1:7; Zec 7:1). He mentions his own name in these passages, and also in Zec 7:8, and the names of contemporaries in 3, 1; 4:6; 6:10; 7:2: the writer (or writers) of the second portion of the book never does this. , It has also been observed that after the first eight chapters we hear nothing of “Satan,” or of “the seven eyes of Jehovah;” that there are no more visions; that ch. 11 contains no allegory, not a symbolic action; that here are no riddles which need to be solved, no angelus interpres to solve them.

(II.) Ch. 9-11. These chapters, it is alleged, have also their characteristic peculiarities:

1. In point of style, the author resembles Hosea- more than any other prophet; such is the verdict both of Knobel and Ewald. He delights to picture Jehovah as the great captain of his people. Jehovah comes to Zion, and pitches his camp there to protect her (Zec 9:8-9). He blows the trumpet, marches against his enemies, makes his people his bow, and shoots his arrows (Zec 9:13-14); or he rides on Judah as his war-horse, and goes forth thereon to victory (Zec 10:3; Zec 10:5). Again, he speaks of the people as a flock, and the leaders of the people as their shepherds (Zec 9:16; Zec 10:2-3; Zec 11:4 sq.). He describes himself also, in his character of prophet, as a shepherd in the last passages, and assumes to himself, in a symbolic action (which, however, may have been one only of the imagination), all the guise and the gear of a shepherd. In general he delights in images (Zec 9:3-4; Zec 9:13-17; Zec 10:3; Zec 10:5; Zec 10:7, etc.), some of which are striking and forcible.

2. The notes of time are also peculiar:

(1.) It was a time when the pride of Assyria was yet at its height (Zec 10:11), and when the Jews had already suffered from it. This first took place 1:l the time of Menahem (B.C. 772-761).

(2.) The Trans-jordanic territory had already been swept by the armies of the invader (Zec 10:10), but a still further desolation threatened it (Zec 11:1-3). The first may have been the invasion of Pul (1Ch 5:26), the second that of Tiglath-pileser.

(3.) The kingdoms of Judah and Ephraim are both standing (9, 10,13; 10:6), but many Israelites are nevertheless exiles in Egypt and Assyria (Zec 9:11; Zec 10:6; Zec 10:8; Zec 10:10, etc.).

(4.) The struggle between Judah and Israel is supposed to be already begun (Zec 11:14). At the same time, Damascus is threatened (Zec 9:1). If so, the reference must be to the alliance formed between Pekah king of Israel and Rezin of Damascus, the consequence of which was the loss of Elath (739).

(5.) Egypt and Assyria are both formidable powers (Zec 10:9-11). The only other prophets to whom these two nations appear as formidable, at the same time, are Hosea (Hos 7:11; Hos 12:1; Hos 14:3) and his contemporary Isaiah (Isa 7:17,etc.); and that in prophecies which must have been uttered between 743 and 740. The expectation seems to have been that the Assyrians, in order to attack Egypt, would march by way of Syria, Phoenicia, and Philistia, along the coast (Zec 9:1-9), as they did afterwards (Isa 20:1), and that the kingdom of Israel would suffer chiefly in consequence (Zec 9:9-12), and Judah in a smaller degree (Zec 9:8-9).

(6.) The kingdom of Israel is described as “a flock for the slaughter”. in ch. 11:over which three shepherds have been set in one month. This corresponds with the season of anarchy and confusion “which followed immediately on the murder of Zechariah the son of Jeroboam II (760). This son reigned only six months, his murderer Shallum but one (2Ki 15:8-15), being put to death in his turn by Menahem. Meanwhile another rival king may have arisen, Bunsen thinks, in some other part of the country, who may have fallen as the murderer did, before Menahem.

(7.) The symbolical action of the breaking of the two shepherd's staves Favor and Union points the same way. The breaking of the first showed that God's favor had departed from Israel, that of the second that all hope of union between Judah and Ephraim was at an end.

All these notes of time, it is claimed, point in the same direction, and make it probable that the author of ch. 9-11 was a contemporary of Isaiah, and prophesied during the reign of Ahaz. According to Knobel, ch. 9 and 10 were probably delivered in Jotham's reign, and ch. 11 in that of Ahaz, who summoned Tiglath-pileser to his aid. Maurer thinks that ch.9 and 10 were written between the first (2Ki 15:29) and second (2Ki 17:4-6) Assyrian invasions, ch. 10 during the seven years' interregnum which followed the death of Pekah, and 11 in the reign of Hoshea.

(III.) Ch. 12-14. By the majority of those critics who assign these chapters to a third author, that author is supposed to have lived shortly before the Babylonian captivity. The grounds for separating these three chapters from ch. 9 to 11 are as follows:

1. This section opens with its own introductory formula, as the preceding one (Zec 9:1) does. This, however, only shows that the sections are distinct, not that they were written at different times.

2. The object of the two sections is altogether different. The author of the former (ch. 9-11) has both Israel and Judah before him; he often speaks of them together (Zec 9:3; Zec 10:6; Zec 11:14; comp. 10:7); he directs his prophecy to the Trans-jordanic territory, and announces the discharge of his office in Israel (Zec 11:4 sq.). The author of the second section, on the other hand, has only to do with Judah and Jerusalem; he nowhere mentions Israel.

3. The political horizon of the two prophets is different. By the former, mention is made of the Syrians, Phoenicians, Philistines (Zec 9:1-7), and Greeks (Zec 9:13), as well as of the Assyrians and Egyptians, the last two being described as at that time the most powerful. It therefore belongs to the earlier time when these two nations were beginning to struggle for supremacy in Western Asia. By the latter, the Egyptians only are mentioned as a hostile nation — not a word is said of the Assyrians. The author consequently must have lived at a time when Egypt was the chief enemy of Judah.

4. The anticipations: of the two prophets are different. The first trembles only for Ephraim. He predicts the desolation of the Trans-jordanic territory, the carrying away captive of the Israelites, but also the return from Assyria and Egypt (Zec 9:7; Zec 9:10). But for Judah he has no cause of fear. Jehovah will protect her (Zec 9:8), and bring back those of her sons who in earlier times had gone into captivity (Zec 9:11). The second prophet, on the other hand making no mention whatever of the northern kingdom, is full of alarm for Judah. He sees hostile nations gathering together against her, and two thirds of her inhabitants destroyed (Zec 13:6); he sees the enemy laying siege to Jerusalem, taking  and plundering it, and carrying half of her people captive (Zec 12:3; Zec 14:2; Zec 14:5). Of any return of the captives nothing is here said.

5. The style of the two prophets is different. The author of this last section is fond of the prophetic formula: וַהָיָה, “And it shall come to pass” (Zec 12:9; Zec 13:2-4; Zec 13:8; Zec 14:6; Zec 14:8; Zec 14:13; Zec 14:16); בִּיּוֹם הִהוּא, “in that day” (Zec 12:3-4; Zec 12:6; Zec 12:8-9; Zec 12:11; Zec 13:1-2; Zec 13:4; Zec 14:8-13; Zec 14:20-21); נְאם יְההוָֹה; saith Jehovah” (Zec 12:1; Zec 12:4; Zec 13:2; Zec 13:7-8). In the section 9-11 the first does not occur at all, the second but once (Zec 9:16), the third only twice (Zec 10:12; Zec 11:6). We have, moreover, in this section certain favorite expressions: “all peoples,” “all people of the earth,” “all nations round about,” “all nations that come up against Jerusalem,” “the inhabitants of Jerusalem,” “the house of David,” “family” for nation, “the families of the earth,” “the family of Egypt,” etc.

6. There are apparently few notes of time in this section. One is the allusion to the death of Josiah in “the mourning of Hadad-rimmon in the valley of Megiddo; another to the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah.. This addition to the name of the king shows, Knobel suggests, that he had been long dead; but the argument. if it is worth anything, would make even more for those who hold a post-exile date. It is certainly remarkable, occurring thus in the body of the prophecy, and not in the inscription as in Isa 1:1.

(B.) Arguments in Favor of the Integrity of the Book.

(I.) As between ch. 1-8 and 9-14. —

1. In reply to all the foregoing arguments, it has been urged by Keil, Stihelin, and others that the difference of style between the two principal divisions of the prophecy is not greater than may reasonably be accounted for by the change of subject. The language in which visions are narrated would, from the nature of the case, be quieter and less animated than that in which prophetic anticipations of future glory are described. They differ as the style, of the narrator differs from that of the orator. Thus, for instance, how different is the style of Hosea, ch. 1-3, from the style of the same prophet in ch. 4-14 or, again, that of Eze 6:7 from Ezekiel 4!

But, besides this, even in what may be termed the more oratorical portions of the first eight chapters, the prophet is to a great extent occupied with  warnings and exhortations of a practical kind (see Zec 1:4-6; Zec 8:9-23); whereas in the subsequent chapters he is rapt into a far- distant and glorious future. In the one case, therefore, the language would naturally sink down to the level of prose; in the other it would rise to an elevation worthy of its exalted subject.

In like manner, the notes of time in the former part (Zec 1:1; Zec 1:7; Zec 7:1) and the constant reference to the Temple may be explained on the ground that the prophet here busies himself with the events of his own time, whereas afterwards his eye is fixed on a far-distant future.

On the other hand, where predictions do occur in the first section, there is a general similarity between them and the predictions of the second. The scene, so to speak, is the same; the same visions float before the eyes of the seer. The times of the Messiah are the theme of the predictions in ch. 1-4, in Zec 9:10 and in Zec 12:1 to Zec 13:6; while the events which are to prepare the way for that time, and especially the sifting of the nation are dwelt upon in ch. 5, in Zec 9:11, and in Zec 13:7-9; Zec 13:2. The same peculiar forms of expression occur in the two divisions of the prophecy. Thus, for instance, we find מֵעוֹבֵר וּמַשָּׁבnot only in Zec 7:14, but also in Zec 9:8; הֶעֵַביר, in the sense of “to remove,” in Zec 3:4, and in Zec 13:2 - elsewhere it occurs in this unusual sense only in later writings (2Ki 16:3; 2Ch 15:8)— “the eye of God,” as betokening the divine providence, in Zec 3:9; Zec 4:10; and in Zec 9:1; Zec 9:8.

In both sections the return of the whole nation after the Exile is the prevailing image of happiness, and in both it is similarly portrayed. As in Zec 2:10, the exiles are summoned to return to their native land, because now, according to the principles of righteous recompense, they shall rule over their enemies, so also a similar strain occurs in Zec 9:12, etc. Both in Zec 2:10 and in Zec 9:9 the renewed protection wherewith God will favor Zion is represented as an entrance into his holy dwelling; in both his people are called on to rejoice, and in-both there is a remarkable agreement in the words. In Zec 9:14, רני ושמח בת ציון כי הנני בא, and in Zec 9:9, מלכ ִיבוא ל ִגילי מאד בת ציון הריעי בת ירושלם הנה

Again, similar forms of expression occur in Zec 2:9; Zec 2:11, and the description of the increase in Jerusalem, Zec 14:10, may be compared with Zec 2:4; and the prediction in Zec 8:20-23 with that in Zec 14:16. The resemblance which has been found in some other  passages is too slight to strengthen the argument; and the occurrence of Chaldaisms, such as צָבָא (Zec 9:8), רָאֲמָה (Zec 14:10), בהל (which occurs besides only in Pro 20:11), and the phrase מַלֵּא קֶשֶׁת (Zec 9:13), instead of דָּרִךְ קֵשֵּׁת, really prove nothing as to the age of the later chapters of Zechariah. Indeed, generally, as regards these minute comparisons of different passages to prove an identity of authorship, Maurer's remark holds true: “Sed quee potest vis esse, disjectorum quorundam locorum, ubi res judicanda est ex toto?”

2. Of far more weight, however, than the arguments already advanced is the fact that the writer of these last chapters (9-14) shows an acquaintance with the later prophets of the time of the Exile. That there are numerous allusions in it to earlier prophets, such as Joel, Amos, Micah, has been shown by Hitzig (Comment. p. 354, 2d ed.); but there are also, it is alleged, allusions to Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the latter part of Isaiah (ch. 40-lxvi). If this can be established, it is evidence that this portion of the book, if not written by Zechariah himself, was at least written after the Exile. We find, then, in Zec 9:2 an allusion to Eze 28:3 : in Eze 28:3 to 1Ki 10:27; in 1Ki 10:5 to Zep 2:4; in Zep 2:11 to Isa 51:14; in Isa 51:12 to Isa 49:9 and Isa 61:7; in Zec 10:3 to Eze 34:17. Zechariah 11 is derived from Ezekiel 34 (comp. esp. Eze 34:4 with Eze 34:4), and Zec 11:3 from Jer 12:5. Zec 12:1 alludes to Isa 51:13; Isa 13:8-9, to Eze 5:12; Eze 14:8 to Eze 47:1-12; Eze 47:10-11, to Jer 31:38-40; Jer 31:16-19 to Isa 66:23; Isa 60:12; Isa 60:20-21, to Eze 43:12; Eze 44:9.

This manifest acquaintance on the part of the writer of Zechariah 9-14 with so many of the later prophets seemed so convincing to De Wette that, after having in the first three editions of his Introduction declared for two authors, he found himself compelled to change his mind, and to admit that the later chapters must belong to the age of Zechariah, and might have been written by Zechariah himself.

Bleek, on the other hand, has done his best to weaken the force of this argument, first by maintaining that in most instances the alleged agreement is only apparent, and, next, that where there is a real agreement (as in Zec 9:12; Zec 11:3; Zec 12:1; Zec 14:16) with the passages above cited, Zechariah may be the original from whom Isaiah and Jeremiah borrowed. It must be confessed, however, that it is more probable that one writer should have allusions to many others than that many others should borrow  from one; and this probability approaches certainty in proportion as we multiply the number of quotations or allusions. If there are passages in Zechariah which are manifestly similar to other passages in Zephaniah, in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Deutero-Isaiah, which is the more probable, that they all borrowed from him, or he from them? In Zec 9:12 especially, as Stihelin argues, the expression is decidedly one to be looked for after the Exile rather than before it; and the passage rests upon Jer 16:18, and has an almost verbal accordance with Isa 61:7.

3. Again, the same critics argue that the historical references in the later chapters are perfectly consistent with a post-exile date. This had already been maintained by Eichhorn, although he supposes these chapters to have been written by a later prophet than Zechariah. Stiahelin puts the case as follows: Even under the Persian rule the political relations of the Jews continued very nearly the same as they were in earlier times. They still were placed between a huge Eastern power on the one side, and Egypt on the other, the only difference now being that Egypt as well as Judaea was subject to the Persians. But Egypt was an unwilling vassal; and as in earlier times, when threatened by Assyria, she had sought for alliances among her neighbors or had endeavored to turn them to account as a kind of outwork in her own defense, so now she would adopt the same policy in her attempts to cast off the Persian yoke. It would follow, as a matter of course, that Persia would be on the watch to check such efforts, and would wreak her vengeance on those among her own tributary or dependent provinces which should venture to form an alliance with Egypt.

Such of these provinces as lay on the sea-coast must indeed suffer in any case, even if they remained true in their allegiance to the Persians. The armies which were destined for the invasion of Egypt would collect in, Syria and Phoenicia, and would march by way of the coast; and, whether they came as friends or as foes, they would probably cause sufficient devastation to justify the prophecy in Zec 9:1, etc., delivered against Damascus, Phoenicia, and Philistia. Meanwhile the prophet seeks to calm the minds of his own people by assuring them of God's protection, and of the coming of the Messiah, who, at the appointed time, shall again unite the two kingdoms of Judah and Ephraim. It is observable, moreover, that the prophet, throughout his discourses, is anxious net only to tranquillize the minds of his countrymen, but, to prevent their engaging in any insurrection against their Persian masters, or forming any alliance with their enemies. In this respect he follows the example of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and, like these  two prophets, he foretells the return of Ephraim, the union of Ephraim and Judah, and the final overthrow both of Assyria (Eze 10:11) — that is, Persia — and of Egypt, the two countries which had, more than all others, vexed and devastated Israel.

That a large portion of the nation was still supposed to be in exile is clear from Eze 9:11, and hence Eze 10:10 can only be regarded as a reminiscence of Mic 5:10; and even if Eze 10:9 must be explained of the past (with De Wette, Einleit. § 250, 6, note a), still it appears from Josephus (Ant. 12:2, 5) that the Persians carried away Jews into Egypt, and from Syncellus (p. 486, Liebuhr's ed.) that Ochus transplanted large numbers, of Jews from Palestine to the east and, north; the earlier custom of thus forcibly removing; to a distance those conquered nations who, from disaffection or a turbulent spirit, were: likely to give occasion for alarm, having not only continued among the Persians, but having become even more common than ever (Heeren, Ideen, 1, 254, 2d ed.). This well-known policy on the part of their conquerors would be a sufficient ground for the assurance which the prophet gives in 10:9. Even the threats uttered against the false prophets and the shepherds of the people are not inconsistent with the times after the Exile. In Neh 5:6 :we find the nobles and rulers of the people oppressing their brethren, and false prophets active in their opposition to Nehemiah. In like manner “the idols” (עֲצִבַּים) in Neh 13:1-5 may be the same as the “Teraphim” of Neh 10:2, where they are mentioned in connection with “the diviners” (הִקּוֹסְמַים). Malachi (Mal 3:5) speaks of “sorcerers” (מְכִשְּׁפַים), and that such superstition long held its ground among the Jews is evident from Josephus (Ant. 8:2, 5). Nor does Zec 14:21 of necessity imply either idol worship or heathen pollution in the Temple. Ch. 11 was spoken by the prophet later than ch. 9 and 10. In Zec 11:14 he declares the impossibility of any reunion between Judah and Ephraim, either because the northern territory had already been laid waste, or because the inhabitants of it had shown a disposition to league with Phoenicia in a vain effort to throw off the Persian yoke, which would only involve them in certain destruction. This difficult passage Stahelin admits he cannot solve to his satisfaction, but contends that it may have been designed to teach the new colony that it was not a part of God's purpose to reunite the severed tribes; and in this he sees an argument for the post-exilian date of the prophecy, inasmuch as the union of the ten- tribes with the two was ever one of the brightest hopes of the prophets who lived before the Captivity.  Having thus shown that there is no reason why the section 9-11 should not belong to a time subsequent to the return from Babylon, Stahelin proceeds to argue that the prophecy directed against the nations (Malachi 9:1-7) is really more applicable to the Persian era than to any other. It is only the coast-line which is here threatened; whereas the earlier prophets, whenever they threaten the maritime tribes, unite with them Moab and Ammon. or Edom. Moreover, the nations here mentioned are not spoken of as enemies of Judah; for being Persian subjects they would not venture to attack the Jewish colony when under the special protection of that power. Of Ashdod it is said that a foreigner ( מִמְזֵיA.V. “bastard”) shall dwell in it. This, too, might naturally have happened in the time of Zechariah. During the Exile, Arabs had established themselves in Southern Palestine, and the prophet foresees that they would occupy Ashdod; and, accordingly, we learn from Neh 13:24 that the dialect of Ashdod was unintelligible to the Jews, and in 4:7 the people of Ashdod appear as a distinct tribe united with other Arabians against Judah. The king of Gaza (mentioned in Zec 9:5) may have been a Persian vassal, as the kings of Tyre and Sidon were, according to Herod. 8:67. A king in Gaza would only be in conformity with the Persian custom (see Herod. 3, 15), although this was no longer the case in the time of Alexander. The mention of the “sons of Javan” (9:13; A. V. “Greece”) is suitable to the Persian period (which is also the view of Eichhoin), as it was then that the Jews were first brought into any close contact with the Greeks. It was, in fact, the fierce struggle between Greece and Persia which gave a peculiar meaning to his words when the prophet promised his own people victory over the Greeks, and so reversed the earlier prediction of Joel 4:6, 7 (A.V. Joe 3:6-7). If, however, we are to understood by Javan Arabia, as some maintain, this again equally suits the period supposed and the prophecy will refer to the Arabians, of whom we have already spoken.

(II.) We come, now to the section 12-14. The main proposition-here is, that however hard Judah and Jerusalem may be pressed by enemies (of Israel there is no further mention), still with God's help they shall be victorious; and the result shall be that Jehovah will be more truly worshipped both by Jews and Gentiles. That this anticipation of the gathering of hostile armies against Jerusalem was not unnatural in the Persian times may be inferred from what has been said above. Persian hosts were often seen in Judea. We find an instance of this in Josephus (‘Ant. 11:7, 1), and Sidon was laid in ashes in consequence of an insurrection  against Persia (Diod. 16:45). On tile other hand, how could a prophet in the time immediately preceding the Exile — the time to which, on account of 12,12, most critics refer this section-have uttered predictions such as these? Since the time of Zephaniah all the prophets looked upon the fate of Jerusalem as sealed, whereas here, in direct contradiction to such views, the preservation of the city is announced even in the extremest calamities. Any analogy to the general strain of thought in this section is only to be found in Isaiah 29-33. Besides, no king is here mentioned, but only “the house of David,” which, according to Jewish tradition (Herzfeld, Gesch. des Volkes Israel, p. 378 sq.), held a high position after the Exile, and accordingly is mentioned (12, 12,13) in its different branches (comp. Movers, Dus Phoniz. Alterth. 1, 531), together with the tribe of Levi; the prophet, like the writer of Psalms 89, looking to it with a kind of yearning, which before the Exile, while there was still a king, would have been inconceivable. Again, the manner in which Egypt is alluded to (14, 19) almost of necessity leads us to the Persian times; for then Egypt, in consequence of her perpetual efforts to throw off the Persian yoke, was naturally brought into hostility with the Jews, who were under the protection of Persia. Before the Exile this was only the case during the interval between the death of Josiah and the battle of Carchemish. It would seem, then, that there is nothing to compel us to place this section 12-14 in the times before the Exile; much, on the contrary, which can only be satisfactorily accounted for on the supposition that it was written during the period of the Persian dominion. Nor must it be forgotten that we have here that fuller development of the Messianic idea, which at such a time might be expected, and one which, in fact, rests upon all the prophets who flourished before the Exile.

Such are the grounds, critical and historical, on which Stahelin rests his defense of the later date of the second portion of the prophet Zechariah. We have given his arguments at length as the ablest and most complete, as well as the most recent, on his side of the controversy. Some of them, it must be admitted, are, full of weight. When critics like Eichhorn maintain that of the whole section Zec 9:1-10; Zec 9:17, no explanation is possible, unless we derive it from the history of Alexander the Great; and when De Wette, after having adopted the theory of different authors, felt himself obliged to abandon it for reasons already mentioned, and to vindicate the integrity of the book, the grounds for a post-exile date must  be very strong. Indeed, it is not easy to say which way the weight of evidence preponderates.

(C.) With regard to the quotation in Matthew (Mat 27:9-10; comp. Zec 11:12-13) there seems no good reason for setting aside the received reading. Jerome observes (Comment. in Evang. Mat 27:9-10), “This passage is not found in Jeremiah. But in Zechariah, who is nearly the last of the twelve prophets, something like it occurs; and though there is no great difference in the meaning, yet both the order and the words are different. I read a short time since, in a Hebrew volume, which a Hebrew of the sect of the Nazarenes presented to me, an apocryphal book of Jeremiah, in which I found the passage word for word. But still I am rather inclined to think that the quotation is made from Zechariah, in the usual manner of the evangelists and apostles, who, neglecting the order of the words, only give the general sense of what they cite from the Old Test.” Eusebius (Evangel. Demonstr. lib. 10) is of opinion that the passage thus quoted stood originally in the prophecy of Jeremiah, but was either erased subsequently by the malice of the Jews [a very improbable supposition, it need hardly be said], or that the name of Zechariah was substituted: for that of Jeremiah through the carelessness of copyists. Augustine (De Cons. Evangel. 3, 30) testifies that the most ancient Greek copies had Jeremiah, and thinks that the mistake was originally Matthew's, but that this was divinely ordered, and that the evangelist would not correct the error even when pointed out, in order that we might thus infer that all the prophets spake by one Spirit, and that what was the work -of one was the work of all (“et singula esse omnilum, et omnia singulorum”). Some later writers account for the non-appearance of the passage in Jeremiah by the confusion in the Greek MSS. of his prophecies-a confusion, however, it may be remarked, which is not confined to the Greek, but which is found no less in our present Hebrew text. Others, again, suggest that in the Greek autograph of Matthew, ΖΡΙΟΥ may have been written, and that copyists may have taken this for ΙΡΙΟΥ. But there is no evidence that abbreviations of this kind were in use so early. Epiphanius and some of the Greek fathers seem to have read ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. The most ancient copy of the Latin version of the Gospels omits the name of Jeremiah, and has merely dictum est per Prophetam. It has been conjectured that this represents the original Greek reading τὸ ηθὲν διὰ τοῦ Προφήτου, and that some early annotator wrote ῾Ιερεμίου on the margin, whence it crept into the text. The choice lies between this, and a  slip of memory on the part of the evangelist, if we admit the integrity of our present book of Zechariah, unless, indeed, we suppose, with Eichhorn, who follows Jerome, that an Apocryphal book of Jeremiah is quoted. Theophylact proposes to insert a καὶ, and would read διὰ ῾Ιερεμίου καὶ τοῦ Προφήτου-ἤγουν Ζαχαρίου. He argues that the quotation is really a fusion of two passages; that concerning the price paid occurring in Zechariah 11 and that concerning the field in Jeremiah 19 But what New Test. writer would have used such a form of expression “by Jeremy and the Prophet?” Such a mode of quotation is without parallel. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the passage as given in Matthew does not represent exactly either the Hebrew text of Zechariah or the version of the Sept. The other passages of the prophet quoted in the New Test. are 9:9 (in Mat 21:5; Joh 12:15) 12:10 (in Joh 19:37; Rev 1:7); 13:7 (in Mat 26:31; Mar 14:27); but in no instance is the prophet quoted by name.

(D.) The following writers have discussed the question of the integrity of Zechariah: Mede, Works (Lond. 1664) p. 786,884; Kidder [Bp.], Demonstration of the Messiahs (ibid. 1700), 2, 199; Newcome [Archbp.], Minor Prophets (ibid. 1785); Blayney, New Translation of Zechariah (Oxf. 1797); Carpzov, Vindic. Critf.(Lips. 1724); Flügge, Die Weissagungen des Proph. Zach. (Hamb. 1784); Bertholdt, Einleitung, 4:1762 sq., 1712 sq.; Eichhorn, Propheten, 3, 327-360, 380-392, 415-428, 515-518; id. Einleitung (4th ed. 1824), 4:427 sq.; Bauer, Einleitung, p. 510 sq.; Beckhaus, Integritat der proph. Schrift. p. 337 sq.; Jahn, Einleitung, 2, 675 sq.; Koster, Melefemata Exeget. (Götting. 1818); Forberg, Comm. Exeget. (Cob. 1824); Gramberg, Gesch. der Relionsideen, 2. 520 sq.; Rosenmüller, Scholia, 7:4, 254 sq.; Gredner, Der Prophet Joel, p. 67 sq.; Hengstenberg, Beitriqe, 1, 361 sq.; id. Christologie, vol. 3; id. Integrity of Zechariah (Edinb. transl. 1848); De Wette, Einleitung (1st to 3rd eds. against the Integrity, later eds. in favor of it); Keil, Einleitung; Havernick, Einleitung; Maurer, Comment. 2,621 sq.; Ewald, Die Propheten; id. Gesch. vol 4; Bleek, Einleitung; id. Zeitalter von Zach., in the Stud. und Krit. 1852, p. 247 sq.; Stiahelin, Einleitung, 1862, p. 315 sq.; Hitzig, in Stud. und Krit. 1830, p. 25 sq., and in Prophet.; Henderson, Minor Prophets (1830); Davidson, in Horme's Introd. (10th ed. 1856), and more recently in his Introduction to the Old. Testament; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, vol. 2, ch. 1, pt. 2; id. Gött in der Geschichte, 1, 449; Sandrock, Zach. ab uno Autore. (Vratisl. 1856); Ortenberg [disintegratist], Bestandtheile des  Buches Sach. (Stuttg. 1860); Wright, Bampton Lect. for 1878; and the later commentators generally.

II. Style and Diction. — Some of Zechariah's peculiarities in these respects have been noticed above. It will have been already perceived that the symbols with which he abounds are obscure, and their prosaic structure is diffuse and unvaried. The rhythm of his poetry is unequal, and its parallelisms are inharmonious and disjointed. His language has in many phrases a close alliance with that of the other prophets, and occasional imitations of them, especially of Ezekiel, characterize his oracles. He is also peculiar in his introduction of spiritual beings into his prophetic scenes. In point of phraseology, generally speaking, Zechariah's style is pure and remarkably free from Chaldaisms. As is common with writers in the decline of a language, he seems to have striven to imitate the purity of the earlier models; but in orthography, and in the use of some words and phrases, he betrays the influence of a later age. He writes אֹתand דָּוַיד, and employs אִחִת‘(Zec 5:7) in its later use as the indefinite article, and אִנְתְּרוֹתwith the fem. termination (Zec 4:12). A full collection of these peculiarities will be found in Kyster, Meletemata in Zechariah etc.

IV. Commentaries. — The following are the exegetical helps on the entire prophecy exclusively, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Jerome, Commentarii (in Opp. ed. Villars [Veron. 1734], 6); Theodoret, Interpretatio (in Opp. ed. Schulze [Hal. 176974], II, 2); Ephrem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. 5, 285); Rupertus Tuitiensis, In Zechariah (in Opp. 1, 520); Kimchi, Commentary (transl. from the Heb. by McCaul, Lond. 1824, 8vo); Luther, Auslegung (Wittenb. 1528, 4to; Erf. eod. 8vo; also in his Works, in Lat. and Germ.); Melancthon, Commentarius (in Opp. 2, 531); Draco, Explicatio [includ. Joel and Micah ] (Vitemb. 1565, fol.); Chytrseus, Lectiones (in Opp. 2, 397); Stunica, R. C.], Commentaria (Salmant. 1577, fol.); Grynaeus, Commentarius (Genev. 1581, 8vo); Osor [R. C.], Commentarius (Colon. 1584, 8vo; also in Opp.); Baldwin, Commentarius [includ. Hagg and Mal.] (Vitemb. 1610, 8vo); Sanctius [R. C.1, Commentarius (Lugd. 1616, 4to); Pemble, Exposition [on ch. 1-9] (Lond. 1629, 4to); De Reyroles [R. C.], Quaestiones (Par. 1631, fol.); Ursinus, Commentarius (Francof. 1652, 8vo); Dorsch, Synopsis (ibid. 1653,1691,4to); Varenius, Explicatio [includ. Haggai lnd Mal.] (Rost. 1662,4to); De Base, Analysis (Brem. 1689, 4to); Biermann, Erklarung (Utrecht, 1699; in Germ. 1706, 4to); Gerbade, Opelooften (Leyd. 1702,  4to); Muilman, Illustratio (Franek. 1703, 4to); Meiss, Erklarung (Leips. 1706, 8vo); Bohle, Analysis, ed. Grape (Rost. 1711, 8vo); Nemethus, Explicatio (Ultraj. 1714, 4to); Boekholt, Erklarung (Amst. 1718, 4to); Andala, Dissertationes (Franek. 1720, 4to); \*Vitringa, Commentarii (Leov. 1734, 4to); Mann, Zergliederung (Brem. eod. 4to); Opitz, Amerk. (Gott. 1747, 4to); Oporin, Amerk. (ibid. eod. 4to); Herlich, Erklarung (Rost. 1764, 8vo); Trinius, Amerk. (Quedlinb. 1780, 8vo); \*Flügge, Erläuterung (Hamb. 1784, 8vo); \*Venema, Sermones (Leov. 1789, 4to); Blayney, Notes (Oxf. 1797, 4to); Thube, Erklarung (Schwerin, 1802, 8vo); Salomon, בַּאוּרַים. (Dessaun, 1805, 8vo); \*Koster, Meletemata [on ch. 9- 14] (Gött. 1818, 8vo); Forberg, Commentarius [ibid.] (Cob. 1824, 4to, pt. 1); Stouard, Commentary (Lond. eod. 8vo); Maller; Erklarung (Brem. 1831, 8vo, pt. 1); Park, Explication (Loud. 1832,8vo); Burger, Etudes (Strasb. 1841, 4to); Baumgarten, Nachtgesichte (Brunswick, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); Neumann, Erklarung (Stuttg. 1860); Wardlaw, Lectures (Lond. 1862, 12mo); \*Kliefoth, Erläuterung (Schwerin, eod. 8vo); Kohler, Erklarung (Erlang. 1862-63, 8vo); Robinson, Homilies (Lond. 1865, 8vo); \*Moore, Commentary [iuclud. Hagg and Mal.] (N.Y. 1866, 8vo); Pressel, Commentar [ibid.] (Gotha, 1870, 8vo); \*Wright, Commentary (Lond. 1879, 8vo). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

## Zedad[[@Headword:Zedad]]

             (Heb. Tsedasd', צַדָד[with. הdirective, Tseda'dah, צְדָדָה, slope; Sept. Σαδαδάκ v.r. Σαραδάκ, etc.), one of the landmarks on the north border of the land of Israel, as promised by Moses (Num 34:8) and as restored by Ezekiel (Eze 47:15). In the former passage it occurs between “the entrance of Hamath” and Ziphron, and in the latter between the “road to Hethlon” and Hamath. A place named Siudud exists to the east of the northern extremity of the chain of Antilibanus, about fifty miles E.N.E. of Baalbek and thirty five S.S.E. of Hums (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2. 507: Wetzstein, Reis. üb. Hauran, p. 88), which Porter thinks is identical with Zedad (Five Years in Damascus, 2, 354356; Giant Cities of Bashan, p. 317); and so also apparently rabbi Schwarz (Palest. p. 26); but the boundaries of Palestine proper never extended so far northward. SEE TRIBE. A trace of the name possibly lingers in the desert plain called Sahil Judeideh, on the western slope of Antilibanus, in or in ear the district of Zebedany (Robinson, Later Bibl. Res. p. 490).

## Zedechias[[@Headword:Zedechias]]

             (Σεδεκίας), the Greek form (1Es 1:46) of the name of king ZEDEKIAH SEE ZEDEKIAH (q.v.).

## Zedekiah[[@Headword:Zedekiah]]

             (Heb. Tsidkiyah', צַדְקַיָּה[but in this simple form only in 1Ki 22:11; Neh 10:1; Jer 27:12; Jer 28:1; Jeremiah 29, 3; elsewhere in tile prolonged form Tsidkiya'hu, צַדַקַיָּהוּ, my righteousness is Jah, or, righteousness of Jehovah; Sept andJosephus, Σεδεκίας), the name of several Hebrews.

1. Son of Chenaanah, a prophet at the court of Ahab, head, or, if not head, virtual leader, of the college. He appears but once, viz., as spokesman when the prophets are consulted by Ahab on the result of his proposed expedition to Ramoth-Gilead (1 Kings 22; 2 Chronicles 18). B.C. 896. Zedekiah had prepared himself for the interview with a pair of iron horns, after the symbolic custom of the prophets (comp. Jer 13:19), the horns of the irem, or buffalo, which was the recognized emblem of the tribe of Ephraim (Deu 33:17). With these, in the interval of Micaiah's arrival, he illustrated the manner in which Ahab should drive the Syrians before him. When Micaiah appeared and had delivered his prophecy, Zedekiah sprang forward and struck him a blow on the face, accompanying it by a taunting sneer. For this he is threatened by Micaiah in terms which are hardly intelligible to us, but which evidently allude to some personal danger to Zedekiah.

The narrative of the Bible does not imply that the blow struck by Zedekiah was prompted by more than sudden anger, or a wish to insult and humiliate the prophet of Jehovah. But Josephus takes a very different view, which he develops at some length (Alt. 8:15, 3). He relates that after Micaiah had spoken, Zedekiah again came forward, and denounced him as false, on the ground that his prophecy contradicted the prediction of Elijah, that Ahab's blood should be licked up by dogs in the field of Naboth of Jezreel; and, as a further proof that he was an impostor, he struck him, daring him to do what Iddo, in somewhat similar circumstances, had done to Jeroboam-viz. wither his hand. This addition is remarkable; but it is related by Josephus with great circumstantiality, and was perhaps drawn by him from that  source, now lost, from which he has added so many touches to the outlines of the sacred narrative.

As to the question of what Zedekiah and his followers were, whether prophets of Jehovah or of some false deity, it seems hardly possible to entertain any doubt. True, they use the name of Jehovah, but that was a habit of false prophets (Jer 28:2; comp. Jer 29:21; Jer 29:31); and there is a vast difference between the casual manner in which they mention the awful name and the full and, as it were, formal style in which Micaiah proclaims and reiterates it. Seeing, also, that Ahab and his queen were professedly worshippers of Baal and Ashtaroth, and that a few years oily before this event they had an establishment consisting of two bodies one of 450, the other of 400 prophets of this false worship, it is difficult to suppose that there could have been also 400 prophets of Jehovah at his court. But the inquiry of the king of Judah seems to decide the point. After hearing the prediction of Zedekiah and his fellows, he asks at once for a prophet of Jehovah: “Is there not here besides (עוֹד) a prophet of Jehovah that we may inquire of him?” The natural inference seems to be that the others were not prophets of Jehovah, but were the 400 prophets of Ashtaroth (A.V. “the groves”) who escaped the sword of Elijah (comp. 1Ki 18:19 with 22:40). They had spoken in his name, but there was something about them — some trait of manner, costume, or gesture — which aroused the suspicions of Jehoshaphat, and, to the practiced eye of one who lived at the center of Jehovah-worship and was well versed in the marks of the genuine prophet, proclaimed them ‘counterfeits. SEE MICAIAH.

2. The son of Hananiah, one of the princes of Judah who were assembled in the scribes chamber of the king's palace when Micaiah announced that Baruch had read the words of Jeremiah in the ears of the people from the chamber of Gemariah the scribe (Jer 36:12). B.C. 605.

3. The last king of Judah and Jerusalem. B.C. 598588. He was the son of Josiah, and his genealogy is given in 1 Chronicles 3, 15, from which it appears that the sons of Josiah were Johanan the first-born (who is never elsewhere mentioned, and therefore probably had died young, or had been set aside by some popular resolution, to which Shallum may have been indebted for the crown in preference to his elder brother, Jehoiakim), the second Jehoiakim, the third Zedekiah, and the fourth Shallum. Since Jehoiakim was twenty-five at his father's death, and Jehoahaz, or Shallum, twenty-three, while Zedekiah was not twenty-one till his accession to the  throne, eleven years later, there must be a different order from that of, age adopted with the last two sons of Josiah: perhaps it war arranged so as to bring together the two sons of Josiah, who reigned each eleven years, each having been preceded by a king who reigned for only three months. Zedekiah is, indeed, called the brother of his predecessor Jehoiachin (2Ch 36:10); but the word must be used in an indefinite sense, for he certainly was his uncle. His mother was Hamutal, the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnab; so that he was full brother of Jehoahaz (2Ki 23:31; 2Ki 24:18).

His original name had been Mattaniah, which was changed to Zedekiah by Nebuchadnezzar when he carried off his nephew Jehoiachin to Babylon, and left him on the throne of Jerusalem. Zedekiallhwas but twenty-one years old when he was thus placed in charge of an impoverished kingdom, and a city which, though still strong in its natural and artificial impregnability, was bereft of well-nigh all its defenders. But Jerusalem might have remained the head of the Babylonian province of Judah, and the Temple of Jehovah continued standing, had Zedekiah possessed wisdom and firmness enough to remain true to his allegiance to Babylon. This, however, he could not do (Jer 38:5). His history is contained in the short sketch of the events of his reign given in 2Ki 24:17-20; 2Ki 24:7, and, with some trifling variations, in Jer 39:1-7; Jeremiah 52, 1-11, together with the still shorter summary in 2Ch 36:10, etc.; and also in Jeremiah 21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38 (being the chapters containing the prophecies delivered by this prophet during this reign, and his relation of various events more or less affecting Zedekiah), and Eze 16:11-21. To these it is important to add the narrative of Josephus (Ant. 10:7, 1-8, 2), which is partly constructed by comparison of the documents enumerated- above, but also seems to contain information derived from other and independent sources. From these it is evident that Zedekiah was a man not so much bad at heart as weak in will. He was one of those unfortunate characters, frequent in history, like Charles I of England and Louis XVI of France, who find themselves at the head of affairs during a great crisis, without having the strength of character to enable them to do what they know to be right, and whose infirmity becomes moral guilt. The princes of his court, as he himself pathetically admits in his interview with Jeremiah, described in ch. 38:had him completely under their influence. “Against them,” he complains, “it is not the king that can do anything.” He was thus driven to disregard the  counsels of the prophet, which, as the event proved, were perfectly sound; and he who might have kept the fragments of the kingdom of Judah together, and maintained for some generations longer the worship of Jehovah, brought final ruin on his country, destruction on the Temple, death. to his family, and a cruel torment and miserable captivity on himself.

It is evident from Jeremiah 27 (in Jer 27:1 Jehoiakim's name is a copyist's error for that of Zedekiah) and 28 (apparently the earliest prophecies delivered during this reign) that the earlier portion of Zedekiah's reign was marked by an agitation throughout the whole of Syria against the Babylonian yoke. Jerusalem seems to have taken the lead since in the fourth year of Zedekiah's reign we find ambassadors from all the neighboring kingdoms — Tyre, Sidon, Edom, and Moab at his court, to consult as to the steps to be taken. This happened either during the king's absence or immediately after his return from Babylon, whither he had gone on some errand, the nature of which is not named, but which may have been an attempt to blind the eyes of Nebuchadnezzar to his contemplated revolt (Jer 51:59). The project was attacked by Jeremiah with the strongest statement of the folly of such a course statement corroborated by the very material fact that a man of Jerusalem named Hananiah, who had opposed him with a declaration in the name of Jehovah, that the spoils of the Temple should be restored within two years, had died, in accordance with Jeremiah's prediction, within two months of its delivery. This, and perhaps also the impossibility of any real alliance between Judah and the surrounding nations, seems to have put a stop, for the time, to the anti- Babylonian movement. On a man of Zedekiah's temperament the sudden death of Hananiah must have produced a strong impression; and we may without improbability accept this as the time at which he procured to be made in silver a set of the vessels of the Temple to replace the golden plate carried off with his predecessor by Nebuchadnezzar (Bar. 1, 8).

The first act of overt rebellion of which any record survives was the formation of an alliance with Egypt, of itself equivalent to a declaration of enmity with Babylon. In fact, according to the statement of Chronicles and Ezekiel, with the expansion of Josephus, it was in direct contravention of the oath of allegiance in the name of Elohim by which Zedekiah was bound by Nebuchadnezzar-namely, that he would keep the kingdom for Nebuchadnezzar, make no innovation, and enter into no league with Egypt (Eze 17:13; 2Ch 36:13; Joseph. Ant. 10:7, 1). As a natural consequence, it brought on Jerusalem an immediate invasion of the  Chaldaeans. The mention of this event in the Bible, though sure, is extremely slight, and occurs only in Jer 34:21; Jer 37:5-11, and Eze 17:15-20; but Josephus (Eze 10:7; Eze 10:3) relates it more fully, and gives (probably by conjecture) the date of its occurrence as the eighth year of Zedekiah. Probably, also, the denunciations of an- Egyptian alliance contained in Jer 2:18; Jer 2:36, have reference to the same time. It appears that Nebuchadnezzar, being made aware of Zedekiah's defection, either by the non-payment of the tribute or by other means, at once sent an-army to ravage Judaea. This was done, and the whole country was reduced, except Jerusalem and two strong places in the western plain, Lachish and Azekah, which still held out (Jer 34:7). I n the panic which followed the appearance of the Chaldaeans, Zedekiah succeeded in inducing the princes and other inhabitants of Jerusalem to abolish the odious custom which prevailed of enslaving their countrymen. A solemn rite (Jer 34:18), recalling in its form that in which the original covenant of the nation had been made with Abram (Gen 15:9, etc.), was performed in the Temple (Jer 34:15), and a crowd of Israelites of both sexes found themselves released from slavery. In the meantime Pharaoh had moved to the assistance of his ally. On hearing of his approach, the Chaldaeans at once raised the siege and advanced to meet him. The nobles seized the moment of respite to reassert their power over the king, and their defiance of Jehovah, by re-enslaving those whom they had so recently manumitted; and the prophet thereupon utters a doom on these miscreants which, in the fierceness of its tone and in some of its expressions, recalls those of Elijah on Ahab (Jer 34:20).

This encounter was quickly followed by Jeremiah's capture and imprisonment which, but for the interference of the king (Jer 37:17; Jer 37:21), would have rapidly put an end to his life (Jer 37:20). How long the Babylonians were absent from Jerusalem we are not told. It must have required at least several months to move a large army and baggage through the difficult and tortuous country, which separates Jerusalem from the Philistine Plain, and to effect the complete repulse of the Egyptian army from Syria, which Josephus affirms was effected. All we certainly know is that on the tenth day of the tenth month of Zedekiah's ninth year, the Chaldaeans were again before the walls (Jer 52:4). From this time forward the siege progressed slowly but surely to its consummation, with the accompaniment of both famine and pestilence (Josephus). Zedekiah again interfered to preserve the life of Jeremiah from the vengeance of the princes (Jer 38:7-13), and then occurred the interview between the king and the prophet of which  mention has already been made, and which affords so good a clew to the condition of abject dependence into which a long course of opposition had brought the weak-minded monarch. It would seem from this conversation that a considerable desertion had already taken place to the besiegers, proving that the prophet's view of the condition of things was shared by many of his countrymen. But the unhappy Zedekiah throws away the chance of preservation for himself and the city which the prophet set before him, in his fear that he would be mocked by those very Jews who had already taken the step Jeremiah was urging him to take (Jer 38:19).

At the same time, his fear of the princes who remained in the city is not diminished, and he even condescends to impose on the prophet a subterfuge, with the view of concealing the real purport of his conversation from these tyrants of his spirit (Jer 38:24-27). But while the king was hesitating the end was rapidly coming nearer. The city was indeed reduced to the last extremity. The fire of the besiegers had throughout been very destructive (Josephus), but it was now aided by a severe famine. The bread had long been consumed (Jer 38:9), and all the terrible expedients had been tried to which the wretched inhabitants of a besieged town are forced to resort in such cases. Mothers had boiled and eaten the flesh of their own infants (Baruch 2, 3; Lam 4:10). Persons of the greatest wealth and station were to be seen searching the dung heaps for a morsel of food. The effeminate nobles, whose fair complexions had been their pride, wandered in the open streets like blackened but living skeletons (Lam 4:5; Lam 4:8). Still the king was seen in public, sitting in the gate where justice was administered, that his people might approach him, though indeed he had no help to give them (Jer 38:7).

At last, after sixteen dreadful months had dragged on, the catastrophe arrived. It was on the ninth day of the fourth month, about the middle of July, at midnight, as Josephus with minuteness informs us, that the breach in those stout and venerable walls was effected. The moon, nine days old, had gone down below the hills which form the western edge of the basin of Jerusalem, or was, at any rate, too low to illuminate the utter darkness which reigns in the narrow lanes of an eastern town, where the inhabitants retire early to rest, and where there are but few windows to emit light from within the houses. The wretched remnants of the army, starved and exhausted, had left the walls, and there was nothing to oppose the entrance of the Chaldaeans. Passing in through the breach, they made their way, as their custom was, to the center of the city, and for the first time the Temple  was entered by a hostile force, and all the princes of the court of the great king took their seats in state in the middle gate of the hitherto virgin house of Jehovah. The alarm quickly spread through the sleeping city, and Zedekiab, collecting his wives and children (Josephus), and surrounding himself with the few soldiers who had survived the accidents of the siege, made his way out of the city at the opposite end to that at which the Assyrians had entered, by a street which, like the Bein es-Surein at Damascus, ran between two walls (probably those on the east and west sides of the so-called Tyropoeon valley), and issued at a gate above the royal gardens and the Fountain of Siloam. ‘Thence he took the road towards the Jordan, perhaps hoping to find refuge, as David had, at some fortified place in the mountains on its eastern side. On the road they were met and recognized by some of the Jews who had formerly deserted to the Chaldseans. By them the intelligence was communicated, with the eager treachery of deserters, to the generals in the city (Josephus), and, as soon as the dawn of day permitted it, swift pursuit was made. The king's party must have had some hours' start, and ought to have had no difficulty in reaching the Jordan; but, either from their being on foot, weak and infirm, while the pursuers were mounted, or perhaps owing to the encumbrance of the women and baggage, they were overtaken near Jericho, when just within sight of the river. A few of the people only remained round the person of the king. The rest fled in all directions, so that he was easily taken.

Nebuchadnezzar himself was then at Riblah, at the upper end of the valley of Lebanon, some thirty-five miles beyond Baalbek, and therefore about ten days journey from Jerusalem. Thither Zedekiah and his sons were dispatched; his daughters were kept at Jerusalem, and shortly after fell into the hands of the notorious Ishmael at Mizpah. When he was brought before Nebuchadnezzar, the great king reproached him in the severest terms, first for breaking his oath of allegiance, and next for ingratitude (Josephus). He then, with a refinement of cruelty characteristic of those cruel times, ordered his sons to be killed before him, and lastly his own eyes to be thrust out. See EYE. He was loaded with brazen fetters, and at a later period taken to Babylon, where he died. We are not told whether he was allowed to communicate with his brother Jehoiachin, who at that time was also in captivity there; nor do we know the time of his death; but from the omission of his name in the statement of Jehoiakim's release by Evil-  Merodach, twenty-six years after the fall of Jerusalem, it is natural to infer that by that time Zedekiah's sufferings had ended.

The fact of his interview with Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah, and his being carried blind to Babylon, reconciles two predictions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, which at the time of their delivery must have appeared conflicting, and which Josephus indeed particularly states Zedekiah alleged as his reason for not giving more heed to Jeremiah. The former of these (Jer 32:4) states that Zedekiah shall “speak with the king of Babylon mouth to mouth, and his eyes shall behold his eyes;” the latter (Eze 12:13), that “he shall be brought to Babylon yet shall he not see it, though he die there.” The whole of this prediction of Ezekiel, whose prophecies appear to have been delivered at Babylon (Eze 1:1-3; Eze 40:1), is truly remarkable as describing almost exactly the circumstances of Zedekiah's flight.

4. A son of Jehoiachin or Jeconiah, and grandson of Jehoiakim, king of Judah (1Ch 3:16). B.C. 598 or later. As nothing further is recorded of him, and he is not mentioned subsequently among the royal lineage (1Ch 3:17), Keil conjectures (Comment. ad loc.) that he may have died prior to the deportation of the royal family; but in that case he must have been only an infant.

5. The son of Maaseiah, a false prophet in Babylon among the captives who were taken with Jeconiah (Jer 29:21-22). He was denounced in the letter of Jeremiah (595) for having, with Ahab the son of Kolaiah, buoyed up the people with false hopes, and for profane and flagitious conduct. Their names were to become a by-word, and their terrible fate a warning. Of this fate we have no direct intimation, or of the manner in which they incurred it; the prophet simply pronounces that they should fall into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar and be burned to death. In the Targum of R. Joseph on 2Ch 28:3, the story is told that Joshua the son of Jozadak the high-priest was cast into the furnace of fire with Ahab and Zedekiah, but that, while they were consumed, he was saved for his righteousness sake. 16. The first named of the princes who sealed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:1 A. V. “Zikijah”). B.C. 410.

## Zedner, Joseph[[@Headword:Zedner, Joseph]]

             for a long time custodian at the British Museum, in London, was born at Gross-Glosgau in 1804, and died in Berlin, October 10, 1871. He wrote, Ueber den Wortton in der hebr. Sprache (Berlin, 1817): — Auswahl historischer Stucke aus hebr. Schriftstellern vonm II. Jahrhunderts bis auf die Gegenwart (Heb. and Germ. ibid. 1840): — ויוס אברהם, or Abraham ben-Ezra's Commentary on the Book of Esther after another Version (Lond. 1850): — Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Afuseunm (ibid. 1867). He also contributed to the Ha-Maskir for 1859 and 1861. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:546. (B.P.)

## Zeeb[[@Headword:Zeeb]]

             SEE WOLF.

Zeeb

(Heb. Zeeb, זְאֵב, wolf, as often; Sept. ὁ Ζήβ, Vulg. Zeb), one of the two “princes” (שָׂרַים) of Midian in the great invasion of Israel-inferior to the “kings” Zebah and Zalmunna. He is always named with Oreb (Jdg 7:25; Jdg 8:3; Psa 83:11). The name signifies in Hebrew “wolf,” just as Oreb does “crow,” and the two are appropriate enough to the customs of predatory warriors, who delight in conferring such names on their chiefs. Zeeb and Oreb were not slain at the first rout of the Arabs below the spring of Harod, but at a later stage of the struggle, probably in crossing the Jordan at a ford farther down the river, near the passes, which descend from Mount Ephraim. An enormous mass of their followers perished with them. SEE OREB.

Zeeb

the wolf, was brought to bay in a winepress which in later times bore his name— “the winepress of Zeeb” (יֶקֶ זְאֵב; Sept. Ι᾿ακεφζήφ v.r. Ι᾿ακεφζηβ, Vulg. Torcular Zeb). Down the Jordan valley, overlooking the plain of Jericho, is a sharp peak, still known as Ash el-Ghorab, i.e. “the Raven's, or Oreb's, Peak.” Five miles north-west of this is a wady and mound known as Triveel el-Diab, i.e. “the Wolf's, or “Zeeb's, Den,” which Tristram accepts as the required localities (Bible Places, p. 230). Rabbi Schwarz's suggestion (Palest. p. 231) is inapposite.

## Zegedin (or Szegedin), Stephen Dan[[@Headword:Zegedin (or Szegedin), Stephen Dan]]

             an eminent Lutheran divine, was born at Zegedin, a city of Lower Hungary, in 1505. His family name was Kis. He studied under Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg, taught and preached Lutheranism in several cities in Hungary, and was taken prisoner by. the Turks, who treated him with great cruelty. He subsequently officiated as minister at Buda and in many other places. He died at Reven, in Hungary, May 2, 1572. He left the following works, which were afterwards published: Assertio de Trinitate (1573): — Tabulae Analyticae in Prophetas, Psalmos, et Novum Testamentuna (1592): — Speculuns Romanum Pontificum Historicum (1602). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Zeibich, Carl Heinrich[[@Headword:Zeibich, Carl Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Eilenburg, June 19,1717. He studied theology, philosophy, and philology at Wittenberg, was made magister in 1737, on presenting a dissertation, De Chaldaicorum Veteris Testamenti apud Judaeos Auctoritate. In 1752 he was made professor, and died August 3, 1763. Of his writings we mention, De Lingua Judaeorum Hebraica Temporibus Christi et Apostolorum (Viteb. 1741): — De Codicum Veteris Testamenti Orientalium et Occidentalium Dissensionibus (ibid. cod.): — De Ritu Baptizandi in Mortem Christi, ab Eunomianis Recentioribus Introducto (ibid. 1752): — Σύμμικτα Antiquitatum Tarsicarum ex Scriptorum Veterum Monumentis Collecta (ibid. 1760). See  Dbring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 4:772 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:547. (B.P.)

## Zeibich, Heinrich August[[@Headword:Zeibich, Heinrich August]]

             a German theologian, was born at Merseburg, June 22, 1729, and died March 30, 1787, at Gera, being professor of elocution there. He is the author of, Vermischte Betrachtunagen auts der Theologie und Philologie (Leipsic, 1772-74, 3 parts): — Progr. de Velo Hierosolymitano, etc. (Gera, 1757): — Von dem Grabe Mosis (ibid. 1758): — Progr. de Vento, Praesentia Divinae Documento (ibid. eod.): — Pr. de Thuribulo Aureo (ibid. 1768): — Pr. de Radiante Mosis Facie a Cincinorum Cornibus Defensa (ibid. 1764): — De Censibus Hebraeorum (ibid. 1764-66): — De Circumcisionis Origine (ibid. 1770): — Progr. duo de Miraculo Manna Israelitica (ibid. 1770-71): — Pr. Isaaci Ortus in Fabula Orionis Vestigia (ibid. 1776): — Pr. de Fl. Josepho Vespasiano Imperium Romanum Vaticinante (ibid. 1783). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:31; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:547. (B.P.)

## Zeisberger, David[[@Headword:Zeisberger, David]]

             a Moravian missionary among the Indians of North America, was born in Moravia, Germany, in 1721 whence his parents emigrated to Herrnhut, in Upper Lusatia, for the sake of religious liberty. He was educated by the Moravians in Saxony, and afterwards lived at their settlement of Nerrendyk, Holland. In 1738 he came to Georgia, where some of his brethren had begun a settlement, that they might preach the gospel to the Creeks. Thence he removed to Pennsylvania, and assisted in the commencement of thle settlements of Bethlehem and Nazareth. Soon afterwards he became a missionary to the Indians, and labored among the Delawares. at Shamokin, and the Iroquois at Onondaga, N.Y., till after the breaking out of war in 1754. On the return of peace, after the conspiracy of Pontiac, he led the remnant of the Christian Indians, who had found a refuge in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Wyalusing, on the Susquehanna. in Bradford County.

In 1767 he established a Church among the Monseys, on the Alleghany. In 1772 he penetrated still farther, exploring the Muskingum region, and laving out the town of Schoenbrunn, on the Tuscarawas, about ten miles from the present Canal Dover, Ohio. Here he was joined by all the Moravian Indians of Pennsylvania, and the mission was greatly enlarged. In 1781, at the instigation of the British commandant  at Detroit, a party of Wyandots broke up these settlements, and compelled the Christian Indians to remove, to Sandusky. The missionaries were shamefully abused. In the following year a party of ninety-six of those who had been driven to Sandusky returned to their former homes to gather their corn, and were treacherously murdered at Gnadenhiitten by a party of the white settlers. After this melancholy incident most of the converts dispersed, and Zeisberger, with a small remnant, went to the Clinton River and formed a settlement in the present state of Michigan. In 1786 he returned to the southern shore of Lake Erie, and soon began another settlement, which he called New Salem. In 1791. however, he was obliged to remove to Canada on account of the hostility of the other Indians. There he founded Fairfield on the Thames. In 1798 the Moravian Indians received a grant from Congress of the tract of land which had been their former home in the valley of the Tuscarawas. To this locality Zeisberger returned with some of his converts, and established a new station, which he called Goshen. Here he remained until his death, November 17, 1808.

Perhaps no man ever preached the gospel so long among the Indians, and amid so many trials and hardships. He was a man of small stature, with a cheerful countenance, of a cool, intrepid spirit, with a good understanding and sound judgment. His portrait is prefixed to Heckewelder's Narrative. Amid all his privations and dangers he was never known to complain, nor ever regretted that he had engaged in the cause of the Redeemer. He would never consent to receive a salary, although he deemed it proper for some missionaries. He trusted in his Lord for the necessaries of life, and he looked to the future World for his reward. Free from selfishness, a spirit of universal love filled his bosom. A more perfect character has seldom been exhibited on the earth. It is a melancholy fact that he suffered more from white men, called Christians, by reason of their selfishness and depravity and hostility to the gospel, than from the Indians. Had the back settlers of our country participated in the benevolent spirit of the Moravians the benefit to the natives would have been incalculable. Amid all obstacles the brethren, in the days of Mr. Zeisberger, instructed and baptized about fifteen hundred Indians. The calm death of those who were murdered at Muskingum, in 1782, is a striking proof of the influence of the gospel on men, concerning whom it is sometimes said they cannot be made Christians. About 1768 he wrote two grammars of the Onondaga, in English and German, and a dictionary, German and Indian, of more than seventeen hundred pages. In the Lenape, or language of the Delawares, he published a spelling-book, sermons to children, and a hymn-book,  containing upwards of five hundred hymns, translated partly from German and partly from English. He left in manuscript a grammar in German of the Delaware language, which has been translated by Mr. Du Ponceau; also a harmony of the four gospels, translated into Delaware. See De Schweinitz, Life and Times of David Zeisberger (Philadelphia, 1870); Heckewelder, Narrative of the Missions. among the Delaware and Mohegan Indians (ibid. 1820); Allen, Amer. Biog. Dict. (1857); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Zeitmann, Gottfried Thomas[[@Headword:Zeitmann, Gottfried Thomas]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born of Jewish parentage at Cracow, Poland, in 1696. On account of the war between Poland and Sweden, Zeitmann's father had to leave his country, and settled at Frankfort, where his son Hirschel (this was Zeitmann's name before his baptism) received his early education. In 1707 he was baptized, taking the above-mentioned name. He desired to learn a trade, but his friends advised him to attend the gymnasium of St. Anna at Augsburg, where he had gone on account of being persecuted by his relatives. In 1717 he commenced his studies at Jena, where he remained till 1721. Having passed some years as a private tutor, he was, in 1728, chosen pastor at Oberode, and in 1736, one of the pastors of Frankfort and Sachsenhausen. He died February 7, 1747. His biographer, Dr. C.H. Martin, says of him, "Zeitmann preferred to speak in Latin, and as oft as we quoted a passage of Scripture, whether of the Old or New Test., he repeated the same in the original, with chapter and verse. He never entered the pulpit without having studied his subject with prayer and meditation. His delivery was distinct, his voice powerful; he could be heard in the largest church in Frankfort." (B.P.)

## Zekukith[[@Headword:Zekukith]]

             SEE CRYSTAL.

## Zelah[[@Headword:Zelah]]

             (Heb. Tsela', צֵלִע [in pause, צֵלָע in Samuel], a rib; Sept. in Joshua Σηλά, in Samuel Πλευρὰ), a city in the tribe of Benjamin (Jos 18:28, where it is men'tioned in the south-western section between Taralah and Ha-Eleph); it contained the family tomb of Kish, the father of Saul (2Sa 21:14), in which the bones of Saul and Jonathan, and also apparently of the two sons and five grandsons of Saul sacrificed to Jehovah on the hill of Gibeah, at last found their resting-place (comp. 2Sa 21:13). The ancient geographers seem ignorant of the locality (Reland, Palaest. p. 1058); but1 modern travelers are inclined to identify it with Beit Jala (Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 1, 401; Bonar, Mission, p. 234), a  considerable Christian village opposite Rachel's Tomb (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 2 sq.). The suggestion of rabbi Schwarz (Palest. p. 128) is too vague. Lieut. Conder's suggestion of Rumm is equally a venture (Tent Work in Palest. 2, 340). SEE ZELZAH.

## Zelek[[@Headword:Zelek]]

             (Heb. Tse'lek, צֶלֶק, fissure; Sept. Σελλήκ and Σβλεγί v.r. Ε᾿λέ and Σελή), an Ammonite, one of David's thirty heroes (2Sa 23:37; 1Ch 11:39). B.C. 1046. SEE DAVID.

## Zell, Matthew[[@Headword:Zell, Matthew]]

             the earliest Reformed preacher of Strasburg, was born in 1477 at Kaisersberg, in Upper Alsace, and graduated in theology at Freiburg. In 1518 he became pastor to the cathedral of Strasburg, having already been strongly influenced by Luther's Theses, and in 1521 he took decided ground as an evangelical preacher, while engaged in the exposition of the epistle to the Romans. Some persons traduced him for his course, but others became his supporters. and even the magistracy of the city pledged themselves in his defence against the chapter. In 1523 his bishop formulated a series of charges against him, to which Zell replied with a  refutation, which was at the same time a Scriptural authentication of the evangelical doctrines. In the same year two clergymen publicly renounced their allegiance to the papacy and entered into wedlock, and Zell improved the occasion by :publishing a sermon in defence of the marriage of priests. Soon afterwards he was himself married.

On December 1, 1523, the magistracy directed all preachers "to proclaim, freely and in public, to the people nothing but the Holy Gospel and the doctrines of God, and whatever may tend to the promotion of love for God and our neighbor." A few months later all the married priests were excommunicated by the bishop, but the measure proved ineffective. Zell replied with an Appellation, and the citizens continued in increasing numbers to turn away from Romanism. Zell was as liberal towards all who believed in Christ as he was firm in his own convictions. He gave hospitable entertainment to the fugitive Schwenkfet, and refused to anathematize the Swiss because of their opinions respecting the sacraments. He attached no great importance to formulated creeds, and took no part in current disputes, nor vet in Bucer's attempt at union. In 1534 he published, in the name of the Strasburg clergy, a catechism (Kurtze christliche Erbauung fur die Kinder u. Angohnden, etc.) for beginners; which seems suited rather to teachers than to children. He also wrote for the latter class an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. In 1542 he united with his colleagues in sending an opinion respecting images, etc., to the preachers of Frankfort, which decided them to be adiaphora, and which asserted the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, but in a heavenly and not bodily manner. Zell died in 1548. His widow, Catharine, was a skilful disputer, and maintained a correspondence with Schwenkfeld during many years, besides issuing a defence of her association with him. She also wrote a brave defence of her husband's memory, in 1557, against an attack made by Louis Rabus. She obtained the reputation of a pious benefactor of the afflicted, and especially of "poor scholars" and such as had fled for refuge to Strasburg on account of their religious convictions, not excluding even Anabaptists. See the biographies of Zell and his wife in Rhlirich, Mittheil. aus d. Gesck. d. Evang. Kirche d. Elsasses (Strasburg, 1855), 3:89 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zella, Council Of[[@Headword:Zella, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Zellense or Teleptense), was held in 418, at Zella, or Tella, in the province of Bvzacena, in Africa, Donatianus, bishop of Zella, presiding. Various regulations were made.

1. Enacts that no man shall be admitted to holy orders who has served in war after baptism.

2. Enacts that every bishop shall be consecrated by three bishops, with the consent of the metropolian, and that of the bishops of the provinces, expressed in writing.

3. Declares that one bishop only cannot consecrate another, except in the Roman Church.

4. Exhorts bishops, priests, etc., to observe continence. 8. Directs that the Montauists and Novatianists shall be admitted into the Church by imposition of handls. See Mansi, Concil. 2:1577.

## Zeller, Christian Heinrich[[@Headword:Zeller, Christian Heinrich]]

             a Protestant pedagogue, was born at Hohen-Entringen, near Tubingen, March 29, 1799. He studied law at Tiibingen, which he did not practice, but gave himself entirely to the cause of education. In 1820 he founded his famous institution for children and teachers at Beuggen-on-theRhine, where he died, May 18, 1860. He published, Gottliche Antworten auf menschliche Fragen (2d ed. Basle, 1852): — Kurze Seelenlehre (Stuttgart, 1846): — Monatsblatt von Beuggen, which contains a great many essays on various subjects. Zeller also distinguisheda himself as a hymn-lwriter; one of his hymns, Gott bei mir an jedem Ort, is found in an English translation in Hymns from the Land qf Luther, page 27 ("My God with me in every place"). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:188 sq. (B.P.)

## Zeller, Hermann[[@Headword:Zeller, Hermann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Neckarweihingen, August 26, 1807, and died at Muhlhausen, April 10, 1885. He is best known as the editor of Biblisches Worterbuch fur das christliche Volk (3d ed. Leipsic, 1884). (B.P.)

## Zeller, Johann[[@Headword:Zeller, Johann]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born at Zurich, June 29, 1807, and died July 6, 1839. He is the author of Stimmen der deutschen Kirche uber das Leben Jesu von Strauss (Zurich, 1837). His Predigten were published after his death (1840). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Zelophehad[[@Headword:Zelophehad]]

             (Heb. Tselophchad', צְלָפְחָד, of uncertain etymology; Sept. Σαλπαάδ v.r. Σαλφαάδ, etc.), son of Hepher, son of Gilead, son of Machir, son of Manasseh (Joshua 17, 3). B.C. ante 1618. He was apparently the second son of his father, Hepher (1Ch 7:15); though Simon and others, following the interpretation of the rabbins, and under the impression that the etymology of his name indicates a first-born, explain the term הִשֵּׁנַי as meaning that his lot came up second. Zelophehad came out of Egypt with Moses; and all that we know of him is that he took no part in Korah's rebellion, but that he died in the wilderness, as did the whole of that generation (Num 14:35; Num 27:3). On his death without male heirs, his five daughters, just after the second numbering in the wilderness, came before Moses and Eleazar to claim the inheritance of their father in the tribe of Manasseh The claim was admitted by divine direction, and a law was promulgated, to be of general application, that if a man died without sons his inheritance should pass to his daughters (Num 26:33; Num 27:1-11); and this led to a further enactment (ch. 36), that such heiresses should not marry out of their own tribe-a regulation which the five daughters of Zelophehad complied with, being all married to sons of Manasseh, so that Zelophehad's inheritance continued in the tribe of Manasseh. The law of succession as exemplified in the case of Zelophehad is treated at length by Selden (De. Success. ch. 22:23). SEE INHERITANCE.

## Zelotes[[@Headword:Zelotes]]

             (Ζηλωτής), an epithet of the apostle Simon (Luk 6:15; Act 1:13) to distinguish him from Simon Peter. ‘In the parallel lists of Mat 10:4; Mark 3:18, he is called Simon the Cananite (Κανανίτης, A. V.  erroneously “Canaanite”), this being a transliteration of the Heb. or Aramaean קִנְאָן, zeal, of which the Greek title is a translation. The word denotes a zealot in' general (1Co 14:12; Tit 2:14; 1Pe 3:13), especially in behalf of Jewish law and institutions (Act 21:20; Act 22:3; Gal 1:14). Probably there were already extant in the time of Christ, when this epithet was given to Simon, the germs of the sect or party afterwards thus designated, the members of which professed great attachment to Judaism, and, under pretext of punishing by informal trial and execution those guilty of infringing the observances of the national religion, perpetrated great excesses (Josephus, War, 4:3, 9; 5, 1, 4; 6:3; 7:8, 1). SEE SIMON.

## Zelzah[[@Headword:Zelzah]]

             (Heb. Tseltsach', צֵלְצִח, shadow from the sun, or, by reduplication from צָלִה, to send; Sept. ἁλλόμενος μεγάλα, Vulg. meridies), a place in the border of Benjamin, mentioned by Samuel when sending Saul home from Ramah: “Thou shalt find two men by Rachel's sepulcher, in the border of Benjamin, at Zelzah” (1Sa 10:2). Rachel's sepulcher stands on the side of the road leading from Bethlehem to Jerusalem, about a mile distant from the former. Westward of the sepulcher, in full view across the valley, and not much over half a mile distant, is the village of Beit Jala, which may be identical with Zelzah. The names bear considerable resemblance to each other and the position agrees with the sacred narrative (Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 1,401). The Sept. rendering of Zelzah is remarkable. It makes it an expression of joy on the part of the men who announced the finding of the asses — “Thou shalt meet two men leaping violently.” But dean Stanley's remark on this is surely a rash criticism, that the Hebrew text “cannot be relied upon” (Sin and Pal. p. 222). The Greek rendering in this case apparently rests upon a reading צלצל, which indicates a possible etymology of the word=double shade. The Talmud has numerous explanations, the favorite one being that Zelzah was Jerusalem— “the shadow (צל) of God.” Something of this kind seems to be at the basis of the rendering of the Vulg. The essential part of the name is thus rendered more closely congruent with that of the above Arabic village, and at the same time with that of ZELAH SEE ZELAH (q.v.), which must have lain in the same vicinity. Rabbi Schwarz suggests an. other location less apposite (Palest. p. 158). SEE SAUL.

## Zemaraim[[@Headword:Zemaraim]]

             (Heb. Tsemara'yim, צְמָרִיַם, double fleece of wool, or perh. the dual of same base as Zemarite [q.v.]), the name of two localities in Palestine.

1. (Sept. Σεμρίμ v.r. Σάρα; Vulg. Semaraim.) One of the ancient towns in the territory allotted to Benjamin (Jos 18:22), where it is grouped in the eastern section of the tribe, and named between Beth-arabah and Bethel; and it would therefore appear to have been situated either in the Jordan valley (Arabah) or on the mountain declivities between it and Bethel. About five miles north of Jericho, in the western edge of the valley of the Jordan, are the ruins of a small town or village, strewn over a low hill, and called Khurbet es-Sumrah, which may be regarded as the modern representative of the old town of Benjamin (Seetzen, Reisen, vol. 4:map; Robinson, Bibl. Res. 1, 569; 3, 292, note; Van de Velde, Memoir; p. 355; De Saulcy, Dead Sea, 2, 20 26; Schwarz, Palest. p. 125). Though little remains above the ground, there are many extensive quarries of sandstone beneath, which are proofs of large buildings once existing in the vicinity (Tristram, Bible Places, p. 103).

2. (Sept. Σομόρων; Vulg. Semeron.) A mountain (הִר) or eminence mentioned in 2Ch 13:4 as being “in Mount Ephraim,” that is to say, within the general district of the highlands of that great tribe. It appears to have been close to the scene of the engagement mentioned in the narrative, which again may be inferred to have been south of Bethel and Ephraim (2Ch 13:19). It may be said, in passing, that a position so far south is no contradiction to its being in Mount Ephraim, which extended into the contiguous territory of Benjamin. SEE RAMAH. It probably lay adjacent to the above-named town, from which it appears to have derived its name (Reland, Palaest. p. 1058).

## Zemarite[[@Headword:Zemarite]]

             (Heb. with the art. hats-Tsemari', הִצְּמָרַי, evidently a patronymic or rather patrial from Zemer [see below]; Sept. ὁ Σαμαραῖος; Vulg. Samarceus), the general designation of one of the Hamitic tribes who in the genealogical table of Genesis 10 (Gen 10:18) and 1 Chronicles 1 (1Ch 1:16) are represented as “‘ sons of Canaan.” They are named between the Arvadite, or people of Ruad, and the Hamathite, or people of Hamah. The old interpreters (Jerusalem Targum, Arabic version, etc.) place them at  Emessa, the modern Hums. Michaelis (Spicileg. 2, 51), revolting at the want of similarity between the two names (which is perhaps the strongest argument in favor of the old identification), proposes to locate them at Sunra, the Simyra (Σιμύρα) or Simyrus (Σίμυρος) of the classical geographers (Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. 1, 504), located on the Phoenician river Eleutherus (Ptolemy, 5, 15, 4; Pliny, 5, 17; Mela, 1, 12, 3), which name is mentioned by Shaw (p. 234) as attached to a site of ruins near Arka, on the west coast of Syria, ten or eleven miles above Tripoli (comp. Buckingham, 2, 415). On the French map of the Lebanon (Carte du, Liban, etc., 1862) this place appears as Kobbet oum Shoumra, and lies between Arka and the Mediterranean, two kilometers from the latter and five and a half from the former. Beyond, however, the resemblance in the names, and the proximity of Ruad and Arka, the probable seats of the Arvadites and Arkites, and the consequent inference that the original seat of the Zemarites must have been somewhere in this direction, there is nothing to prove that Sumra or Shumra has any connection with the Tsemarites of the ancient records. The name is more likely to have sprung from the locality in the eastern declivity of Mount Ephraim or Benjamin, elsewhere designated as ZEMARAIM SEE ZEMARAIM (q.v.). The identification by the Sept and Vulg. of both these places with the city of Samaria is evidently a mere conjecture or false transliteration.

## Zemira[[@Headword:Zemira]]

             (Heb. Zemirah', זְמַירָה, music, as in Isaiah 24? 16, etc.; Sept. Ζεμιρά v.r. Ζαμιρίας ‘and Α᾿μαρίας; Vulg. Zamira), first named of the nine sons of Becher son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8). B.C. post 1874.

## Zemzem[[@Headword:Zemzem]]

             is the name of a well at Mecca accounted sacred by the Mohammedans. It is said to have been formed from the spring of water which God pointed out to Hagar and Ishmael when they were driven from the house of Abraham and compelled to flee into Arabia. The Mohammedan pilgrims drink of its waters and believe it to be effectual in healing diseases, and even in purifying the soul.

## Zenan[[@Headword:Zenan]]

             (Heb. Tsenan', צְנָן, pointed, if this be the proper form of the name; Sept. Σεννάμ, v.r. Σεννά; Vulg. Sanan), a town in the lowland district of Judah (Jos 15:37), where it is named before Hadashah and Migdal-gad in the western group of the tribe. SEE JUDAH. Accordingly, a few miles south of the present Mejdel is a small village called Jenn, which is probably the modern representative of Zenan. It is generally supposed that Zenan is the same place which the prophet Micah calls Zaanan (1, 11; see Reland, Palcesto p. 1058; Keil and Delitzsch, On Jos 15:37). Knobel supposes this last to be identical with: the ruin of esSenat, near Belt Jibrin (Tobler, Dritte Wanderung, p. 124). Schwarz (Palest. p. 103) proposes to  identify Zenan with “the village Zan-abra, situated two and a half English miles south-east of Mareshah.” By this he doubtless intends the place which iln the lists of Robinson (Bibl. Res. [1st ed.], vol. 3, app. p. 117) is called es-Sendbirah, and in Tobler's Dritte Wanderung (p. 149), es- Sennd2bereh. The latter traveler in his map places it about two and a half miles due east of Marash (Maresha). But both these latter identifications are more than doubtful.

## Zenas[[@Headword:Zenas]]

             (Ζηνᾶς, a contraction from Ζηνόδωρος, as Α᾿ρτεμᾶς from Αρτεμίδωρος, Νυμφᾶς Νυμφόδωρος and probably ῾Ερμᾶς from ῾Ερμόδωρος), a believer, and, as may be inferred from the context, a preacher of the Gospel, who is mentioned in Tit 3:13 in connection with Apollos, and, together with him, is there commended by Paul to the care and hospitality of Titus and the Cretan brethren. A.D. cir. 59. He is further described as the lawyer” (τὸν νομικόν). It is impossible to determine with certainty whether we are to infer from this designation that Zenas was a Roman juris-consult or a Jewish doctor. Grotius accepts the former alternative, and thinks that he was a Greek who had studied Roman law. The New Test. usage of ᾷονλχρο leads rather to the other inference. Tradition has been somewhat busy with the name of Zenas. The Synopsis de Vita et Morte Prophetarum, Apostolorumn, et Diiscipulorumn Domini, ascribed to Dorotheus of Tyre, makes him to have been one of the “seventy-two” disciples, and subsequently bishop of Diospolis, in Palestine (Bibl. Patr. 3, 150). The “seventy-two” disciples of Dorotheus are, however, a mere string of names picked out of salutations and other incidental notices in the New Test. The Greek menologies on the festival of SS. Bartholomew and Titus (Aug. 25) refer to a certain Life of Titus, ascribed to Zenas, which is also quoted for the supposed conversion of the younger Pliny (comp. Fabricius, Codex Apocr. N.T. 2, 831, 2). The association of Zenas with Titus, in Paul's epistle to the latter, sufficiently accounts for the forgery.

## Zend Language[[@Headword:Zend Language]]

             SEE ZEND-AVESTA.

## Zend-Avesta[[@Headword:Zend-Avesta]]

             is the name commonly given to the sacred books of the Parsees (q.v.), which are ascribed to Zoroaster (q.v.). The word avesta (avastha) means text, or orifiinal text; zend, or zand, means translation and paraphrase. According to the latest researches, it would seem as if only a small portion of the entire collection now extant were formed by avesta, or text, the rest being made up of zend, or commentary, without text. The term zend has changed its meaning repeatedly. Originally it indicated an authoritative interpretation coming from the highest source, which was in time embodied in the text itself. Later it came to denote a translation into the Pehlvi, or native idiom of Persia, made by the Zoroastrian priests during the Sassanian period. There is also a special zend doctrine which differs considerably from that contained in the avesta. A still further explanation of the zend doctrine is the pazend, a word which often occurs in connection with avesta and zend.

The doctrine of the "Magi," as the Zoroastrian priests were anciently called, as well as those of India and babylonia, is first alluded to in Jeremiah, where the chief of the Magi is mentioned among Nebuchadnezzar's retinue. In the New Test. (Mat 2:1) the Magi came to worship Jesus at Bethlehem. The earliest account among Greek writers is furnished by Herodotus. There are also accounts by Ctesias, the Greek physician of Artaxerxes II, by Denion, Theopomus, and Hermippus. But only fragments.from their writings remain, embedded chiefly in Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius. The writings of Pliny, Strabo, Pausanius, Dion. Chrysostomus also contain more or less information on the subject. Among the Armenian writers of the 5th century of our aera we find Eznik and Elizaeus, from whose records we may gather that the Zdroastrians at their time were split into two parties, the one called Mog, the other Zendik — the former inhabiting chiefly Media and Persia, and acknowledging in  the main the avesta; the latter living principally in Bactria, and following the traditional explanations, or zend proper. The nations of modern Europe came into contact with the adherents of Zoroastrianism in the western parts of India, and in the 17th century some MSS. of their sacred books were brought to England. But no one was able to read them; and Hyde himself, the celebrated Oxford scholar, was unable to make any use of them when, in 1700, he wrote his learned work on the Persian religion.

The key to this book was first obtained by Anquetil Duperron, a young Frenchman, who went to Bombay in 1754, and there prevailed on some of the dusturs, or learned priests, to introduce him into the mysteries of the holy language and rites. and to sell him some of their most valuable works written in it. In 1759 he commenced a translation of the whole Zend-Avesta. In 1761 he returned to Paris with one hundred and eighty MSS. in different Oriental languages, and in 1771 published in French the first European translation of the Zend-Avesta, to which was added a great deal of supplementary matter. This work produced a profound sensation throughout Europe. In England it was pronounced a forgery by almost all scholars. In France there was but one opinion, viz., that English scholars were trying to run down the work out of sheer spite and jealousy. In Germany, however, opinions were divided; for while some acceded to all the arguments arrayed against it, there arose another renowned German scholar, Kleuker, who, in token of his complete and unreserved trust in the genuienness, set about translating Anquetil's work into German, adding much supplementary matter. After the lapse of more than fifty years, Rash, a Danish scholar, undertook an investigation of the matter. In 1826 he wrote a pamphlet, in which he pointed out (as had been done before) the close affinity between the language of the Zend-Avesta and the Sanscrit, and proved it to be, not a corruption of Sanscrit, but a distinct language.' He, also proved that modern Persian is derived from Zend, as Italian from Latin, and this gave the key to many of the errors of Anquetil's version.

The learned dustur himself, from whom Anquetil derived his information of the language, possessed no grammatical knowledge of it. Rash had pointed out the way, Eugene Burnouf followed it. He, indeed, may be called the father of Zend philology. For more than twenty years this eminent scholar devoted all his energies to elucidating, commenting on, and discussing this language, and the sacred writings couched in it, and in publishing texts and translations. In Germany, Olshausen, Bopp, Miuller, Brockhaus, Spiegel, Haug, and in Copenhagen, Westergaard, have been busy ever since in editing and translating the Zend-Avesta or some portions of it.  The Zend-Avesta was originally of very great extent, consisting of vastly more than at present. Pliny says that Zoroaster composed two million verses, and Attavari, an Arabian author, says that his writings covered twelve thousand cow-skins. But from the conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great, in 330 B.C., to the accession of the Sassanidae, in A.D. 235, the religion of Zoroaster and the wisdom of the Magi were thrown into the background by Greek ideas, and became nearly lost. When, however, the Sassanidae assumed the rule their principal endeavors were directed to the revival of the ancient faith, and their unceasing efforts after the ancient fragments of the Zoroastrian doctrine have resulted in the small collection which we now possess. The whole Scripture is said to have consisted of twenty-one nosks, or parts, each containing avesta and zend, that is, text and commentary. The number, twenty-one, was to correspond to the twenty-one words of which the most sacred prayer of the Zoroastrians (the Honovar) was composed. By the unanimous consent of both classical and Persian writers the whole bulk of the sacred literature is ascribed to Zoroaster himself. They are supposed to be the substance, or, as was subsequently held, the very words of divine revelations to the prophet in the form of conversations.

The name Zend-Avesta belongs more particularly to the three collections which are severally called Vendidad, Vispered, and Yasna, while the remaining writings are comprised under the name of Khorda-Avesta, or small Avesta. The latter contains short prayers, and especially the Yashts, or Yeshts, hymns addressed to the different genii, on the days which bear their names and are sacred to them, or on the days of those genii who are considered to be the attendants of the former.

The Vendidad consists of twenty-two fargards, or sections, which treat of cosmogony, and may be called the religious and civil code of the old Parsees. The first fargard relates how. Ahura- Mazda (now called Ormuzd), the good spirit, created the several countries and places (of which sixteen are named), excellent and perfect in their kind, but that Angro-Manyus (now called Ahriman), the evil or black spirit, created in opposition all the evils which infest these worlds. In the second fargard Zoroaster bids Yima announce to mankind the sacred law which he had taught him, but Yima refuses compliance with this behest. He then bids him enlarge the worlds and make them prosperous. This he obeys, and carries out the orders given him by Ahura-Mazda. The third fargard enumerates the five things which are the most agreeable, then the five tihings which are  the most disagreeable, and afterwards the five things which convey the greatest satisfaction in this world. The fourth fargard may be termed the criminal code of the Avesta. It enumerates, in the first instance, various offences, which are considered to be so grave as to affect, not only the person, who commits them, but also his relatives, and then proceeds to define the punishments incurred by the offender. The eight following fargards contain injunctions in reference to impurities caused by dead bodies. The thirteenth fargard begins with the description of two kinds of dogs, the one created by Ahura-Mazda, the other by Angro-Manyus — the killing of the former being a criminal, that of the latter a meritorious act; and the remaining part of the book is devoted to the proper treatment of dogs in general, while the same subject is continued in the fourteenth fargard, which enumerates also the penalties for injuring dogs. The treatment of young dogs is likewise the subject matter of the latter part of the fifteenth fargard, which, in its first sections, treats of sexual offences, and the bringing up of illegitimate children. The great care and attention given to dogs seems to have arisen from the fact that the country was infested with wolves. The sixteenth fargard teaches how to treat women when affected with impurities. The seventeenth fargard, treats of impurities caused by the cutting of hair and the trimming of nails. The next fargard is more of a mixed character; it treats of various ceremonies, and gives injunctions on cleanliness, decency, and moral conduct. The nineteenth fargard relates how Angro-Manyus endeavored to kill Zoroaster, but how the latter successfully defended himself with weapons given him by AhuraMazda. Then the evil spirit, being aware that it had no material power over Zoroaster, next resorted to temptations; but those, too, were defeated by the prophet, who now resolved to conquer the, evil spirit, and for this purpose addressed to Ahura-Mazda various questions on the rites of purification and the condition of souls after death. The twentieth fargard gives some information about the first mall who understood curing disease. The twenty-first fargard is devoted to the phenomena of the sky and the luminous bodies, and comprises invocations of the clouds, the sun, the moon, and the stars. The last fargard relates that AngroManyus, having engendered diseases, Ahura-Mazda is compelled to devise remedies against them. The book concludes with an account of the creation of various animals and other objects to this end. The form of all these fargards is nearly always that of a dialogue between Ahura-Mazda and Zoroaster, and the same form is occasionally observed in the two other portions of the Avesta, which differ materially from those of the Vendidad.  The Vispered contains a collection of prayers, composed of twenty-three chapters, resembling the younger Yasna, next to be noticed, and referring to the same ceremonies. The Vispered and the Yasna bear prominently a liturgical character. All that can really be held to emanate from Zoroaster himself are the five Gathas, which form part of the Yasna. This Yasna consists principally of prayers to be recited at the sacrificial rites, such as the consecration of Zoothra, or holy water; of the Baresona, or bundle of twigs of a particular tree; the preparation of the sacred juice of the homa (Indian, soma, q.v.), taken to be an emblem of immortality; the offering of certain cakes, etc. The whole of the Yasna now comprises seventy-two chapters. It consists apparently of two parts belonging to different periods.

The older is written in what has been called the Gatha dialect, and was considered sacred even at the time when the other books of the Zend- Avesta were composed. This “older Yasna" was divided into the Gathas and some minor pieces. The former, five in number, are small collections of sacred prayers, songs, and hymns, arranged in meter, and exhibiting philosophical and abstract thoughts about metaphysical subjects. The name itself signifies song. Their metre resembles chiefly that of the Vedic hymns. They are without rhymes, and only the syllables are counted. The first bears the heading (which is implied as to the other four), "The Revealed Thought, the Revealed Word, the Revealed Deed of Zarathustra the Holy; the Archangels first sang the Gathas." They are all more or less devoted to exhortations on the part of the prophet, to forsake polytheism, and to bow only before Ahura-Mazda. The difference between monotheism and idolatry is pointed out in the respective sources whence they flow, "existence " and "nonexistence." The mission, activity, and teaching of Zoroaster are dwelt upon more or less in all the Gathas, but chiefly in the second. To the other portion belongs the "Yasna of Seven Chapters," which seems to have been composed by early disciples, and which consists of prayers, in prose, addressed to Ahura-Mazda, the angels, the fire, the earth, the waters, and other spiritual beings, genii presiding over the different parts of the good creation. There is also a chapter containing a formula by which the ancient Iranians were received into the new religious community. The so-called younger Yasna, written in the common Zend language, is of more varied contents, such as an invitation to Ahura-Mazda and all the good spirits to be present at the sacrifice, pieces referring to the preparation and drinking of the homa juice, the praises of the genius Serosh, and a commentary on the; most sacred prayers.  The Yashts are in twenty-four divisions. Yasht (yesti) means worship by prayers and sacrifices, and in the Avesta indicates certain laudations of sacred persons and objects, called yazatas (izad), or angels; and in so far different in nature from the invocations in the Yasna and Vispered that, while in the latter the divine beings are invited promiscuously, the single yashts are addressed to individual minima. In these songs are also found the primary sources of the legends contained in the Shah-nameh.

There yet remain some smaller pieces. Khorda-Avesta, which are now used by the Parsees as common prayers, such as the five Nijayish, addressed to the sun, the moon, -the water, and the fire; the Afrigans, or blessings to be recited over a certain meal prepared for an angel or a deceased person; the five Gabs, or prayers to the angels set over the five different times of the day and night; and finally the Sirozah, or thirty days, being a calendar, or rather an enumeration, of the thirty divine beings that preside over each of the days. It is chiefly recited on the thirtieth day after the death of a man.

The religious belief taught in the Avesta rests on the dualism of the two great principles — Ahura-Mazda or the good, and Angro-Manyus, or the evil principle. The genii subordinate to the former are the Amesha-spentas, six of whom are named in the Yasna, viz., Vohumano, who protects living beings; Asha-vahishta, or the genius of fire; Kshathra-vairya or the genius of metals; Spenta-armaiti, or the genius of earth; Hauroat, or the genius of water; and Ameretat, or the genius of the trees. They are severally. opposed by the Devas, or dsemons, subordinate to Angro-Manyus, viz., by Akomano, Andar, Saurva, Naonghaithi, Tauru, and Zairicha. Other dsemons are named in the Vendidad. The worshippers of fire belong to Ahura-Mazda, whereas the worshippers of the Devas are possessed by Angro-Manyus. SEE ZOROASTER.

The worship taught by Zoroaster seems to have been of the simplest kind, the adoration of fire by means of hymns and offerings, chiefly, if not exclusively, taken from the vegetable kingdom, an essential concomitant of the sacrifice being the juice of the homa (or soma), which occupies an important part also in the Vedic rites. This worship, however, must not be confounded with the complicated ritual of later periods of the Parsee creed, which assumed a similar development to that based by the Hindus on the Rigveda text, and is indicated by several portions of the Avesta, which cannot be looked upon as its earliest part. At the present day every Parsee child is taught to repeat long passages in the original Zend; but hardly a  single word of that language is intelligible even to the Parsee priests or dusturs.

Literature. — In the Zend language this consists chiefly of its translated text, the accompanying glosses, and a few independent works in the same language, the Huzvaresh, or literary Pehlevi, as the Bundehesh and the Din-karb, of much later date. It is an important aid to the understanding of the Avesta; yet its interpretation is not to be implicitly trusted. That part of the Zoroastrian literature which is composed in the socalled Parsmee dialect is of still more modern date and limited extent. Glosses or interpretations of the Avestan texts, called Pa-Zend, versions of certain portions of them and of Pehlevi texts, sundry invocations and ascriptions of praise, and expositions of Parsee doctrine constitute nearly its whole substance. Several passages of these texts were published in Spiegel's Parsee Grammar (Leipsic, 1851). After the settlement of the Parsees in India, a Sanscrit version of the Yasna and some other parts of the Avestan text was made by Nerioseugh. It has been published in a Latin transliteration by Spiegel (Leipsic, 1861). See Spiegel, Avesta; die heiligen Schrifteen der Parsen, aus dem Grundtext ubersetzt (Leipsic, 1852-63, 3 volumes; Eng. ed. of the same by Bleek, Lond. 1864); Haug, Essays (1st ed. Bombay, 1862); Havelacque, Grammaire de la Langue Zende (Paris. 1878); Harlesz, Avesta, Livre Sacre des Sectateurs de Zoroastre (Liege, 1875-78, 3 volumes); Burnouf, Vendidad-Sade; Olshausen, Vendidad Zend-Avesta; Rask, Alter und Echtheit der Zendsprache; Spiegel, Eranische Alterthumskunde (Leipsic, 1872, 1873, 2 volumes); Muller, Chips from a German Workshop, volume 1, lectures 5-8. For the language of the Zend-Avesta, see Pietraszenski, A br qge de la Gramnmaire Zend (Berlin, 1861, 8vo); Haug, Outlines of Zend Grammar (Bombay, 1862, 8vo).

## Zenkel, Georg Peter[[@Headword:Zenkel, Georg Peter]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born March 20, 1717, at Schwarzenbach, in Bayreuth, He studied theology, Oriental languages, and natural sciences at Jena. In 1740 he was permitted to lecture, and in 1746 was made adjunct to the philosophical faculty. In 1754 he was called as professor of philosophy to Erlangen, and opened his lectures with an  address, De Methodo Docendi apud Veteres Hebraos. In 1755 he resigned his position, and died December 14, 1760. He wrote, Commentarii Grammatici Ebreae Lingua (Jena, 1748, 1749): — Commentarius Evagelico-Homileticus (ibid. 1747 a.o.): — Beitrage zur Vertheidigung, der Mosaischen Religion, etc. (Gotha, 1752-56, 2 volumes): — Diss. Philologica de Sepultura Christi, ad Locum Esaiae 53:9 (Jena, 1754). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 4:782 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:550; Steinschneider, Bibl. Handbuch, page 152. (B.P.)

## Zeno[[@Headword:Zeno]]

             a Greek philosopher, was born at Elea, in Southern Italy, about B.C. 490. He was a pupil of Carmenides, and lived at Elea all his life, with the exception of occasional visits to Athens, where he had many of the wealthy citizens for his disciples. He is said to have engaged in a conspiracy against  Nearchus, the tyrant of Elea, who captured him and put him to death by cruel torture. For an account of his philosophy, SEE ELEATIC SCHOOL.

## Zeno (2)[[@Headword:Zeno (2)]]

             a reputed bishop OF VERONA, and alleged author of ninety-three sermomns, which were published in 1508 by Jacob de Lenco and Albert Castellan under the title, S. Zenoni Episc. Vetronens. Sermones, after a very ancient manuscript found fifty years before in the episcopal library of Verona by Guarinus. These sermons were previously wholly unknown, and Zeno himself lived only in a few miracle-legends. He was represented with a fish attached to his angle or episcopal staff, because he had, while angling, delivered a drowning man from the clutches of the devil. Eleven of the sermons are certainly not by the author of the general mass. The age of the collection is variously estimated; Vogel, in Herzog (following Dorner), dating them back perhaps to the beginning of the latter half of the 3d century, Barbnius to A.D. 200, others to A.D. 450-500. It would seem that they emanated from the mind of a bishop who was endowed with earnestness and dignity of character as well as theological learning, and who presided over an established Church and a regularly organized clergy. See Fessler, Institut. Patrolog. (Oenipont, 1851), 1:73 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, KirchenLexikon, s.v.; Jazdzewski, Zeno, Veroinensis Episc. (Ratisbon, 1862); Dorner, Enwicklungsgesch d. Lehre von d. Person Christi, 2d ed. 1:754 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zeno the Stoic[[@Headword:Zeno the Stoic]]

             SEE STOICS.

## Zenobia[[@Headword:Zenobia]]

             SEE TADMOR.

## Zenonism[[@Headword:Zenonism]]

             SEE STOIC PHILOSOPHY; SEE STOICS.

## Zentgrav, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Zentgrav, Johann Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Strasburg, May 21, 1643. he studied at Leipsic and Wittenberg, was in 1676 professor in his native city, in 1678 doctor of theology, and died November 28, 1707. Zentgrav was a voluminous writer. A complete list of his writings, embracing all departments of theology, is given by Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Zephaniah[[@Headword:Zephaniah]]

             (Heb. Tsephanyah', צְפִנְיָה[in the prolonged form Tsephanya'hu,

צְפִנְיָהוּ, 2Ki 25:18], hidden of Jehovah; Sept. Σοφονίας v.r. [in 1 Chronicles] Σαφανίας, Vulg. Sophonias), the name of four Hebrews.

1. A Kohathite Levite, son of Tahath and father of Azariah, in the ancestry of the prophet Samuel (q.v.) and of Heman (1Ch 6:36 [Heb. 21]); the same elsewhere (Heb. 21:24 [9]) called URIEL SEE URIEL (q.v.) the father of Uzziah.

2. A prophet of whom we have no information beyond what his book furnishes. In this (Zep 1:1) he is said to have been “the son of Cushi, the son of Gedaliah, the son of Amariah, the son of Hizkiah,” which last is usually regarded as the same with king Hezekiah. If so, he lived B.C. cir. 620. With this agrees the date, of his prophecy there given; namely, in the reign of Josiah. We do not elsewhere, however, read of an such son of Hezekiah as Amariah, and, so far as he record and probability go, Manasseh was his only son. SEE ZEPHANIAH, BOOK OF.

3. The son of Maaseiah (Jer 21:1) and sagan, or second priest, in the reign of Zedekiah. He succeeded Jehoiada (Jer 29:29; Jer 25:26), and was probably a ruler of the Temple, whose office it was, among others, to punish pretenders to the gift of prophecy. In this capacity, he was appealed to by Shenaiah the Nehelamite, in a letter from Babylon, to punish Jeremiah (Jer 29:29). Twice was he sent from Zedekiah to inquire of Jeremiah the issue of the siege of the city by the Chaldaeans (Jer 21:1), and to implore him to intercede for the people (Jer 37:3). On the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuzaradan, he was taken with Seraiah the high-priest and others, and slain at Riblah. (Jer 52:24; Jer 52:27; 2Ki 25:18; 2Ki 25:21). B.C. 588.

4. Father of Josiah 2 (Zec 6:10), and of Hen, according to the reading of the received text of Zec 6:14 as given in the A. V. B.C. ante 519. SEE JOSIAH.

## Zephaniah, Book Of[[@Headword:Zephaniah, Book Of]]

             the ninth in order of the minor prophets, both in the Hebrew and Greek copies of the Scriptures (Jerome, Prolog. ad Paul. et Eustoch.). Besides his genuine prophecy, there was in the ancient, Christian Church an apocryphal book ascribed to Zephaniah the prophet, and quoted by some of the fathers under the name of his Α᾿νάληψις or Προφήτεια Ea. SEE APOCRYPHA.

I. Author. —

1. The name of this prophet has been variously explained. Disputes upon it arose as early as the times of Jerome, for in his Commentary on this book he says, “Nomen Sophoniae, alii speculam, alii arcanum Dei, transtulerunt.” The word was thus derived either from צָפָהhe watched, or צָפִן, he hid, with the common affix יָה i.e. Jah. The old father made it a matter of indifference which etymon he adopted, as both, according to him, give virtually the same sense the commission of a prophet being virtually that of a watchman or seer, and the burden of his message some secret revealed to him by God. Abarbanel (Praef. in Ezekiel) adheres to the latter mode of derivation, and the Pseudo-Dorotheus, following the former, translates the prophet's name by the Greek participle σκοπεύων. Hiller and Simonis differ also in a similar way; Hiller, taking the term from צפן, renders it “abscondidit se, i.e. delituit Jehovah” (Onomast. s.v.), as if the name had contained a mystic reference to the character' of the age:in which the prophet lived, when God had withdrawn himself from his apostate people; but Simonis (Ononmast. V. 7.) gives the true signification, one sanctioned by Gesenits— “abscondidit, i.e. custodivit Jehovah,” Jehovah hath guarded, the verb צפן being used of divine protection in Psa 27:5 and Psa 83:4. The name seems to have been a common one among the Jews.

2. Parentage. — Contrary to usual custom, the pedigree of the prophet is traced back for four generations “the son of Cushi, the son of Gedaliah, the son of Amariah, the son of Hizkiah.” This formal record of his lineage has led many to suppose that Zephaniah had sprung from a noble stock (Cyril, Prcef. ad Zephaniah), and the occurrence of the highest name in the list, which in the Hebrew text is spelled and pointed in the same way as that rendered Hezekiah in the books of Kings and Chronicles, has induced some to identify it with that of the good king Hezekiah, and to pronounce the  prophet a cadet of the royal house of Judah. Kimchi is very cautious in his opinion, and leaves the point undecided but Aben-Ezra, ever ready to magnify his nation, at once concludes that Zephaniah was descended from Hezekiah; and his opinion has been followed by Huet- (Denonstrat, Evangel. Propos. 4:303), and partially by Eichhorn (Einleit. § 593).

The conjecture has little else to recommend it than the mere occurrence of the royal name. But it was not a name confined to royalty; and had it been the name of the pious monarch to which Zephaniah's genealogy is traced, certainly his official designation, “king of Judah,” would have been subjoined in order to prevent mistake. Such an addition is found in connection with his name in Pro 25:1 and Isa 38:9. It forms no objection to this statement to affirm that the phrase “king of Judah” is added to Josiah, and to avoid repetition may have been omitted after Hizkiah, for such regard to euphony such finical delicacy, is no feature of Hebrew composition. The argument of Carpzov (Introd. p. 414), copied by Rosenmuller (P7rovmium in Zephaniah), against the supposed connection of the prophet with the bloodroyal is of no great weight. These critics say that from Hezekiah to Josiah, in whose reign Zephaniah flourished, are only three generations, while from Hezekiah to Zephaniah four are reckoned in the first verse of the prophecy.

But as Hezekiah reigned twenty-nine years, and his successor sat on the throne no less than fifty-five years, there is room enough in such a period for the four specified descents; and Amariah, though not heir to the crown, may have been much older than his youthful brother Manasseh, who was crowned at' the age of twelve. As there was at least another Zephaniah, a conspicuous personage at the time of the Captivity, the parentage of the prophet may have been recounted so minutely to prevent any reader from confounding the two individuals. The descent of the prophet from king Hezekiah, therefore, is not in itself improbable, and the fact that the pedigree terminates with that name points to a personage of rank and importance. Late critics and commentators generally acquiesce in this hypothesis, viz. Eichhorn, Hitzig, F. Ad. Strauss (Vaticinia Zephaniae [Berlin, 1843]), Hivernick, Keil, and Bleek (Einleitun. in das Alte Testament). The Jews absurdly reckon that here, as in other superscriptions, the persons recorded as a prophet's ancestors were themselves endowed with the prophetic spirit. The so- called Epiphanius (De Vitis Prophet. ch. 19) asserts that Zephaniah was of the tribe of Simeon, of the hill Sarabatha, ἀπὸ ὄρους Σαραβαθά. The existence of the prophet is known only from his oracles, and these have no biographical sketches; so that our knowledge of this man of God comprises  only the fact and the results of his inspiration. It may be safely inferred, however, that he labored with Josiah in the pious work of re-establishing the worship of Jehovah in the land.

II. Date — It is recorded (ch. 1) that the word of the Lord came to him “in the days of Josiah the son of Amon, king of Judah.” We have reason for supposing that he flourished during the earlier portion of Josiah's reign. In the second chapter (Isa 38:13-15) he foretells the doom of Nineveh, and the fall of that ancient city happened about the eighteenth year of Josiah. In the commencement of his oracles, also, he denounces various forms of idolatry, and specially the remnant of Baal. The reformation of Josiah began in the twelfth and was completed in the eighteenth year of his reign. So thorough was his extirpation of the idolatrous rites and hierarchy which defiled his kingdom that he burned down the groves, dismissed the priesthood, threw' down the altars, and made dust of the images of Baalim. Zephaniah must have prophesied prior to this religious revolution, while some remains of Baal were yet secreted in the land, or between the twelfth and eighteenth years of the royal reformer. — So Hitzig (Die 12 kleinen Prophet.) and Movers (Chronii p. 234) place him; while Eichhorn, Bertholdt, and Jiger incline to give him a somewhat later date.

At all events, he flourished between the years B.C. 642 and 611; and the portion of his prophecy which refers to the destruction of the Assyrian empire must have been delivered prior to the year B.C. 625, the year in which Nineveh fell (Henderson, On the Minor Prophets, p. 326). The publication of these oracles was therefore contemporary with a portion of those of Jeremiah, for the word of the Lord came to him in the thirteenth year 0o the reign of Josiah. Indeed, the Jewish tradition is, that Zephaniah had for his colleagues Jeremiah and the prophetess Huldah, the former fixing his sphere of labor in the thoroughfares and market-places, the latter exercising her honorable vocation in the college in Jerusalem (Carpzov, Introd. p. 415). Koster (Die Propheten, 3) endeavors to prove that Zephaniah was posterior to Habakkuk. His arguments from similarity of diction are very trivial, and the more so when we reflect that all circumstances combine in inducing us to fix the period of Habakkuk (q.v.) in the reign of Jehoiakim, immediately before the Chaldaean invasion. In the present book Nineveh is represented as in a state of peace and prosperity, while the notices of Jerusalem touch upon the same tendencies to idolatry and crime, which are condemned by the contemporary Jeremiah. It is not impossible, moreover, that the prophecy was delivered about the  time when the Scythians overran the empires of Western Asia, extending their devastations to Palestine. The king's children, who are spoken of in ch. 1, 8 as addicted to foreign habits, could not have been sons of Josiah, who was but eight years old at his accession, but were probably his brothers or near relatives. The remnant of Baal (ch. 1, 4) implies that some partial reformation had previously taken place, while the notices of open idolatry are incompatible with the state of Judah after the discovery of the Book of the Law.

III. Contents. — In ch. 1 the utter desolation of Judaea is predicted as a judgment for idolatry, and neglect of the Lord, the luxury of the princes, and the violence and deceit of their dependents (Isa 38:3-9). The prosperity, security, and insolence of the people are contrasted with the horrors of the day of wrath; the assaults upon the fenced cities and high towers, and the slaughter of the people (Isa 38:10-18). Ch. 2 is a call to repentance (Isa 38:1-3), with prediction of the ruin of the cities of the Philistines, and the restoration of the house of Judah after the visitation (Isa 38:4-7). Other enemies of Judah, Moab, Ammon, are threatened with perpetual destruction, Ethiopia with a great slaughter, and Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, with desolation (Isa 38:8-15). In ch. 3 the prophet addresses Jerusalem, which he reproves sharply for vice and disobedience, the cruelty of the princes and the treachery of the priests, and for their general disregard of warnings and visitations (Isa 38:1-7). He then concludes with a series of promises, the destruction of the enemies of God's people, the restoration of exiles, the extirpation of the proud and violent, and the permanent peace and blessedness of the poor and afflicted remnant who shall trust in the name of the Lord. These exhortations to rejoicing and exertion are mingled with intimations of a complete manifestation of God's righteousness and love in the restoration of his people (Isa 38:8-20).

It has been disputed what the enemies are with whose desolating inroads he threatens Judah. The ordinary and most probable opinion is that the foes whose period of invasion was “a day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities and against the high towers” (ch. 1, 16), were the Chaldaeans. Hitzig especially, Cramer too, and Eichhorn, supposed the prophet to refer to a Scythian invasion, the history of which they imagine has been preserved by Herodotus (1, 105). But the general style of the oracle, and the sweeping vengeance which it menaces against Assyria, Philistia, Ammon, and Cush, as well as against Judah, by some great and unnamed power, point to the Chaldaean expedition which, under Nebuchadnezzar,  laid Jerusalem waste, and carried to Babylon its enslaved population. The contemporary prophecies of Jeremiah contemplate the musterings, onset, and devastations of the same victorious hosts, The former part of Zephaniah's prediction is “a day of clouds and of thick darkness,” but in the closing section of it light is sown for the righteous, “The king of Israel, the Lord, is in the midst of thee; he will rejoice over thee with joy; he will rest in his love.”

IV. Style. — We cannot by any means award so low a character to Zephaniah's style is done by De Wette (Einleit. § 245), who describes it as being often heavy and tedious. It has not the sustained majesty of Isaiah, or the sublime and original energy of Joel: it has no prominent feature of distinction yet its delineations are graphic, and many of its touches sire bold and striking. For example, in the first chapter the prophet groups together in his descriptions of the national idolatry several characteristic exhibitions of its forms and worship. The verses are not tame and prosaic portraiture, but form a series of vivid sketches. The poet seizes on the more strange peculiarities of the heathen worship-uttering denunciations on the remnant of Baal, the worshippers of Chemarim the star-adorers, the devotees of Malcham, the fanatics who dad themselves in strange apparel, and those who in some superstitious mummery leaped upon the threshold (Bochart, Hieroz. c. 36). Nota few verses occur in the course of the prophecy which, in tone and dignity, are not unworthy to be associate with the more distinguished efforts of the Hebrew bards. A few paronomasiae occur (Zep 1:15 and Zep 2:1-4), and Occasionally there is a peculiar repetition of a leading word' in the formation of a climax (Zep 2:15). Jahn (Introd. § 132) and Eichhorn assert that Zephaniah has borrowed to a considerable extent from the earlier prophets, especially from Isaiah; yet, the similarity of such passages as Isa 34:11 to Zep 2:14, or Isa 47:8 to Zep 2:15, or Isa 18:1 to Zep 3:10, or Isa 16:6 to Zep 2:8, is not sufficient evidence that Zephaniah was Isaiah's imitator.

The clauses of resemblance are idiomatic in nature, and seem to have been of proverbial force and currency, so that both prophets may have taken them from the national usus loquendi. Coincidences of expression have also been noted between Zephaniah and some of his contemporaries, particularly Jeremiah (Eichhorn, Einleit. § 595; Rosenmüller, Prosem. 6). Between Zep 1:5 and Jer 8:2 we can perceive little similarity of language, though the same superstitious custom is referred to, and a  comparison of Zep 1:12 with Jer 48:11 leads to such a conclusion as we have already stated, as the phrase common to both passages — “settled on the lees” — must have been one in wide circulation in a wine country like Judaea. It was altogether groundless, therefore, in some of the older critics, such as Isidore and Schmidius (Prolegom. in Sophon.), to style Zephaniah the abbreviator of Jeremiah. Resemblances have also been traced between Zephaniah and Amos, and between him and his successor Ezekiel; but to call these imitations is rash indeed, if we reflect on the similarity of the topics discussed, and the peculiar range of imagery and phraseology which is common to Hebrew prophetic poetry, and which was the stereotyped language of the inspired brotherhood. The language of Zephaniah is pure; it has not the classic ease and elegance of the earlier compositions, but it wants the degenerate feebleness and Aramaic corruption of the succeeding era. Zephaniah is not expressly quoted in the New Test.; but clauses and expressions occur which seem to have been formed from his prophecy (Zep 3:9; Rom 15:6, etc.). He was, in fine, as Cyril of Alexandria terms him (Prawfat. in Soph. tom. 3), “a true prophet, and filled with the Holy Ghost, and bringing his oracles from the mouth of God.”

The chief characteristics of this book are the unity and harmony of the composition, the grace, energy, and dignity of its style, and the rapid and effective alternations of threats and promises. Its prophetical import is chiefly shown in the accurate predictions of the desolation, which has fallen upon each of the nations denounced for their crimes; Ethiopia, which is menaced with a terrible invasion, being alone exempted from the doom of perpetual ruin. The general tone of the last portion is Messianic, but without any specific reference to the person of our Lord.

There has often been noticed in this prophecy a general or universal character, rather than specific predictions, though these are not entirely wanting. This tendency is in harmony with the position which Zephaniah was called to occupy in the course of divine providence; for he lived at the commencement of the period: of the universal empires, which are represented by Daniel in detail, and exhibited as introductory to the kingdom of the Son of man. The Chaldaean monarchy was rising with marvelous rapidity to universal empire, and was in preparation by the Lord to be the scourge of his own people as well as of the heathen nations; and in connection with their work Zephaniah saw the coming of the day of the Lord, the day of judgment, when all the earth should be devoured With the  fire of his jealousy (ch. 1, 18; 3, 8). But as earlier prophets, especially Joel and Isaiah, had already foreseen and declared this in connection with the work of the Assyrian monarchy, which only made a commencement and left the completion to its rival and heir at Babylon we find the language and imagery of these earlier prophets continually referred to, adopted, or elaborated anew by Zephaniah and his contemporary Jeremiah, with whom he has much in common.

V. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on this entire book exclusively: Luther, Commentarius (in Opp. vol. 4; also in Germ. in Werks); Bucer, Commentarins (Argent. 1528, 8vo); Selnecker, Auslegun (Leips. 1566, 4to) Casar, Predigten (Wittenb.: 1603, 8vo); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rost.'1623, 4to); Larenus, Tuba (Mediob. 1653, 8vo); Gebhardus, Vindicatio (Gryphan. 1701-2, 4to) Hocke, Auslegung [includ. Nah. and Hab.] (Frankf. 1710, 4to); Noltenius, Commentarious [on ch. 1] (Fr. ad 0. 1719-24, 4to); Gebhardi, Erklarung (Fr. am O. 1728, 4to); Cramer, Scythische Denkmaler (Kiel, 1777, 8vo); Anton, .Interpretatio [on ch. 3] (Gorl. 1811, 4to) Colln, Observationes (Vratisl. 1818, 4to.); Ewald, Erklarung (Erlang. 1827, 8vo); Strauss, Commentarius (Berol. 1843, 8vo); Robinson, Homilies (Lond. 1865, 8vo);' Reinke, Erläuterung (Leips. 1868). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

## Zephath[[@Headword:Zephath]]

             (Heb. Tsephath', צְפִת, watch-tower; Sept. Σεφέθ v.r. Σεφέκ.' and Σεφέρ; Vulg. Sephaath), the earlier name (according to the notice of Judges 1, 17) of a Canaanitish town, which after its capture and destruction was called by the Israelites HORMAH SEE HORMAH (q.v.). According to rabbi Schwarz (Palest. p. 186), it is like-wise mentioned in the Jerus. Talmud (Rosh hash-Shanah, ch. 2). SEE ZIPH. Two identifications have been proposed for Zephath-that of Dr. Robinson with the well-known pass es- Sufd, by which the ascent is made from the borders of the Arabah to the higher level of the “south country” (Bibl. Res. 2, 181), and that of Mr. Rowlands (Williams, Holy City, 1, 464) with Sebata, two, and a half hours beyond Khalasa, on the road to Suez, and a quarter of an hour north of Rohebeh, or Ruheibeh. SEE ZEPHATHAH.

1. The former of these Mr. Wilton (The Negeb, etc., p. 199, 200) has challenged, on account of the impracticability of the pass for the approach of the Israelites, and the inappropriateness of so rugged and desolate a spot for the position of a city of any importance. The question really forms part of a much larger one, which this is not the place to discuss — viz. the route by which the Israelites approached the Holy Land. SEE EXODE. But, in the meantime, it should not be overlooked that the attempt of the Israelites in question was an unsuccessful one which is so far in favor of the steepness of the pass. It should also be borne in mind that both in ancient and modern times the difficult passes have in many cases been the chief thoroughfares in Palestine, and this one in particular has remained such to the present day. The argument from the nature of the site is one which might be brought with equal force against the existence of many others of the towns in this region.

2. On the identification of Mr. Rowlands some doubt has been thrown by the want of certainty as to the name and exact locality. Dr. Stewart (Tent and Khan, p. 205) heard of the name, but east of Khalasa instead of south, and this was in answer to a leading question always a dangerous experiment with Arabs. The English engineers of the Ordnance Survey, however, found Sebaita in the vicinity indicated; namely, about fifteen, miles south of Khalasah. Prof. Palmer gives a full description of the extensive ruins of the place (Desert of the Exodus, p. 315 sq.), and a plan of the town, with other details, may be found in the Quarterly. Statement of the “Palestine Explor. Fund,” Jan. 1871, p. 3-73. Preferring, as we decidedly do, the location of Kadesh-barnea, on the edge of the Arabah, we should decide against the claims of this spot to be the Zephath of Scripture, notwithstanding the agreement in name and remains. SEE KADESH.

## Zephathah[[@Headword:Zephathah]]

             (Heb. Tsepha'thah, צְפָתָה, watchtower; Sept. κατὰ βοῤᾶν; Josephus, Σαφθά, Ant. 8:12,1; Vulg. Sephata), the name of a valley (גֵּאי) where Asa joined battle with Zerah the Ethiopian (2Ch 14:10). It was “at,” or rather “belonging to,” Mareshah (לְמָרֵשָׁה; Josephus, οὐκ ἄπωθεν). This would seem to exclude the possibility of its being, as suggested by Robinson (Bibl. Res.2, 31), at Teles-Safieh, which is not less than eight  miles from Marash, the modern representative of Mareshah. There is a deep valley, which runs past the latter place down to, Beit Jibrin, and thence into the plain of Philistia. This, perhaps, may be the valley of Zephathah (Porter, Handbook, p. 258). Some, however, understand the name Zephathah to be only thatof Zepihath (q.v.), with הdirective, and render it “the valley towards Zephath.”

## Zepheth[[@Headword:Zepheth]]

             SEE PITCH.

## Zephi[[@Headword:Zephi]]

             (1Ch 1:36). SEE ZEPHO.

## Zepho[[@Headword:Zepho]]

             (Heb. Tsephoo, צַפוֹ, watch-tower; Sept. Σωφάρ; Vulg. Sephu), third named of the five sons of Eliphaz the son of Esau (Gen 36:11), and one of the Idumeans “dukes” (Gen 36:15), B.C. considerably post 1927. In the parallel passage (1Ch 1:36) the name is written Zephi (Heb. Tsephi', צְפַי; Sept. Σωφάρ; Vulg. Sephi).

## Zephon[[@Headword:Zephon]]

             (Heb. Tsephon', צְפוֹן, watch; Sept. Σαφών: Vulg. Sephon), first named of the -seven sons of Gad (Num 26:15) and'progenitor of the family of the Zephonites (Heb. with the art. hats-Tsephoni', הִצְּפיּנַי; Sept. ὁ Σαφωνί; Vulg. Sephonifte). In Genesis 46, 16 his name is written Ziphion (Heb. Tsiphyon', הִצְּפיוֹן; Sept. Σαφών .Vulg. Sephion). B.C. 1874.

## Zephyrinus[[@Headword:Zephyrinus]]

             bishop of Rome, succeeded. Victor about A.D. 199-201, and filled his office (according to Eusebius) during eighteen years. He died in 217. His pontificate falls in the period when Montanistic and Monarchian influences were struggling to obtain control of the Church; and although his own personality was by no means imposing, his rule became important through the: unlimited power which he permitted Calixtus I (q.v.) to acquire. Zephyrinus's original attitude was hostile towards Montanism; and though  the influence of Hippolytus (q.v.) compelled the gradual exclusion of the Monarchians from the Church, they, were accorded kindly treatment. The peace of the Church was in this way preserved, ill outward appearance, while Zephyrinus lived. The more energetic administration of his successor, Calixtus, produced a formal breach, and thus conferred prominence upon Zephyrinus's pontificate as being the close of the first period of the greatness of the Roman Church. Eusebius furnishes a few scanty notices on Zephyrinus in the Hist. Eccles. (bk. 5 and 6), which are supplemented by the ninth book of Hippolytus (Contr. Heres.). The latter work called forth Bunsen's book Hippolytus u. seine Zeit, a production of but little value, and Döllinger's Hippolytus u. Callistus, which is not impartial. Greater importance attaches to Baur's brief remarks in his work on the Christianity of the first three centuries, and to Ritschlein Entsterung d. altkaitholischen Kirche (2nd ed.). See also, Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Zephyrus[[@Headword:Zephyrus]]

             in Greek mythology, the representative of the west wind, was a son of Astrseus and Eos. He was represented in Athens on the tower of winds, lightly draped with a mantle, because he was the warmest wind. In the lap of his mantle he carried a quantity of flowers.

## Zer[[@Headword:Zer]]

             (Heb. Tser, צֵרrock; Sept. by misapprehension, Τύρος, Vulg. Ser), one of the fortified towns of Naphtali (Jos 19:35), where it is named between Ziddim and Hamnath; but from the absence of the copulative ("and") between this and the preceding name, as well as from the total ("nineteen cities") in Jos 19:33, it is evidently a part of the preceding name, Ziddim-zer. SEE ZIDDIM. Schwarz remarks (Palest. page 182) that Zer is mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud (Megillah, 1) as lying near Ziddim.

## Zera Abraham[[@Headword:Zera Abraham]]

             (זֶרִע אִבְרָהָם) is the title of a grammatico-historical commentary on the Pentateuch, written by Abraham Seeb, of Brzesc, in the 17th century, and published at Sulzbach in 1685. See De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 65; Furst, Bibl. Jud 1:11. (B.P.)

## Zerah[[@Headword:Zerah]]

             (Heb. Ze'rach, זֶרִח[in pause Za'rach, זָרִה, 1Ch 2:4; “Zarah,” Gen 38:30], rising of the sun; Sept. usually Ζαρά, but sometimes Ζαρέ, Ζαρές, etc.), the name of several Hebrews and one foreigner.

1. Second named of the three sons of Reuel, son of Esau (Gen 36:13; 1Ch 1:37), and one of the “dukes” or phylarchs of the Edomites (Gen 36:17). B.C. considerably post 1927. . Jobab of Bozrah, one of, the early kings of Edom, perhaps belonged to his family (Gen 36:33; 1Ch 1:44).

2. Twin son with his elder brother Pharez of Judah and Tamar (Gen 38:30; 1Ch 2:6; “Zara,” Mat 1:3). B.C. cir. 1895. His descendants were called Zarhites, Ezrahites, and Izrahites (Num 26:20; 1Ki 4:31; 1Ch 27:8; 1Ch 27:11), and continued at least down to the time of Zerubbabel (9, 6; Neh 11:24). Nothing is related of Zerah individually beyond the peculiar circumstances of his birth (Gen 38:27-30), concerning which see Heidegger, Hist. Patriarch. 18:28; Geddes, Critical Remarks, p. 126, 127.

3. Fourth named of the five sons of Simeon (1Ch 4:24), and founder of the family of Zarhites (Num 26:13). B.C. 1874. In Gen 46:10 he is called ZOHAR.

4. A Gershonite Levite, son of Iddo (or Adaiah) and father of Jeaterai (1Ch 6:21; 1Ch 6:41 [Heb. 6:26]). B.C. ante 1043.

5. The Ethiopian or Cushite (הִכּוּשַׁי) king who invaded Judah, and was defeated by Asa (2Ch 14:9). The incident derives great importance from the synchronism thus afforded between Biblical and other history.

1. The Name. — In its form Zerah is identical with the Hebrew proper name above. It has been supposed to represent the Egyptian Usarken, possibly pronounced Usarchen, a name almost certainly of Shemitic origin. SEE SHISHAK. The difference is great, but may be partly accounted for if we suppose that the Egyptian deviates from the original Shemitic form and that the Hebrew represents that form, or that a further deviation than would have been made was the result of the similarity of the Hebrew proper name Zerah. So, סוֹאeven if pronounced Sewa or Seva, is more remote from Shebek or Shebetek than Zerah from Usarken. It may be conjectured that these forms resemble those of Memphis, Moph, Noph, which evidently represent current pronunciation, probably of Shemites.

2. The Date. — The war between Asa and Zerah appears to have taken place soon after the, tenth (2Ch 14:1) or early in the fifteenth year of Asa (15, 10). It therefore occurred in about the same year of Usarken II, fourth king of the, twenty-second- dynasty, who began to reign about the same time as the king of Judah. We may therefore date the invasion in B.C. 939.

3. The Event. — The first ten years of Asa's reign were undisturbed by war. Then: Asa.took counsel with his subjects, and walled and fortified the cities of Judah. He also maintained. an army of 580,000 men, 300,000 spearmen of Judah, and 280,000 archers of Benjamin. This great force was probably the whole number of men able to bear arms (2Ch 14:1-8). At length the anticipated danger came. Zerah the Ethiopian, with a mighty army of a million, Cushim and Lubim, with three hundred chariots, invaded the kingdom, and advanced unopposed in the field as far as Mareshah. As the invaders afterwards retreated by way of Gerar, and Mareshah lay on the west of the hill-country of Judah, where it rises out of the Philistine plain, in the line of march from Egypt to Jerusalem, it cannot be doubted that they came out of Egypt. Between the border on the side of Gerar and Mareshah lay no important city but Gath. Gath and Mareshah  were both fortified by Rehboam before the invasion of Shishak (2Ch 11:8), and were no doubt captured and probably dismantled by that king (comp. 2Ch 12:4), whose list of conquered towns, etc., shows that he not only took some strong towns, but that he subdued the country in detail. A delay in the capture of Gath, where the warlike Philistines may have opposed a stubborn resistance, would have removed the only obstacle on the way to Mareshah, thus securing the retreat that was afterwards made by this route.

From Mareshah or its immediate neighborhood was a route to Jerusalem, presenting no difficulties but those of a hilly country, for not one important town is known to have lain between the capital and this outpost of the tribe of Judah. The invading army had swarmed across the border and devoured the Philistine fields before Asa could march to meet it. The distances from Gerar, or the southwestern border. of Palestine, to Mareshah was not much greater than from Mareshah to Jerusalem, and, considering the nature of the tracts, would have taken about the same time to traverse; and only such delay as would have been caused by the sieges of Gath and Mareshah could have enabled Asa hastily to collect a levy and march to relieve the beleaguered town or hold the passes. “In the valley of Zephathah at Mareshah” the two armies met. We cannot perfectly determine the site of the battle. Mareshah, according to the Onomasticon, lay within two miles of Eleutheropolis, and Dr. Robinson has reasonably conjectured its position to be marked by a remarkable “tell,” or artificial mound, a mile and a half south of the site of the latter town. Its signification, “that which is at the head,” would scarcely suit a position at the opening of a valley. But it seems that a narrow valley terminates, and a broad one commences, at the supposed site. The valley of Zephathah, “the watch-tower,” is supposed by Dr. Robinson to be the latter, a broad wady, descending from Eleutheropolis in a northwesterly direction towards Tell es-Safieh, in which last name he is disposed to trace the old appellation (Bibl. Res. 2,- 31). . The two have no connection whatever, and Robinson's conjecture is extremely hazardous. SEE ZEPHATHAH.

If this identification be correct, we must suppose that Zerah retired from before Mareshah towards the plain, that he might use his “chariots and horsemen” with effect, instead of entangling them in the narrow valleys leading towards Jerusalem. From the prayer of Asa we may judge that, when he came upon the invading army, he saw its hugeness, and so that, as he descended through a valley, it lay spread out beneath him. The Egyptian-monuments enable us to picture the general disposition of Zerah's army. The chariots formed the first corps in a single or double line; behind them, massed in phalanxes, were heavy-  armed troops; probably on the flanks stood archers and horsemen in lighter formations. Asa, marching down a valley, must have attacked in a heavy column; for none but the most highly disciplined troops can -form line from column in the face of an enemy. His spearmen of Judah would have composed this column: each bank of the valley would have been occupied by the Benjamite archers, like those who came to David,” helpers of the war, armed with bows, and [who] could use both the right hand and the left in [hurling] stones and [shooting] arrows out of a bow” (1Ch 12:1-2).

No doubt, the Ethiopian, confident in his numbers, disdained to attack the Hebrews or clear the heights, but waited in the broad valley, or the plain. Asa's prayer before the battle is fill of the noble faith of the age of the Judges: “Lord [it is] alike to thee to help, whether the strong or the weak: help us, O Lord our God; for we rest on thee, and in thy name we go against this multitude. 0 Lord, thou [art] our God; let not man prevail against thee.” From the account of Abijah's defeat of Jeroboam, we may suppose that the priests sounded their trumpets, and the men of Judah descended with a shout (2Ch 13:14-15). The hills and mountains were the favorite camping-places of the Hebrews, who usually rushed down upon their more numerous or better-disciplined enemies in the plains and valleys. If the battle were deliberately set in array, it would have begun early in the morning, according to the usual practice of these times, when there was not a night-surprise, as when Goliath challenged the Israelites (1Sa 17:20-23), and when Thothmes III fought the Canaanites at Megiddo; and, as we may judge from the long pursuits at this period, the sun would have been in the eyes of the army of Zerah, and its archers would thus have been useless.

The chariots broke, by, the charge and with horses made unmanageable by flights of arrows, must have been forced back upon the cumbrous host behind. “So the Lord smote the Ethiopians before Asa, and before Judah; and the Ethiopians fled, And Asa and the people that [were] with him pursued them unto Gerar; and [or “for”] the Ethiopians were overthrown, that they could not recover themselves.” This last clause seems to relate to an irremediable overthrow at the first; and, indeed, had it not been so, the pursuit would not have been carried, and, as it seems, at once, beyond the frontier. So complete was the overthrow that the Hebrews could capture and spoil the cities around Gerar, which must have been in alliance with Zerah. From these cities they took very much spoil, and they also smote “the tents of cattle, and carried away sheep and camels in abundance” (2Ch 14:9-15). More seems to have been captured from the Arabs than from the  army of Zerah; probably the army consisted of a nucleus of regular troops, and a great body of tributaries, who would have scattered in all directions, leaving their country open to reprisals. On his return to Jerusalem, Asa was met by Azariah, who exhorted him and the people to be faithful to God. Accordingly, Asa made a second reformation, and collected his subjects at Jerusalem in the third month of the fifteenth year, and made a covenant, and offered of the spoil “seven hundred oxen and seven thousand sheep” (2Ch 15:1-15).

From this it would, appear that the battle was fought in the preceding winter. The success of Asa, and the manifest blessing that attended him, drew to him Ephraimites, Manassites, and Simeonites. His father had already captured cities in the Israelitish territory (2Ch 13:19), and he held cities in Mount Ephraim (2Ch 15:8), and then was at peace with Israel. Simeon, always at the mercy of a powerful king of Judah, would have naturally turned to him. Never was the house of David stronger after the defection of the ten tribes; but soon the king fell into the wicked error, so constantly to be repeated, of calling the heathen -to aid him against the kindred Israelites, and hired Ben-hadad, king of Syria-Damascus, to lay their cities waste, when Hanani the prophet recalled to him the great victory he had achieved when he trusted in God (2Ch 16:1-9). The after-years of Asa were troubled with wars (2Ch 16:9); but they were with Baasha (1Ki 15:16; 1Ki 15:32). Zerah and his people had been too signally crushed to attack him again. SEE ASA.

4. The identification of Zera has occasioned some difference of opinion. The term Cushite or Ethiopian may imply that he was of Arabian Cush; the principal objection to which is that history affords no indication that Arabia had at that epoch, or from its system of government could well have, any king so powerful as Zerah. That he was of Abyssinia or African Ethiopia, is resisted by the difficulty of seeing how this “huge host” could have obtained a passage through Egypt, as it must have done to reach Judaea. If we could suppose, with Champollion (Precis, p. 257), whom Coquerel follows (Biog, Sacr. s.v.), that Zerah the Cushite was the then king of Egypt, of an Ethiopian dynasty, this difficulty would be satisfactorily met. But lately it has been supposed that Zerah is the Hebrew name of Usarken I, second king of the Egyptian twenty-second dynasty; or perhaps more probably Usarken II, his second successor. This is a tempting explanation, but cannot be received without question, and it is not deemed satisfactory by Rosellini, Wilkinson, Sharpe, and others. Jahn hazards an ingenious  conjecture, that Zerah was king of Cush on both sides of the Red Sea, that is, of bath the Arabian and African Ethiopia; and thus provides him a sufficient power without subjecting him to the necessity of passing through Egypt. There are two other suppositions, which are not destitute of probability. It is conceived either that he was a native Ethiopian general who, on this occasion, commanded the armies of Egypt, or that he was an Ethiopian general who led an Ethiopian army through Egypt, now separate from Ethiopia, and invaded Judah through Egypt. This question is a wider one than seems at first sight. We have to inquire whether the army of Zerah was that of an Egyptian king, and, if the reply be affirmative, whether it was led by either Usarken I or II.

The war of Shishak had reduced the angle of Arabia that divided Egypt from Palestine. Probably Shishak was unable to attack the Assyrians, and endeavored, by securing this tract, to guard the approach to Egypt. If the army of Zerah were Egyptian, this would account for its connection with the people of Gerar and the pastoral tribes of the neighborhood. The sudden decline of the power of Egypt after the reign of Shishak would be explained by the overthrow of the Egyptian army about thirty years later.

The composition of the army of Zerah, of Cushim and Lubirm (2Ch 16:8), closely resembles that of Shishak, of Lubim, Sukkim, and Cushim (12:3): both armies also had chariots and horsemen (12:3; 16:8). The Cushim might have been of an Asiatic Cush, but the Lubim can only have been Africans. The army, therefore, must have been of a king of Egypt, or Ethiopia above Egypt. The uncertainty is removed by our finding that the kings of the twenty-second dynasty employed mercenaries of the Mashuwasha, a Libyan tribe, which apparently supplied the most important part of their hired force. The army, moreover, as consisting partly, if not wholly, of a mercenary force, and with chariots and horsemen, is, save in the horsemen, exactly what the Egyptian army of the empire would have been, with the one change of the increased importance given to the mercenaries, which we know marked it under the twenty-second dynasty. That the army was that of an Egyptian king therefore cannot be doubted.

As to the identification of Zerah with a Usarken, we speak diffidently. That he is called a Cushite must be compared with the occurrence of the name Namuret, Nimrod, in the line of the Usarkens, but that line seems rather to have been of Eastern than of Western Ethiopians. The name Usarken “has been thought to be Sargon, in which case it is unlikely, but not impossible,  that another Hebrew or Shemitic name should have been adopted to represent the Egyptian form. On the other hand, the kings of the twenty- second dynasty were of a warlike family, and their sons constantly held military commands. It is unlikely that an important army would have been entrusted to any but a king or prince. Usarken is less remote from Zerah than seems at first sight, and, according to our computation, Zerah might have been Usarken II, but according to Dr. Hincks's, Usarken II.

5. Preternatural Character of the Deliverance. — The defeat of the Egyptian army by Asa is without parallel in the history of the Jews. On no other occasion did an Israelitish army meet an army of one of the great powers on either side and defeat it. Shishak was unopposed; Sennacherib was not met in the field; Necho was so met, and overthrew Josiah's army; Nebuchadnezzar, like Shishak, was only delayed by fortifications.

The defeat of Zerah thus is a solitary instance, more of the power of faith than of the bravery of the Hebrews, a single witness that the God of Israel was still the same who had led his people through the Red Sea, and would give them the same aid if they trusted in him. We have, indeed, no distinct statement that the defeat of Zerah was a miracle, but we have proof enough that God providentially enabled the Hebrews to vanquish a force greater in number, stronger in the appliances of war, with horsemen and chariots more accurate in discipline, no raw levies hastily equipped from the king's armory, but a seasoned standing militia, strengthened and more terrible by the addition of swarms of hungry Arabs, bred to war and whose whole life was a time of pillage. This great deliverance is one of the many proofs that God is to his people ever the same, whether he bids them stand still and behold his salvation, or nerves them with that courage that has wrought great things in his name in our later age; thus it bridges over a chasm between two periods outwardly unlike, and bids us see in history the immutability of the divine actions. SEE EGYPT.

## Zerahiah[[@Headword:Zerahiah]]

             (Heb. Zerachyah', זְרִחְיָה, Jehovah has risen; Sept. Σαραϊvα v.r. Ζαραία), the name of two Hebrews.

1. A priest, son of Uzzi and father of Meraioth, in the ancestry of the later Jewish pontiffs (1Ch 6:6; 1Ch 6:51 [Heb. 5:32; 6:30]), and of Ezra (Ezr 7:4). B.C. cir. 1350. SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

2. Father of Elihoenai “of the sons of Pahath-moab” (Ezr 8:4). B.C. ante 459.

## Zeraim [[@Headword:Zeraim ]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Zerdust[[@Headword:Zerdust]]

             SEE ZOROASTER.

## Zered [[@Headword:Zered ]]

             (Heb. id. זֶרֶד [in pause Za'red, זָרֶד Deu 2:13; “Zared,”Num 21:12], osier-brook; Sept. Ζαρέδ v.r. Ζαρέτ and Ζαρέ), the name of a brook or valley (נִחִלִ) on the border between Moab and Edom (Deu 2:13), where the Israelites encamped before crossing the Arnon (Num 21:12). It seems to be the same with the Wady el-Ahsy, which runs into the Dead Sea near its S.E. corner (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 157). Laborde, arguing from the distance, thinks that the source of the Wady Ghuirundel in the Arabah is the site, as from Mount Hor to el-Ahsy is by way of Ezion-geber sixty-five leagues, in which only four stages occur; a rate of progress quite beyond their power. This argument, however, is feeble, since it is clear that the march stations mentioned indicate not daily stages, but more permanent encampments. He also thinks the palm trees of Wady Ghuruindel would have attracted notice, and that Wady Jethum (el-Ithm) could not have been the way consistently with the precept of Deu 2:3. “The camping station in the catalogue of Numbers 23, which corresponds to the “pitching in the valley of Zered” of Num 21:12, is probably Dibon-gad, as it stands next to Ije-abarim (comp. Num 33:44-45 with Num 21:12). The Wady el-Ahsy forms the boundary between the districts of Jebal and Kerak. Taking its rise near the castle of el-Ahsy, on the route of the Syrian Haj, upon the high eastern desert, it breaks down through the whole chain of mountains (:Burckhardt, Travels, p. 400) in a very deep ravine, and contains a hot spring which the Arabs call the “Bath of Solomon son of David” (Irby, May 29). The Israelites doubtless crossed it near its upper end, where it would present no difficulty. SEE EXODE.

The Jewish interpreters translate the name in the first case “osiers,” and in the second “baskets” (Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan), which recalls the “brook of the willows” of Isaiah (Isa 15:7). The name Sufsaf (willow) is attached to the valley which runs down from Kerak to the Dead  Sea; but this appears to be too far north for the Zered. SEE WILLOWS, BROOK OF THE.

## Zereda[[@Headword:Zereda]]

             (Heb. with the art. hats-Tseredah', הִצְּרֵדָה, the fortress [Fürst] or the cool [Gesen.] Sept. ἡ Σαριδά v.r. Σαριρά; Vulg. Sareda), a town in Mount Ephraim, the birthplace of Jeroboam the son of Nebat (1Ki 11:26). In an addition made by the Sept; to ch. 12 Sarira (as this place is called by some MSS.) is said to have been built by Jeroboam for Solomon, and it is stated that to it Jeroboam returned when he came out of Egypt. The same passage further substitutes it for Tirzah. It seems to have been located as a fastness on some strong position. On this account, as well as because of its connection with Mount Ephraim, it cannot be (as many think) the same with Zeredatha, Zerrath, or Zarthan, which lay in the Jordan valley. Lieut. Conder (Tent Work in Palest. 2, 340) identities it with Surdah, a village little more than a mile south of Jufna (Tristram, Bible Places, p. 110).

## Zereda (2)[[@Headword:Zereda (2)]]

             The present Surdah lies twenty-one and a half miles north-west of Beitin (Bethel), and is "a small village on a hillside, with a garden to the south of  it, and the spring Ain Jelazun on the east" (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:295).

## Zeredathah[[@Headword:Zeredathah]]

             (Heb. Tsereda'thah, צְרֵדָתָה,' which is the same word with Zereda above, with T local added; Sept. Σιρδαθά v.r., Σαρηθαθά and Σαδαθά; Vulg. Scaredatha), mentioned as the place of Solomon's brass-foundry (2Ch 4:17), in place of the ZARTIAN SEE ZARTIAN (q.v.) of the parallel passage (1Ki 7:46).

## Zererath[[@Headword:Zererath]]

             [some Zere'rath], or rather .ZER'ERA (Heb. Tsererah', צְרֵרָה, with ה local added, Tserera'thah, צְרֵרָתָה, to Zererah, perh. an interchange for Zeredah, as some MSS and versions read; Sept. Ταγαραγαθά v.r. καὶ συνηγμένη; Vulg. omits), a place mentioned (Jdg 7:22) in describing the rout of the Midianites before Gideon: “And the host [camp] fled to [as far as] Beth-shittah in [towards] Zererath [Zererah], and [i.e. even] to [as far as] the border of Abel-meholah, unto [upon] Tabbath,” It appears to have been the same place in the Jordan valley elsewhere called. Zeredathah (q.v.) or Zaretan (q.v.), but not Zereda (q.v.).

## Zeresh[[@Headword:Zeresh]]

             (Heb. id. זֶרֶשׁ, Persian for gold; Sept. Ζωσαρά v.r. Σωσαρά; Josephus, Ζάραρα, Ant. 11:6, 10; Vulg. Zares), the wife of Haman the Agagite (Esther 5, 10), who advised him to prepare the gallows for Mordecai (Est 5:10; Est 5:14), but predicted his fall on learning that Mordecai was a Jew (6, 13). B.C. 474. SEE ESTHER.

## Zereth[[@Headword:Zereth]]

             SEE SPAN.

## Zereth (2)[[@Headword:Zereth (2)]]

             (Heb. Tse'reth, צֶרֶת, prob. splendor; Sept. Σερέθ v.r. Σαρέθ and Α᾿ρέθ; Vulg. Sereth), first named of the three sons of Ashur (the Judahite and founder of Tekoa) by one of his wives, Helah (1Ch 4:7). B.C. cir. 1612.

## Zeri[[@Headword:Zeri]]

             (Heb. Tseri', צְרַי; Sept. Σουρί; Vulg. Sori), second named of the six sons and assistants of Jeduthun in the Levitical music (1Ch 25:3); probably the same elsewhere (1Ch 25:11) called by the equivalent name of IZRI SEE IZRI (q.v.).

## Zeror[[@Headword:Zeror]]

             (Heb. Tseror', צַרוֹר, a bunch, as often; Sept. Σαράρ v.r. Α῾ρέδ and Ι᾿αρέδ;' Vulg. Seror), a Benjamite, son of Bechorath and father of Abiel in the ancestry of king Saul (1Sa 9:1). B.C. cir. 1230.

## Zerremer, Heinrich Gottlieb[[@Headword:Zerremer, Heinrich Gottlieb]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Wernigerode, March 8, 1750. He studied at Halle, and, after completing his studies, accepted a position as teacher of Latin and mathematics at Klosterbergen. In 1775 he was called as pastor to Bayendorf. In 1787 he was appointed, first preacher at Derenburng, in the duchy of Halberstadt. In 1810 he was appointed general superintendent at Halberstadt, where he died, November 10, 1811. He was a popular writer, and his publications were greatly esteemartin his day; though of little value for the present. They are given by Doring, in his Die gelehrten Theologen-Deutschlands; 4:787; see also Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:192, 196, 226, 233, 248, 394. (B.P.)

## Zeruah[[@Headword:Zeruah]]

             (Heb. Tseruah'. צְרוּעָה, smitten with leporosy [Gesen.] or full-breasted [Fürst]; Sept. Σαρουά Vulg. Sarua), the widowed mother of Jeroboam the son of Nebat (1Ki 11:26). B.C. 973. In the additional narrative of the Sept. inserted after 1Ki 12:24, she is called Sarira (a corruption of Zereda, Jeroboam's native place), and is said to have been a harlot.

## Zerubbabel[[@Headword:Zerubbabel]]

             (Heb. Zerubbabel', זְרבָּבֶל, sown in Babylon; Sept. Ζοροβάβελ; Josephus, Ζοροβάβελος), the phylarch or head of the tribe of Judah at the time of the return from the Babylonian captivity in the first year of Cyrus. B.C. 536. His exact parentage is a little obscure from his being always called the son of Shealtiel (Ezr 3:2; Ezr 3:8; Ezra 5, 2, etc.; Hag 1:1; Hag 1:12; Hag 1:14, etc.), and appearing as such in the genealogies (“Zorobabel,” Mat 1:12; Luk 3:27),whereas in 1Ch 3:19 he is represented as the son of Pedaiah, Shealtiel's or Salathiels brother, and .consequently as Salathiel's nephew. Probably the genealogy in 1 Chronicles exhibits his legal parentage, and he succeeded his uncle as head of the house of Judah — a supposition which tallies with the facts that Salathiel appears as the first-born, and that no children are assigned to him. It is worth noting that Josephus speaks of Zorobabel as “the son of Salathiel of the posterity of David and of the tribe of Judah” (Ant. 11:3, 10). Had he believed him to be the son of Jeconiah, of whom he had spoken (10, 11, 2), he could hardly have failed to say so (comp. 10:7, 1). (See below.)

1. Canonical History. — In the first year of Cyrus, Zerubbabel was living at Babylon, and was the recognized prince (נָשַׂרא) of Judah in the Captivity, what in later times was called, רֵישׁ הִגְּלוּתָהor “the Prince of the Captivity.” On the issuing of Cyrus's decree, he immediately availed himself of it, and placed himself at the head of those of his countrymen “whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem.” It is probable that he was in the king of Babylon's service, both from- his having, like Daniel and the three children, received a Ghaldee name (Sheshbazzar), and from' his receiving from Cyrus the office of governor (פֶּחָה) of Judaea. The restoration of the sacred vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had brought from the Temple having been effected, and copious presents of silver and gold and, goods and beasts having been bestowed upon the captives, Zerubbabel went forth at the head of the returning colony, accompanied by Jeshua the high-priest, and perhaps by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and a considerable number of priests, Levites, and heads of houses of Judah and Benjamin, with their followers. On arriving at Jerusalem, Zerubbabel's first care was to build the altar on its old site, and to restore the daily sacrifice.

Perhaps, also, they kepit the Feast of Tabernacles, as it is said they did in Ezr 3:4. But his great  work, which he set about immediately, was the rebuilding of the Temple. Being armed with a grant from Cyrus of timber and stone for the building, and of money for the expenses of the builders (Ezr 6:4), he had collected the materials, including cedar-trees brought from Lebanon to Joppa, according to the precedent in the time of Solomon (2Ch 2:16), and got together masons and carpenters to do the work by the opening of, the second year of their return to Jerusalem. Accordingly, in the second month of: the second year of their return, the foundation of the Temple was laid with all the pomp which they could command: — the priests in their vestments with trumpets, and the sons of Asaph with cymbals, singing the very same psalm of praise for God's unfailing. mercy to Israel which was sung when Solomon dedicated his Temple (2Ch 5:11-14); while the people responded with a great shout of joy “because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid.” How strange must have been the emotions of Zerubbabel at this moment! As he stood upon Mount Zion and beheld from its summit the desolations of Jerusalem, the site of the Temple blank, David's palace a heap of ashes, his father's sepulchers defiled and overlaid with rubbish, and the silence of desertion and emptiness hanging oppressively over the streets and waste places of what was once the joyous city; and then remembered how his great ancestor David had brought up the ark in triumph to the very spot where he was then standing, how-Solomon had reigned there in all his magnificence and power, and how the petty kings and potentates of the neighboring nations had been his vassals and tributaries — how must his heart alternately have swelled with pride, and throbbed with anguish, and sunk in humiliation! In the midst of these mighty memories he was but the officer of a foreign heathen despot, the head of a feeble remnant of half-emancipated slaves, the captain of a band hardly able to hold up their heads in the presence of their hostile and jealous neighbors; and yet there he was, the son of David, the heir of great and mysterious promises, returned by a wonderful providence to the home of his ancestors. At his bidding the daily sacrifice had been restored after a cessation of half a century, and now the foundations of the Temple were actually laid, amid the songs of the Levites singing according to David's ordinance, and the shouts' of the tribe of Judah. It was a heart-stirring situation; and, despite all the discouragements attending it, we cannot doubt that Zerubbabel's faith and hope were kindled by it into fresh life.

But there were many hindrances and delays to be encountered before the work was finished. The Samaritans or Cutiheans put in a claim to join with the Jews in rebuilding the Temple; and when Zerubbabel and his companions refused to admit them into partnership, they tried to hinder them from building, and hired counselors to frustrate their purpose. They probably contrived, in the first instance, to intercept the supplies of timber and stone, and the wages of the workmen, which were paid out of the king's revenue, and then by misrepresentation to calumniate them at the court of Persia. Thus they were successful in putting a stop to the work during the seven remaining years of therein of Cyrus, and through the eight years of Cambyses and Smerdis. Nor does Zerubbabel appear quite blameless for this long delay. The difficulties in the way of building the Temple were not such as need have stopped the work; and during this long suspension of sixteen years, Zerubbabel and the rest of the people had been busy in building costly houses for themselves, and one might even suspect that the cedar-wood which had been brought for the Temple had been used to decorate private dwellings (comp. the use of, סָפִּן in Hag 1:4, and 1Ki 7:3; 1Ki 7:7). They had, in fact, ceased to care for the, desolation of the Temple (Hag 1:2-4), and had not noticed that God was rebuking their lukewarmness by withholding his blessing from their labors (Hag 1:5-11). But in the second year of Darius light dawned upon the darkness of the colony from Babylon.. In that year-it was the: most memorable event in Zerubbabel's life-the spirit of prophecy suddenly blazed up with a most brilliant light among the returned captives; and the long silence which was ton ensue till the ministry of John the Baptist was preceded by the stirring utterances of-Haggai and Zechariah. Their words fell like sparks upon tinder. In a moment Zerubbabel, roused from his apathy, threw his whole strength into the work, zealously seconded by Jeshua and all the people. Undeterred by a fresh attempt of their enemies to hinder the progress of the building, they went on with the work even while a reference was made to Darius; and when, after ‘the original decree of Cyrus had been found at Ecbatana, a most gracious and favorable decree was issued by- Darius, enjoining Tatnai and Shetharboznai to assist the Jews with whatsoever they had need of at the king's expense, the work advanced so rapidly that on the third day of the month Adar, in the sixth year of Darius, the; Temple was finished, and was forthwith dedicated with much pomp and rejoicing. It is difficult to calculate how great was the effect of the prophecies of Haggai! and Zechariah in sustaining the courage and energy of Zerubbabel in carrying his work to completion. Addressed, as many of them were,  directly to Zerubbabel by name; speaking, as they did, most glorious things of the Temple which lie was building; conveying to Zerubbabel himself extraordinary assurances of divine favor, and coupling with them magnificent and consolatory predictions of the future glory of Jerusalem and Judah and of the conversion of the Gentiles, they necessarily exercised an immense influence upon his mind (Hag 1:13-14; Hag 2:4-9; Hag 2:21-23; Zec 4:6-10). It is not too much to say that these prophecies upon Zerubbabel were the immediate instrument by which the Church and commonwealth of Judah were preserved from destruction and received a life, which endured till the coming of Christ.

The only other works of Zerubbabel which we learn from the Scripture history are the restoration of the courses of priests and Levites, and of the provision for their maintenance, according to the institution of David (Ezr 6:18; Neh 12:47); — the registering of the returned captives according to their genealogies (7:5); and the keeping of a Passover in the seventh year of Darius, with which last event ends all that we know of the life of Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel — a man inferior to few of the great characters of Scripture, whether we consider the perilous undertaking ‘to which he devoted himself, the importance in the economy of then divine government of his work, his courageous faith, or the singular distinction of being the object of so many and such remarkable prophetic utterances.

2. The Apocryphal history of Zerubbabel, which, as usual, Josephus follows, may be summed up in a few words. The story told in 1 Esdras 3-7 is that on the occasion of a great feast made by Darius on his accession, three young men of his bodyguard had a contest who should write the wisest sentence. One of the three (Zerubbabel) writing “Women are strongest, but above all things Truth beareth away the victory,” and afterwards defending his sentence with much eloquence, was declared by acclamation to be the wisest, and claimed for his reward at the king's hand that the, king should perform his vow which he had vowed to rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple. Upon this the king gave him letters to all his treasurers and governors on the other side the river, with grants of money and exemption from taxes, and sent him to rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple, accompanied by the families of which the list is given in Ezra 2, Nehemiah 7; and then follows, in utter confusion, the history of Zerubbabel as given in Scripture. Apparently, too, the compiler did not perceive that Sanabasar (Sheshbazzar) was the same person as Zerubbabel. Josephus, indeed,  seems to identify Sheshbazzar with Zerubbabel, and tries to reconcile the story in 1 Esdras by saying, “Now it so fell out that about this time Zorobabel, who had been made governor of the Jew-s that had been- in captivity, came to Darius from Jerusalem, for there had been an old friendship between him and the king,” etc. (Ant. 11:3).

But it is obvious on the face of it — that this is simply Josephus's invention to reconcile 1 Esdr. with the canonical Ezra. Josephus has also another story (ibid. 11:4, 9) which is not found in 1 Esdras, of Zorobabel going on an embassy to Darius to accuse the Samaritan governors and heptarchs of withholding from the Jews the grants made by Darius out of the royal treasury for the offering of sacrifices and other Temple expenses, and of his obtaining a decree from the king commanding his officers in Samaria to supply the high-priest with all that he required. But that this is not authentic history seems pretty certain from the names of the governors, Sambabas being an imitation or corruption of Sanballat, Tanganies of Tatnai (or Thauthanai, as in Sept.), Sadraces of Sathrabouzanes, confused with Shadrach, Bobelo of Zorobabel; and the names of the ambassadors, which are manifestly copied from the list in 1 Esdras 5, 8, whereas Zorobabel, Enenius and Mardochaeus correspond to Zorobabel, Ananias, and Mardochaeus of Josephus. Moreover, the letter or decree of Darius as given by Josephus is as manifestly copied from the decree of Darius in Ezr 6:6-10. In all probability, therefore, the document used by Josephus was one of those numerous Apocryphal religious romances of which the Hellenistic Jews were so fond about the 4th and 3rd century before Christ, and was written partly- to explain Zorobabel's presence at the court of Darius, as spoken of in 1 Esdras, partly to explain that of Mordecai at the court of Ahasuerns, though he was in the list of those who were Zorobabel's companions (as it seemed), and partly to give an opportunity for reviling and humiliating the Samaritans. It also gratified the favorite taste for embellishing and corroborating, and giving, as was thought, additional probability to, the Scripture narrative, and dwelling upon bygone times of Jewish triumphs.

3. The list of Zerubbabel's posterity in 1Ch 3:19-24 is somewhat confused. Perhaps its statements may be harmonized with themselves and with the New Test. genealogies, if the entire passage read thus: [1Ch 3:19] The issue of Pedaiah were Zerubbabel (by his brother Salathiel's widow), Shimei (to whom may be added Zerubbabel's children, Meshullam, Hanamiah, and a daughter Shelomith), [1Ch 3:20] Hashubah, Ohel, Berechiah, and Hasadiah (called also Jushab-hesed), making in all  five sons (besides Zerubbabel, who was reckoned as Salathiel's heir .[Ezr 3:2]). [v. 21] The descendants of the above Hananiah were Pelatiah and Jesaiah, besides the children of a third son Rephaiah, together with those of Arnan (one of the last-mentioned children), and in like manner the issue again of his son Obadiah and grandson Shechaniah. [v. 22] The family of this last consisted of six descendants, namely, his son Shemaiah, and grandchildren Hattush, Igeal, Bariah, Neariah, and Shaphat. [v. 23] Neariah had three sons, Elioenai, Hezekiah, and Azrikam; [v. 24] and Elioenai again seven, namely, Hodaiah, Eliashib, Pelaiah, Akkub, Johanann, Delaiah, and Anani.” An objection, it must be admitted, lies against this arrangement, namely, that it brings down the list to a later date than the close of the Old-Test. canon (B.C. 406), requiring the supposition of the addition of some of the last names by a subsequent hand Another lie, which condenses the lineage within earlier limits, is given under DARIUS 2. The above adjustment, however, is not only conformed to the natural view of the text, bun is also confirmed by not a few striking coincidences in names and descent with the genealogies of our Lord as given by the evangelists. The following table will exhibit these at a glance (see Strong, Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels, § 9). SEE GENEALOGY (OF CHRIST).
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## Zeruiah[[@Headword:Zeruiah]]

             (Heb. Tseruyah', צְרוּיָה [1Sa 14:1 צְריָּה, wounded [Gesen.] or balsam [Fürst]; Sept and Josephus, Σαρουϊvα; Vulg. Sarvia), a woman noted as the mother of the three leading heroes of David's army-Abishai, Joab, and Asahel — the sons of Zeruiah (1Sa 26:6; 2Sa 2:18; 1Ki 1:7, etc.). B.C. ante 1046. She and Abigail are specified in the genealogy of David's family in 1Ch 2:13-17 as “sisters of the sons of Jesse” (1Ch 2:16; comp. Josephus, Ant. 6:10,1). The expression is in itself enough to raise a suspicion that she was not a daughter of Jesse, a suspicion which is corroborated by the statement of 2Sa 17:25, that Abigail was the daughter of Nahash. Abigail being apparently the younger of the two women, it is a probable inference that they were both the daughters of Nahash, but whether this Nahash be as Prof. Stanley has ingeniously conjectured-the king of the Ammonites and the former husband of Jesse's wife, or some other person unknown, must forever remain a mere conjecture. SEE DAVID; SEE NAHASH.

Her relation to Jessen (in the original Ishai) is expressed in the name of her son Abishai. Of Zeruiah's husband there is no mention in the Bible. Josephus (Anf. 7:3) explicitly states that his name was Souri (Σουρί), but no corroboration of the statement appears to have been discovered in the Jewish traditions, nor does Josephus himself refer to it again. The mother of such remarkable sons must herself have been a remarkable woman, and this may account for the fact, unusual if not unique, that the family is always called after her, and that her husband's name has not been considered worthy of preservation in the sacred records.

## Zestermann, August Christian Adolf[[@Headword:Zestermann, August Christian Adolf]]

             who died at Leipsic, March 16, 1869, doctor and professor, is the author of, De Basilicis Libri Tres (Leipsic, 1847): — Die antiken und christlichen Basiliken nach ihrer Entstehung, Ausbildung und Beziehung zueinander dargestellt (1847). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Zetham[[@Headword:Zetham]]

             (Heb. Zetham', זְתָם, prob. 1. q. Zethan [q.v.]; Sept. Ζεθόμ v.r. Ζοθομ, Ζηθάν, etc.; Vulg. Zetham, Zatham), a grandson of Laadan, a Gershonite Levite (1Ch 23:8), associated with his father, Jehiel or Jehieli, and his brother Joel, in charge of the Temple treasury (1Ch 26:22). B.C. 1043.

## Zethan[[@Headword:Zethan]]

             (Heb. Zeythan', זֵיתָן, olive [Gesen.] or shining [Fürst]; Sept. Ζαιθάν v.r. ᾿Ηθάν; Vulg. Zethan), fifth named of the seven sons of Bilhan, a Benjamite (1Ch 7:10). B.C. prob. 1014.

## Zethar[[@Headword:Zethar]]

             (Heb. Zethar', זֶתָר, prob. Persian, either star [Gesen.] or sacrifice [Ftirst]; Sept. Α᾿βαταξάς; Vulg. Zethar), sixth named of the seven eunuchs of Ahtasuerus who attended upon the king, and were commanded to bring Vashti into his presence (Est 1:10). B.C. 483.

## Zia[[@Headword:Zia]]

             (Heb. id. זַיעִ, motion [Gesen.] or terrified [Fürst]; Sept. Ζιά v.r. Ζουέ; Vulg. Zie), sixth named of the seven Gadite chiefs resident in Bashan (1Ch 5:13). B.C. prob. 1014.

## Ziba[[@Headword:Ziba]]

             (Heb. Tsiba', צַיבָא[briefly צַבָא., 2Sa 16:4], plantation [Fürst], or statue. [Gesen.]; Sept. Σιβά v.r. Σιββά; Josephus, Σιβάς; Vulg. Siba), a person who plays a prominent part, though with doubtful credit to himself, in one of the episodes of David's history (2Sa 9:2-12; 2Sa 16:1-4; 2Sa 19:17; 2Sa 19:29). He had been a slave (עֶבֶד) of the house of Saul before the overthrow of his kingdom, and (probably at the time of the great Philistine incursion which proved so fatal to his master's family) had been set free (Josephus, Ant. 7:5, 5). It was of him that David inquired if there was any one left of the house of Saul to whom the monarch might show favor. B.C. 1044. Mephibosheth was in consequence found, and having been certified of David's friendship, Ziba was appointed to till the land for the prince, and generally to constitute his household and do him service (2Sa 9:2-10). The opportunities thus afforded him he had so far improved that when first encountered in the history he is head of an establishment of fifteen sons and twenty slaves. David's reception of Mephibosheth had the effect of throwing Ziba with his whole establishment back into the state of bondage from which he had so long been free. It reduced him from being an independent landholder to the position of a mere dependent. When David had to fly from Jerusalem in consequence of  the rebellion of Absalom, Ziba met the king with a large and acceptable present: “But where is Mephibosheth?” asked the fugitive monarch. “In Jerusalem,” was the answer; “for he said, Today shall the house of Israel restore me the kingdom of my father.” Enraged at this, which looked like ingratitude as well as treachery, David thereupon gave to Ziba all the property of Mephibosheth (2Sa 16:1 sq.). On David's return to his metropolis an explanation took place, when Mephibosheth accused Ziba of having slandered him; and David, apparently not being perfectly satisfied with the defense, gave his final award, that the land should be divided between the master and his servant (2Sa 19:24 sq.). B.C. 1023. SEE MEPHIBOSHETH.

## Zibeon[[@Headword:Zibeon]]

             (Heb. Tsibon', צבְעוֹן, dyed [Gesen.] or robber [Fürst]; Sept.' Σεβεγών; Vulg. Sebeon), the father of Anah, whose daughter Aholibamah was Esau's wife (Gen 36:2). B.C. ante 1963. Although called a Hivite, he is probably the same as Zibeon the son of Seir the Horite (Gen 36:20; Gen 36:24; Gen 36:29; 1 Chronicles 1, 38, 40), the latter signifying “cave-dweller” and the former being the name of his tribe, for we know nothing of the race of the Troglodytes; or perhaps הִחַוַּי(the Hivite) is a mis-transcription for הִחֹרַי(the Horite). SEE ESAU.

Another difficulty connected with this Zibeon is that Anah in Gen 36:2 is called his daughter, and in Gen 36:24 his son; but this difficulty appears to be easily explained by supposing that בתrefers to Aholibamah, and not to the name next preceding it. The Samaritan, it should be observed, has בן. An allusion is made to some unrecorded fact in the history of the Horites in the passage “This [was that] Anah that found the mules in the wilderness as he fed the asses of Zibeon his father” (Gen 36:24). The word rendered “mules” (q.v.) in the A.V. is the Heb. יֵמַים, yemim, perhaps the Emim, or giants, as in the reading of the Samuel הָאֵימַים, and so also Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan; Gesenius prefers “hot-springs,” following the Vulg. rendering. Zibeon was also one of the dukes or phylarchs of the Horites (Gen 36:29). For the identification with Beeri, father of Judith the Hittite (26, 34), SEE BEERI, and also SEE ANATH.

## Zibia[[@Headword:Zibia]]

             (Heb. Tsibya', צַבְיָא; Sept. Σεβιά v.r. Ι᾿εβιά; Vulg. Sebia), a Benjamite, second named of the seven sons of Shaharaim (q.v.) by one of his two wives, Hodesh (1Ch 8:9). B.C. post 1612.

## Zibiah[[@Headword:Zibiah]]

             (Heb. Tsibyah', צַבְיָה; Sept. Σαβιά v.r. Α᾿βιά; Vulg. Sebi(l), a native of Beer-sheba, mother of king Jehoash of Judah (2Ki 12:1; 2Ch 24:1), and consequently wife (or concubine) of his father, Ahaziah. B.C. 876.

## Zichri[[@Headword:Zichri]]

             (Heb. Zikr זַכְרַי, umy memorial or memzorable; Sept. Ζεχρί v.r. Ζαχρό, Ζοχοί, Ζαρί, and even sometimes Ζαχαρίας, Ε᾿ζεχρί; Vulg. Zechri), the name of numerous Hebrews.

1. Last named of the three sons of Izhar the son of Kohath of the tribe of Levi (Exo 6:21, where most editions of the A.V. incorrectly have “Zithri”). B.C. cir. 1658.

2. Second named of the nine sons of Shimhi of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:19). B.C. cir. 1612.

3. Fifth named of the eleven sons of Shashak of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:23). B.C. cir. 1612.

4. Last named of the six sons of Jeroham of the, tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:27). B.C. cir. 1612. 5. A “son” of Asaph and father of Micah (1Ch 9:15); elsewhere called Zabdi (Neh 11:17) and Zaccur (Neh 12:35).

6. A descendant of Eliezer the son of Moses, being son of Joram and father of the treasurer Shelomith (1Ch 26:25). B.C. ante 1043.

7. The father of Eliezer, which latter was chief of the Reubenites in David's reign (1Ch 27:16). B.C. ante 1043.

8. A Judahite whose son Amasiah volunteered at the head of 200,000 men in Jehoshaphat's army (2Ch 17:16). B.C. 909.

9. Father of Elishaphat, which latter was one of the conspirators with Jehoiada to restore Joash (2Ch 23:1). B.C. ante 876.

10. An Ephraimitish chief in the invading army of Pekah the son of Remaliah (2Ch 28:7). B.C. cir. 734. It seems that he took advantage of the victory of this monarch over the army of Judah to penetrate into Jerusalem, where he slew one of the sons of Ahaz, the governor of the palace, and the king's chief minister or favorite. SEE AHAZ; SEE PEKAH. There is some probability in the conjecture that he was the “Tabael's son” whom Pekah and Rezin designed to set upon the throne of Judah (Isa 7:6). SEE TABAEL.

11. Father of Joel, which latter was superintendent of the Benjamites after the return from Babylon (Neh 11:9). B.C. ante 536.

12. A priest of the family of Abijah in the days of the high-priest Joiakim the son of Jeshua (Neh 12:17). B.C. cir. 480.

## Zickler, Friedrich Samuel[[@Headword:Zickler, Friedrich Samuel]]

             a Protestanti theologian of Germany, was born November 14, 1721, at Schwabsdorf, in Weimar. He studied at Jena, where he was made magister in 1744, on presenting a dissertation, Ad Vaticinium Jacobaeum Genes. 49:12. In 1758 he was made professor of philosophy, and at the jubilee of the Jena University was made doctor of theology, presenting a dissertation, De Glorioso Servatoris in Coelum Adscensu. In 1760 he went to Erlangen as third professor of theology and university-preacher. He opened his lectures with a dissertation on De ὀρθοδοξία et ὀρθοτομία Necessariis in Doctore Ecclesiae Requisitis. He returned again to Jena in 1768, advanced rapidly, end died April 25, 1779, having four years before been chosen first professor of theology. He wrote, Diss. I et II. Historico- Exegeticae, Religionem Bestiarum ab Egyptiis Consecratarum Exponentes, etc. (Jena, 1745-46): — Diss. Exegetica Statum Ecclesiae Novi Foederis Primaevae a Jerenziae 3:14 sq., Praedictum Exponens (ibid. 1747): — Chaldaismus Danielis Prophete, etc. (ibid. 1749, etc.).  See Doring, Die gelehirten Theologis Deutschlands, 4:789 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:550. (B.P.)

## Ziddim[[@Headword:Ziddim]]

             (Heb. with the art. hats-Tsiddinm', הִצַּדַּים, the declivities; Sept. τῶν Τυρίων [apparently reading ד for ד]; Vittig, Assedim), the first named of the fortified towns of the tribe of Naplitali (Jos 19:35), Zer being mentioned next; but the two names are probably to be connected as one. SEE ZER. The Sept. (as above) identifies the place with Tyre and the Syriac with Zidon, but both these are quite beyond the bounds of Naphtali. The Jerusalem Talmud (Megillah, ch. 1) is probably nearer, the mark in identifying hats-Tsiddim with Kefr Chittai, whicil Schwarz (Palest. p. 182) with much probability takes to be the present Hattin, at the northern foot of the well-known Kurn Hacttin, or “Horns of Hattin, a few miles west of Tiberias. This identification falls in with the fact that the next names in the list are all known to have been connected with the lake. “The village has several traces of antiquity in its tombs, and is, compared with many others, a clean and thriving place” (Tristram, Bible Places, p. 258).

## Ziddim (2)[[@Headword:Ziddim (2)]]

             The modern Hattin lies seven and a quarter miles north-west of Tiberias, and four and three quarters south-west of Mejdel (Magdala); it contains several rock-cut tombs to the west, and the wady of Neby Shuaib (Jethro) on the south (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 1:384).

## Zidkijah[[@Headword:Zidkijah]]

             (Neh 10:1). SEE ZEDKKIAH.

## Zidon[[@Headword:Zidon]]

             (Heb. Tsidon', צַידוֹן[nor briefer צירֹן, Gen 10:15; Gen 10:19; Gen 49:13], fishery [Gesen.] or fortress [Fürst]; Sept. [usually], New Test., and classical writers generally, Σιδών; A.V. “Sidon” in Gen 49:13; Gen 49:15; Gen 49:19, and New Test.), the name of a man and of a place. They have a mutual bearing in relation to origin and birthplace of the Punic race, which figured so conspicuously in later times and in Roman history.

1. The eldest son of Canaan (Gen 10:15; 1Ch 1:13). B.C. considerably post 2514. SEE ETHNOGRAPHY.

2. One of the most ancient cities of Phoenicia (Gen 10:19; Gen 49:13; Jos 11:8; Jos 19:28; Jdg 1:31; Jdg 10:6; Jdg 18:28; 2Sa 24:6; 1Ki 17:9; Isa 23:2; Isa 23:4; Isa 23:12; Jer 25:22; Jer 27:3; Jer 47:4; Eze 27:8; Eze 28:21-22; Joe 2:4 [Heb 4:4]; Zec 9:2; Mat 11:21-22; Mat 15:21; Mar 3:8; Mar 7:24; Mar 7:31; Luk 4:26; Luk 6:17; Luke 10; Luke 13, 14; Act 12:20; Act 27:3), which still retains its ancient appellation (Phoen. צדן) in the Arabic from Saida. Justin Martyr (who lived in Palestine) derives the name from the Phoenician word for fish, “piscem Phoenices sidon vocant “ (18, 3); but Josephus; from the son of Canaan (Ant. 6:2).

1. — Situation and Importance. — Zidon lies on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea,: in lat. 33 34' 5” N., less than twenty English miles to the north iof: Tyre. It is situated in the narrow plain between the Lebanon and the sea, to which it once gave its own name (Josephus, Ant. 5, 3, 1, τὸ μέγα πεδίον Σιδῶνος πόλεως) at a point where the mountains recede to a distance of two miles (Kenrick, Phoenicia, p. 19). Adjoining the city there are luxuriant gardens and orchards, in which there is a profusion of the finest fruit trees suited to the climate. “The plain is flat and low,” says Mr. Porter, author of the Handbook for Syria and Palestine, “but near the coast line rises a little hill, a spur from which shoots out a few hundred yards into the sea in a southwestern direction. On the northern slope of the promontory thus formed stands the old city of Zidon. The hill behind on the south is covered by the citadel” (Encyclop. Britannica, 8t.h ed. s.v.). It had a very commodious harbor, which is now nearly choked up with sand (Strabo, 16:756; Josephus, Ant. 14:10, 6). It was distant one day's journey  from the fountains of the Jordan (ibid. 5, 3, 1), and four hundred stadia from Berytus (Strabo, 16:756, 757).

It was situated in the allotment of the tribe of Asher, but never conquered (Jdg 1:31); on the contrary, it was sometimes a formidable enemy (Jdg 10:12). Even in Joshua's time it was called Tsidon-rabba, or Great Zidon (Jos 11:8; Jos 19:28), or Zidon the Metropolis, scil. of Zidonia. This district appears to have embraced the states of Zidon, Tyre, and-Aradas, and its inhabitants are always distinguished from the inhabitants of the city itself (called “dwellers יושביof Zidon”) as צדונים, “Zidonians,” or dwellers in the districts and it seems in those early times to have extended northward to the Giblites, southward to the Carmel (Zebulun's border, Gen 49:13). At a later period the boundaries south were determined by the fluctuating- issue of the struggle for the hegemony between Zidon and Tyre, while northward the river Tamyrus divided it from the State of Berytus. To ‘the east, where it never had extended very far (Dan, a Zidonian colony, being described as being “far from the Zidonians,” Jdg 18:7) in early days, it touched, at a later period, the territory of Damascus. The assumption, however, drawn by some writers from the inexact way in which the appellation Zidonian is used by ancient writers — viz. that this name stood for “Phoenician,” and Zidonia itself for the whole of Phoenicia, of which it formed only an important part is incorrect. Tyre, of later origin than Zidoni, if not indeed founded by it, in the same way styles itself on coins אם צדנם, Metropolis of Zidonia, in the sense of its momentary hegemony over Zidon only, possibly also with a secondary reference to the nationality of its inhabitants, mostly immigrants from Zidon. The frequent allusions to the skillfulness of the Zido niansin arts andmanufactures, the extent of their commerce, their nautical information and prowess, in ancient writers, are well known (see Homer, It. 6:290; 23:743; Odys. 4, 617; 13:285; 15:117,425). Of the trade of the “Zidonian merchants” (Isa 23:2; Eze 27:8), both by land and sea, we hear in Diod. Sic. (16, 41, 45); of their glass, linen, and other manufactories, in Pliny (5, 20), Virgil, Strabo (16, 10), and other classical writers. The best vessels-in the fleet of Xerxes were Zidonian (Herod. 7:99, 128). In Hasselquist's time (1750) its exports to France; were considerable (Travels, p. 166); but at present its traffic is chiefly confined to the neighboring towns (Mannert, Geographie, 1, 291; Kitto, Pictorial Bible, notes on Deuteronomy 33 and Joshua 19).

2. History. — The antiquity of Zidon is evident from the ethnological assertion that Zidon was the first-born of Canaan, though Berytus and  Byblus, as towns founded by Cronos, claimed a high mythological antiquity. Tyre is not mentioned in the Pentateuch at all; but Zidon is referred to in terms that give it the pre-eminence among Phoenician cities. From a Biblical point of view, this city is inferior in interest to its neighbor Tyre, with which its name is so often associated. Indeed, in all the passages above referred to in which the two cities are mentioned together, Tyre is named first a circumstance which might at once be deemed accidental, or the mere result of Tyre's being the nearest of the two cities to Palestine, were it, not that some doubt on this point is raised by the order being reversed in two works which were written at a period after Zidon had enjoyed a long temporary superiority (Ezr 3:7; 1Ch 22:4). However this may be, it is certain that, of the two, Tyre is of the greater importance in reference to the writings of the most celebrated Hebrew prophets; and the splendid prophecies directed against Tyre, as a single colossal power (Ezekiel 26; Ezekiel 27; Eze 28:1-19; Isaiah 23), have no parallel in the shorter and vaguer utterances against Zidon (Eze 28:21-23). The predominant Biblical interest of Tyre arises from the prophecies relating to its destiny.

If we could believe Justin (18:3), there would be no doubt that Zidon was of greater antiquity than Tyre, as he says that the inhabitants of Zidoni, when their city had been reduced by the king of Ashkelon, founded Tyre the year before the capture of Troy. Justin, however, is such a weak authority for any disputed historical fact, and his account of the early history of the Jews, wherein we have some means of testing his accuracy, seems to be so much in the nature of a romance (36:2), that, without laying stress on the unreasonableness of any one's assuming to know the precise time when Troy was taken, he cannot be accepted as an authority for the early history of the Phoenicians. In contradiction of this statement, it has been further insisted on that the relation between a colony and the mother city among the Phoenicians was sacred, and that as the Tyrians never acknowledged this relation towards. Zidon, the supposed connection between Tyre and Zidon is morally impossible. This is a very strong point; but, perhaps, not absolutely conclusive, as no one can prove that this was the custom of the Phoenicians sat the very distant period when, alone, the Zidonians would have built Tyre, if they founded it at all;, or that it would have applied not only to the conscious and deliberate founding of a colony, but likewise to such an almost accidental founding of a city as is implied in the account of Justin. Certainly there is otherwise nothing improbable in  Zidonians having founded Tyre, as the Tyrians are called Zidonians; but the Zidonians are never called Tyrians. At any rate, this circumstance tends to show that in early times Zidon was the most influential of the two cities. This is shadowed forth in the book of Genesis by the statement that Zidon was the firstborn of Canaan (Gen 10:15), and is implied in the name of “Great Zidon,” or “the, metropolis Zidon,” which is twice given to it in Joshua (Gen 11:8 to Gen 19:28). It is confirmed, likewise, by Zidonians being used as the generic name of the Phoenicians, or Canaanites, (Gen 13:6; Jdg 18:7); and by the reason assigned for there being no deliverer to Laish when its peaceable inhabitants were massacred, that “it was far from Zidon” whereas, if Tyre had been then of equal importance, it would have been more natural to mention Tyre, which professed substantially the same religion, and was almost twenty miles nearer (Jdg 18:28).

It is in accordance with the inference to be drawn from these circumstances that in the Homeric poems Tyre is not named, while there is mention both of Zidon and the Zidonians (Odys. 15:425; II. 23:743); and the land of the Zidonians is called “Sidonia” (Odys. 13:285). One point, however, in- the Homeric poems, deserves to be specially noted concerning the Zidonians, that they are never here mentioned as traders, or praised for their nautical skill, for which they were afterwards so celebrated (Herod. 7:44, 96). The traders are invariably known by the general name of Phoenicians, which would,' indeed, include the, Zidonians; but still the special praise of Zidonians was as skilled workmen. When Achilles distributed prizes at the games in honor of Patroclus, he gave as the prize of the swiftest runner a large silver bowl for mixing wine with water, which had been cunningly made by the skilful Zidonians, but which Phoenicians had brought over the sea (Homer, I1. 23:74, 744). When Menelaus wished to give to Telemachus what was most beautiful and most valuable, he presented him; with a similar mixing-bowl of silver, with golden rim —a divine work, the work of Hephaestus-which had been a gift to Menelaus himself from Phuedimus, king of the Zildonians (Odys. 4:614-618; 15:425). Again, all the beautifully embroidered robes of Andromache, from which she selected one as an offering to Athene, were the productions of Zidonian women, which Paris when coming to Troy with Helen, had brought from Sidonia (Il. 6, 289-295). But in no case is anything mentioned as having been brought from Zidon in Zidonian vessels or by Zidonian sailors. Perhaps, at this time the Phoenician vessels were principally fitted out at; seaports of Phoenicia to the north of Zidon.  But very soon after that: period the splendior and power of Zidon began to pale before Tyre, which existed already at the time of Joshua, but as a dependency of Zidon. After the memorable defeat, which the Zidonianas suffered in the war with the king of Ashkelonu (13th century B.C.), reported by Justin, when the Zidonians are said to have “retired to their ships and to have founded [refounded] Tyre,” Zidon almost disappears from history for a time, so utterly enfeebled and insignificant had it become through the sudden and brilliant rise of its own daughter and rival, to whom all the noblest and most skilful of her children had fled. Its fate was almost the same as was that of Tyre herself when Dido-Elissa had founded Carthage, and drew all the most important elements from the old city to the new town, which, it must not be forgotten had originally been a Zidonian settlement under the name of Kakkabe, s.v.

From the time of Solomon to the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, Zidon is not often directly mentioned in the Bible, and it appears to have been subordinate to Tyre. When the people called. “Zidonians” is mentioned, it sometimes seems that the Phoenicians of the plain of Zidon are meant, as, for example, when, Solomon said to Hiram that there was none among the Jews that could skill to hew timber like the Zidonlians (1Ki 5:6); and, possibly, when Ethbaal, the father of Jezebel, is called their king (1Ki 16:31), who, according to Menander, in Josephus (Ant. 8:13, 2), was king of the Tyrians. This may likewise be the meaning when Ashtoreth is called the goddess, or abomination, of the Zidonians (1Ki 11:5; 1Ki 11:33; 2Ki 23:13); or when women of the Zidonians are mentioned in reference to Solomon (1Ki 11:1). And this seems to be equally true of the phrases “daughter of Zidon,” and “merchants of Zidon,” and even once of “Zidon” itself (Isaiah 23:2; 4:12) in the prophecy of Isaiah against Tyre. There is no doubt, however, that Zidon itself, the city properly so called, was threatened by Joel (Joe 3:4) and Jeremiah (Jer 27:3). Still, all that is known respecting it during this epoch is very scanty, amounting to scarcely more than that one of its sources of gain was trade in slaves, in which the inhabitants did not shrink from, selling inhabitants of Palestine; that the city was governed by kings (Jer 25:22); that., previous to the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, it had furnished mariners to Tyre (Eze 27:8); that, at one period, it was subject, in some sense or other, to Tyre; and that, when Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, invaded Phoenicia, Zidon seized the opportunity to revolt. It seems strange to hear of the ‘subjection of one great city to another  great city only twenty miles off, inhabited by men of the same race, language, and religion; but the fact is rendered conceivable by the relation of Athens to its allies after the Persian war, and by the history of the Italian republics in the Middle Ages. It is not improbable that its rivalry with Tyre may have been influential in inducing Zidon, more than a century later, to submit to Nebuchadnezzar, apparently without offering any serious resistance.

During the Persian domination, Zidon seems to have attained its highest point of prosperity; and it is recorded that., towards the close of that period, it far excelled all other Phoenician cities in wealth and importance (Diod. Sic. 116, 44; Mela, 1:12). It. is very probable that the long siege of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar had tended not only to weaken and impoverished Tyre, but likewise to enrich Zidon at the expense of Tyre; as it was an obvious expedient for any Tyrian merchants, artisans, and sailors, who deemed resistance useless or unwise, to transfer their residence to Zidon. — However this may be, in the expedition of Xerxes against Greece, the Zidonians were highly favored, and were a pre-eminently important element of his naval power. When, from a hill near Abydos, Xerxes witnessed a boat-race in his fleet, the prize was gained by the Zidonians (Herod. 7,44); when he reviewed his fleet, he sat beneath a golden canopy in a Zidonian galley (ibid. 7:100); when he wished to examine the months of the river Peneus, he entrusted himself to a Zidonian galley, as was his wont on similar occasions (ibid. 7:128); and when the Tyrants and general officers of his great expedition sat in order of honor, the king of the Zidonians sat first (ibid. 8; 67). Again, Herodotus states that the Phoenicians supplied the blest vessels of the whole fleet; and of the Phoenicians, the Zidonians (7, 96). Lastly, as Homer gives a vivid idea of the beauty of Achilles by saying that Nireus (thrice-named) was the most beautiful of all the Greeks who went to Troy, after the son of Peleus, so Herodotus completes the triumph of the Zidonians when he praises the vessels of Artemisia (probably for the daring of their crews) by saying that they were the most renowned of the whole fleet, “after the Zidonians” (7, 9).

The prosperity of Zidon was suddenly cut short by an unsuccessful revolt against Persia, which led to one of the most disastrous catastrophes recorded in history. Unlike the siege and capture of Tyre by Alexander the Great, which is narrated by several writers, and which is of commanding interest through, its relation to such a renowned conqueror, the fate of  Zidon is only known through the history of Diodorus (16, 4245), and is mainly connected with Arttaxerxes Ochus (B.C. 359-338), a monarch who is justly regarded with mingled aversion and contempt. Hence the calamitous overthrow of Zidon has not, perhaps, attracted so much attention as it deserves. The principal circumstances were these. While the Persians were making preparations in Phoenicia to put down the revolt in Egypt, some Persian satraps and generals behaved oppressively and insolently to Zidonians in the Zidonian division of the city of Tripolis. On this the Zidonian people projected a revolt; and, having first concerted arrangements with other Phoenician cities and made a treaty with Nectanebus, they put their designs into execution. They commenced by committing outrages in a residence and park (παράδεισος) of the Persian king; they burned a large store of fodder which had been collected for the Persian cavalry; and they seized and put to death the Persians who, had been guilty of insults towards the Zidonians. Afterwards, under their king Tennes, with the assistance from Egypt of four thousand Greek mercenaries under Mentor, they expelled the Persian satraps from Phoenicia; they strengthened the defenses of their city; they equipped a fleet of one hundred triremes; and prepared for a desperate resistance. But their king Tennes proved a traitor to their cause; and, in performance of a compact with Ochus, he betrayed into the king's power one hundred of the most distinguished citizens of Zidon, who were all shot to death with javelins. Five hundred other citizens, who went out to the king with ensigns of supplication, shared the same fate; and, by, concert between Tennes and Mentor, the Persian troops were admitted within the gates and occupied the city walls. The Zidonians, before the arrival of Ochus, had burned their vessels to prevent any one leaving the town; and when they saw themselves surrounded by the Persian troops, they adopted the desperate resolution of shutting themselves up with their families, and setting fire each man to his own house (B.C. 351). Forty thousand persons are said to have perished in the flames. Tennes himself did not save his own life, as Ochus, notwithstanding his promise to the contrary, put him to death. The privilege of searching the ruins was sold for money.

After this dismal tragedy Zidon gradually recovered from the blow; fresh immigrants from other cities must have settled in it; and probably many. Zidonian sailors survived who had been plying their trade elsewhere in merchant vessels at the time of the capture of the city. The battle of Issus was fought about eighteen years afterwards (B.C. 333); and then the  inhabitants of the restored city opened their gates to Alexander of their own accord, from hatred, as is expressly stated, of Darius and the Persians (Arrian, Anab. 2, 15). The impolicy as well as the cruelty of Ochus in his mode of dealing with the revolt of Zidon now became apparent; for the Zidonian fleet, in joining Alexander, was an essential element of his success against Tyre. After aiding to bring upon Tyre as great a calamity as had afflicted their own city, they were so far merciful that they saved the lives of many Tyrians by concealing them in their ships and then transporting them to Zidon (Quint. Curtius, 4:4,15). From this time Zidon, being dependent on the fortunes of war in the contests between the successors of Alexander, ceases to play any important political part in history. It became, however, again a flourishing town; and Polybius (5, 70) incidentally mentions that Antiochus, in his war with Ptolemy Philpator, encamped over against Zidon (B.C. 218), but did not venture to attack it from the abundance of its resources and the great number of its inhabitants, either natives or refugees.

Subsequently, according to Josephus (Ant. 14, 21), Julius. Cesar wrote a letter respecting Hyrcanus, which he addressed to the “Magistrates, Council, and Demos of Sidon.” This shows that up to that time the Zidonians enjoyed the forms of liberty, though Dion I Cassius says (64, 7) that Augustus, on his arrival in the East, deprived them of it for seditions conduct. Not long after Strabo, in his account of Phoenicia, says of Tyre and Sidon, “Both were illustrious and splendid formerly, and now; but which should be called the capital of Phoenicia is a matter of dispute between the inhabitants” (16, 756). He adds that it is situated on the mainland, on a fine naturally formed harbor. He speaks of the inhabitants as cultivating the sciences of arithmetic and astronomy; and says that the best opportunities were afforded in Zidon for acquiring a knowledge of these and of all other branches of philosophy. He adds that in his time there were distinguished philosophers natives of Zidon as Boethus, with whom he studied the philosophy of Aristotle, and his brother Diodotus. It is to be observed that both these names were Greek; and it is to be presumed that in Strabo's time Greek was the language of the educated classes at least, both in Tyre and Zidon. This is nearly all that is known of the state of Zidon when it was visited by Christ. It is about fifty miles distant from Nazareth, and is the most northern city, which is mentioned in connection with his journeys. Pliny notes the manufacture of glass at Zidon (Nat. Hist., 5, 17, 19); and during the Roman period we may conceive Tyre and Zidon as two thriving cities, each having an extensive trade, and each having its  staple manufacture the latter of glass, and Tyre of purple dyes from shell- fish.

Zidon is mentioned several times in the New Test. Jesus went once to the coasts of Tyre and Zidon (Mat 15:21); Sarepta, a city of Sidon, is referred to (Luk 4:26); and Paul touched at Zidon on his voyage from Caesarea to Rome (Act 27:3). Whatever be the doom of Tyre and Zidon, it shall be “more tolerable in the day of judgment” than that of Chorazin and Bethsaida, which saw the Savior's mighty works, but were unconvinced by them; for had these towns been so privileged, “they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.”

Zidon was sometimes dignified with the Greek title of Nacuarchis (commander of ships), and was also called by the Romans Colonia Augusta and Metropolis. Christianity appears to have been introduced here at an early period (Act 27:3), and a bishop of Zidon attended the Council of Nicaea in 325. After the conquest of Syria by the Moslems (in 636), Zidon surrendered to her new masters without resistance, and it was then in an enfeebled condition. It shared generally the fortunes of Tyre, with the exception that it was several times taken and retaken during the wars of the Crusades, and suffered, accordingly, more than Tyre previous to the fatal year B.C. 1291. Since that time it never seems to have fallen quite so low as Tyre. Through Fakhr ed-Din, emir of the Druses between 1594 and 1634, and the settlement at Saida of French commercial houses, it had a revival of trade in the 17th and part of the 18th century, and became the: principal city on the Syrian coast for commerce between the East and the West (see Memoires du Clevalier d'Arieux [Paris, 1735], 1, 294-379). This was put an end to at the close of last century by violence and oppression. (Ritter, Erdkunde, 17. Theil, 1. Abth. 3. Buch, p. 40, 406), closing a period of prosperity in which the population of the city was at one time estimated at 20,000 inhabitants. Under the Egyptian rule the place again somewhat revived, but in 1840 its fortress was destroyed by the European allies.

3. Present Condition. — The town still shows signs of former wealth, and the houses are better constructed and more solid than those at Tyre, being many of them built of stone. Its chief exports are silk, cotton, and nutgalls  (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 3, 418, 419). The trade between Syria and Europe, however, now mainly passes through Beirut, as its most important commercial center; and the natural advantages of Beirut, in this respect, for the purposes of modern navigation, are so decided that it is certain to maintain its present superiority over Zidon and Tyre.

The modern Saida has thus lost all and everything, and has once more become a poor, miserable place, without trade or manufactures worthy of the name. To add to its desolation, an earthquake, which took place in 1837, destroyed about one, hundred of its insignificant houses. Yet such is its favorable-natural position, and the fruitfulness of the surrounding country, that in 1840 the district of Saida contained about 70,000 inhabitants (above 36,000 Christians and Jews), whose annual tax amounted to about $570,000. It only requires some favorable turn in the tide of its affairs to make it once more lift up its head again as of yore. The population of Saida is estimated at 10,000, of whom about 7000 are Moslems, 500 Jews, and the rest Catholics, Maronites, and Protestants. The city that once divided with Tyre the empire of the seas is now-almost without a vessel, and its commerce is so insignificant that it would not repay even a periodical call of one of the passing steamers. Silk and fruit are its staple products; the latter is not surpassed in variety or quality by any other place in Syria. The harbor was formed by a low ridge of rocks running out from the northern point of the peninsula, parallel to the shoreline. On one of these stands an old castle, which is connected with the town by a bridge of nine arches, forming the picturesque group so well known from engravings. The harbor was counted large in the days of ancient commerce, being sufficient to contain fifty galleys; but the Druse chief Fakhr ed-Din, fearing the Turks, caused it to be filled up with stones and earth, so that now only small boats can enter. Larger vessels, when they come here at all, anchor off to the northward, sheltered only from the south and east winds.

4. Antiquities. — Around the island, on which stand the ruins of the medieval castle, particularly on the south-west side, are remains of quays built of large hewn stones, and similar remains flank the whole of the ridge which forms the northern, harbor. The broad tongue of land which bounds the harbor on the west also bears remains of ancient walls, and on the east side there are two artificial square basins. Antiquities, chiefly of the Christian period, consisting of sarcophagi, cippi, statuettes, trinkets, and tear-vessels, are frequently dug up in the gardens around the town. The  necropolis, situated in the limestone rocks adjacent, contains tombs of various plans and styles, which are minutely described by Renan (Mission en Phoenicia, p. 117). Saida, however, possesses another most vital interest, apart from its faded historical memories. It is the only spot in Phoenicia where Phoenician monuments with Phoenician inscriptions have been found as yet. While the great bulk of paleographical relics of this most important people had been found in; its colonies, Saida alone has furnished no less than three of the most ancient and lengthy inscriptions extant. On Jan. 19, 1855, one of the many sepulchral caves near the city was opened by chance, and there was discovered in it a sarcophagus, the lid of which represented the form of a mummy with the uncovered face of a man.

Twenty two lines of Phoenician writing were found engraved upon the chest of the royal personage — king Ashmanezer II — whom it represents. A smaller, abbreviated inscription runs round the neck. The age of this monument has variously been conjectured as of the 11th century B.C. (Ewald), which is unquestionably wrong; further, as of the 7th, 6th, or 4th respectively by Hitzig, the due de Luynes, Levy, and others. The inscriptions contain principally a solemn injunction, or rather an adjuration, not to disturb the royal remains. Besides this, there is an enumeration of the temples erected by the defunct in honor of the gods. This sarcophagus is now in the Nineveh division of the sculptures in the Louvre. At first sight the material of which it is composed may be easily mistaken, and it has been supposed to be black marble. On the authority, however, of M. Suchard of Paris, who has examined it very closely, it may be stated that the sarcophagus is of black syenite, which, as far ‘as is known, is more abundant in Egypt than elsewhere. It may be added that the features of the countenance on the lid are decidedly of the Egyptian type, and the head- dress is Egyptian, with the head of a bird sculptured on what might seem the place of the right and left shoulder. There can therefore be little reason to doubt that this sarcophagus was either made in Egypt and sent thence to Zidon, or that it was made in Phoenicia in imitation of' similar works of art in Egypt. The inscriptions themselves are the longest Phoenician inscriptions which have come down to our times. A translation of them was published by Prof. Dietrich at Marburg in 1855, and by Ewald at Göttingen in 1856. The king's title is “king of the Zidonians;” and, as is the case with Ethbaal, mentioned in the book of Kings (1Ki 16:31), there must remain a certain doubt whether this was a title ordinarily assumed by kings of Zidon, or whether it had a wider signification. We learn from the inscription that the king's mother was a priestess of Ashtoreth.  The following is a portion of the most remarkable (larger) inscription divided into words (there is no division even of the letters in the original) according to the sense-in some instances merely conjectured-and transcribed into Hebrew characters, to which is subjoined a translation, principally following Munk and Levy, but occasionally differing from either:

בירחבלבשנתעסרוארבער צדנ אליפתחאי

לאמרנגזלתבלעתיבנמסכיממאז אלתשמע

כ תוכלאדמאשיפתחעל בקבר משכבזואליבקשבנמנמכאיממ

ישאאית אליכנלמבנוזרעתחתנמויסגרנמהאלנט בדנמככלממל

כאנכאשמנע מתאנכ מתזואיתזרעממלכתהאאמאדממהמת

The third inscription we have mentioned was discovered a few years ago by consul Moore on another locality Near Saida. It is found on a block sixty-nine centimeters in height, thirty-eight in length, which evidently was once used for building purposes. It is now in the possession of count devogue. The inscription reads as follows.

צדנμכבןבדעשתרת ימלבִדעשתרתמל ִבירח מ בשתלילעשתרת מלגִדנμאיתשׂרנאר

The fragmentary nature of this inscription allows of literary certainty in its deciphering, save with respect to a few proper names. SEE PHOENICIA.

## Zidonian[[@Headword:Zidonian]]

             (Heb. sing. Tsidoni', צַדֹנַי, Eze 32:30; plur. Tsidonim, צַידֹנַים צַידוֹנַים[the full form], or צַדֹנַים[Ezr 3:7, they of Zidon], and [1Ki 11:5; 1Ki 11:33] Tsidongs צַידֹנַין, Sept. Σιδώνιοι Eze 32:30, (στρατηγὶ Α᾿σσούρ]; Vulg. Sidonmi [except Eze 32:30, venatores]; A.V. “Sidonians,” 2 Kings 16:31) the inhabitants of Zidon. They were among the nations of Canaan left to practice the Israelites in the art of war (Jdg 3:3), and colonies of them appear to have spread up into the hill country from Lebanon to Misrephoth-maim, (Jos 13:4; Jos 13:6), whence in later times they hewed cedar-trees for David and Solomon (1Ch 22:4). They oppressed the Israelites on their first entrance into, the country (Jdg 10:12), and appear to have lived a luxurious, reckless life Jdg 15:7); they were skilful in hewing timber (in 5, 6), and were employed for this purpose by Solomon. They were idolaters and  worshipped Ashtoreth as their tutelary goddess (Jdg 11:5; Jdg 11:33; 2Ki 23:13), as well as the sun-god Baal, from whom their king was named (1Ki 16:31). The term Zidonian among the Hebrews appears to have been extended in meaning as that of Phoenician among the Greeks. Zidonian worm en (Tsedeniyoth', צֵדְנַיּוֹת; Sept. Σύραι, Vulg. Sidoniae) were in Solomon's harem (11, 1), SEE ZIDON.

## Ziegelbauer, Magnoald[[@Headword:Ziegelbauer, Magnoald]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1696 at Elwangen, Suabia. In 1707 he entered the brotherhood of the Benedictine friars, and taught philosophy and theology at the convent of Zwiefalten and that of Reichenau. After having resided for a time near the learned, priest Bessel of Gottenich, who had been appointed to instruct the young friars, he passed many years at Vienna, and at Braunau and Prague, in Bohemia, and assisted in reorganizing the academic college at the last-named place. In 1747 he went to occupy the position of secretary of the Academy of the Unknown at Olmütz. Here he prepared a book in which he wished to call the attention of the pope to numerous abuses introduced among the clergy of these countries. Those interested in suppressing the publication of this work administered to him a poison powder by a physician. He died June 14, 1750, at Olmiutz. We have from Ziegeibauer, Historische Nachricht von der S. Georgenfahne (Vienna, 1735): — Acta S. Stephani Protomaityris (ibid. 1736), in German: — Novus Rei Litterarice Ord. S. Benedicti Conspectus (Ratisbon, 1739), a prospectus of a large and excellent collection which was published by Legipont after his death under the title Historia Rei Litter. Ord. S. Benedicti (Augsburg, 1754): — Elpitome Historica Monasterii Brennoniensis prope Pragam (Cologne, 1740): — Sponsalia Virginis (Konigshofen, 1740): — Historia Didactica de Crucis Cultu in Od. S. Benedicti (Vienna, 1746): — Centifolium Camaldulense (ibid. 1750), which is a prospectus of the historical library of the Camaldules. Ziegelbauer left in manuscript several works, such as Olomucium Sacrum and Bibliotheca Bohemica. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Ziegenbalg, Bartholomaus[[@Headword:Ziegenbalg, Bartholomaus]]

             a well-known Protestant missionlry of Germany, was born June 14, 1683, at Pulsnitz, in Lusatia. He studied at Halle, where A.H. Francke enlisted him for missionary service. On November 29, 1705, he left for Tranquebar with his friend Pliitschow. For a time his work was opposed by the Danish officers, but finally he succeeded. Having mastered the language, he translated Luther's smaller catechism, the New Test., and commenced the translation of the Old Test. into the Malabar language. He also founded schools and built chapels there. In 1714 he returned to Europe, to return again to Tranquebar in 1716, where he died, February 23, 1719. He published, Grammatica Damulica (Halle, 1716): — together with J.E. Grundler, he published Theologia Thetica in qua Omnia Dogmata ad Salutem Cognoscendam Necessaria Perspicua Methodo Tractantur, etc. (2d ed. Halle, 1856). — See German, Ziegenbalg und Plutschow (Erlangen, 1868, 2 vols.); Theologisches Universallexikon, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:1491. (B. P.)

## Ziegenbein, Johann Wilhelm Heinrich[[@Headword:Ziegenbein, Johann Wilhelm Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in 1766 at Braunschweig. In 1798 he was appointed pastor of St. Peter's, in his native place, and advanced in 1803 as general superintendent of the duchy of Blankenburg. In 1819 he was appointed abbot of Michaelstein, and died January 12, 1824. Ziegenbein's writings are mostly of a pedagogical nature. He translated froni the French Senebrier's lives of Calvin and Beza (Hamburg, 1789); from the English Priestley's Comparison of the Institutions of Moses with those of the Hindus and other Ancient Nations; The Life of Gibbon, etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 4:793 sq; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:142; 2:73, 95, 228, 237, 239, 245, 248, 260, 339, 354; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:550. (B.P.)

## Ziegler, Daniel, D.D[[@Headword:Ziegler, Daniel, D.D]]

             a German Reformed minister, was born at Reading, Pennsylvania, July 11, 1804. His parents removing to New Berlin, Union County, in his infancy, his youth was spent there. He was a saddler by trade, and went to Philadelphia to work; but his mind being turned towards the ministry, he entered the University of Pennsylvania, located at Philadelphia; studied theology in the seminary of the Reformed Church at Carlisle; was licensed in 1830, and became pastor of some congregations in York County; was called to the Kreutzcreek charge, where he spent the whole of his life, with the exception of the last few years, which were devoted to the First Reformed Church in York. He died May 23, 1876. He preached almost exclusively in German which he spoke with great fluency, accuracy, and elegance. His preaching was calm, clear, and impressive. He was a man of culture, pleasant, open-hearted, kind, and sympathizing. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Germ. Ref. Church, 5:199.

## Ziegler, Werner Carl Ludwig[[@Headword:Ziegler, Werner Carl Ludwig]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born May 15, 1763, at Scharnebeck, in Luneburg. He studied at Gottingen, some time lectured in the Gbttingen University, and was called, in 1792, as professor of theology at Rostock. He died April 24, 1809, leaving, De Mimis Romanorum Commentatio (Gottingen, 1788): — Vollstandige Einleitung in den Brief an die Hebraer (ibid. 1791): — Progr. Adit. Historia Dogmatis de Redemptione, etc. (ibid. eod.): — Beitrage zur Geschichte des Glaubens an das Daseyn Gottes in der Theologie (ibid 1792). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 4:798 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:32, 90, 211, 572, 596, 599, 610; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:551. (B.P.)

## Zierold, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Zierold, Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 14, 1669, at Neustadt- oberWiesenthal, in Meissen. He studied at Leipsic, travelled extensively through Austria, Holland, and' England, was appointed, in 1696, pastor and professor of theology at the Groningen College in Stargard, received the doctorate of theology in 1698, and died September 1, 1731. He wrote, Analogismus Nominum et Rerum ex Psalms 1 (Stargard, 1701): — היטב בארoder deutliche Erlauterungen der heiligen Schrift (Leipsic, 1715): — Der Prediger Salomo aus der Bedeutung der Buchstaben (ibid. eod.): —  Der Prophet Obadja, etc. (ibid. eod.): — Der Prophet Joel, etc. (ibid. 1720). — See Hildebrand, Hirten nach dem Herzen Gottes zu Stargard; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:551. (B.P.)

## Zif[[@Headword:Zif]]

             (Heb. Ziv, זְו, bloom; Sept. Ζιού v.r. Νεισώ, Vulg. Zio), the early name (1Ki 6:1; 1Ki 6:37) of the second Hebrew month IYAR SEE IYAR (q.v.), corresponding to April or May. SEE CALENDAR.

## Zigabenus, Euthymius[[@Headword:Zigabenus, Euthymius]]

             SEE EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS.

## Ziha[[@Headword:Ziha]]

             (Heb. Tsicha'. צַיחָא,' parched; Sept. Σιαά v.r. Σηά, Σουαά, Σουθιά, etc.; Vulg. Siha, Soha, Soaha), the name of two Hebrews.

1. One of the Nethinim whose “children” returned from Babylon with Ze'rubbabel (Ezr 2:43; Neh 7:46). B.C. ante 53.

2. First named of the two chief Nethinim resident in Ophel after the Captivity (Neh 11:21). B.C. 536.

## Ziim[[@Headword:Ziim]]

             SEE TSIYIM.

## Ziklag[[@Headword:Ziklag]]

             (Heb. Tsikclag צַקְלִג [on pause צַקַלָג, fully Tsikelag'; צַיקַלִג 1Ch 12:20], winding [Fürst]; Sept. Σεκελά or Σικελάγ v.r. Σικελά etc.; Josephus, Σίκελλα, Ant. 6:13, 10; 14, 6; Steph., Byz. Σέκελα; Vulg. Siceleg), a place which possesses a special interest from its having been the residence and the private property of David. It is first mentioned in the catalogue: of the towns of Judah in Joshua 15 where it is enumerated (Jos 15:31) among those of the extreme south, between Hormah (or Zephath) and Madmannah (possibly Beth-marcaboth). It next occurs in the same connection, among the places which were allotted out of the territory of Judah to Simeon (Jos 19:5). We next encounter it in the possession of the Philistines (1Sa 27:6), when it was, at David's request, bestowed upon him by Achish king of Gath. He resided there for a year and four months (1Sa 27:7; 1 Samuel 31; 1Sa 14:26; 1Ch 12:1; 1Ch 12:20; Josephus [Ant. 6:13, 10] gives this, as one, month and twenty-days). It was there he received the news of Saul's death (2Sa 1:1; in, 2Sa 1:10). He then relinquished it for Hebron (2, 1). Ziklag is finally mentioned, in company with, Beer-sheba, Hazarshual, and other towns of the south, as being reinhabited by the people of Judani after their return from the Captivity (Neh 11:28).

The situation of the town is difficult to determine, notwithstanding so many notices. On the other hand, that it was in “the south” (Negeb) seems certain, both from the towns named with it, and also from its mention with “the south of the Cherethites” and “the south of Caleb” some of whose  descendants we know were at Ziph and Maon, perhaps even at Paran (1Sa 25:1). On the other hand, this is difficult to reconcile with its connection with the Philistines and with the fact which follows from the narrative of 1 Samuel 30 (see 1Sa 30:9-10; 1Sa 30:21) that it was north of the brook Besor. The word employed in 1Sa 27:5; 1Sa 27:7; 1Sa 27:11, to denote the region in which it stood is peculiar. It is not hash-Shephelah, as it must have been had Ziklag stood in the ordinary lowland of Philistia, but has-Sadeh, which Prof. Stanley (Sin and Pal. App. § 15) renders “the field.” On the whole, though the temptation is strong to suppose (as some have suggested) that there were two places of the same name, the only conclusion seems to be that Ziklag was in the south country, with a portion of which the Philistines had a connection, which man have lasted from the time of their residence there in the days of Abraham and Isaac. Ziklag does not appear to have been known to Eusebius and Jerome, or to any .f the older travelers. Mr. Rowlands, however, in his journey from Gaza to Suez in 1842 (in Williams, Holy City, 1, 463-468), was told of “an ancient site called Asluj, or Kasluj, with some ancient walls,” three hours east of Sebata, which again was two hours and a half south of Khalasa. This he considers as identical with Ziklag. Dr. Robinson had previously (in 1838) heard of Aslui as lying south-west of Milh, on the way to Abdeh (Bibl. Res. 2, 201), a position not discordant with that of Mr. Rowlands. The identification is supported by Mr. Wilton (Negeb, p. 209); but in the Arabic form of the name. the similarity which prompted Mr. Rowlands's conjecture almost entirely disappears (עשלג צקלג). — Smith. The English engineers think that they have discovered the name and site of Ziklag in the ruins still called Khirbet Zuheilikah, occupying three small hills, nearly half a mile apart, in the form of an equilateral triangle, together with ancient cities, situated in an open, rolling plain eleven miles east-southeast of Gaza, and nineteen south-west of Beit-Jibrin. (Quar. Report of Pal. Explor. Fund, Jan. 1878, p. 12 sq.). SEE SIMEON.

## Zillah[[@Headword:Zillah]]

             (Heb. Tsillah', צַלָּה, shade; Sept. Σελλά; Vulg. Sella), last named of the two wives of Lamech the Cainite, to whom he addressed his song (Gen 4:19; Gen 4:22-23). B.C. cir. 3500. She was the mother of Tubal- Cain and Naamah. Dr. Kalisch (Common Genesis) regards the names of Lamechts wives and of his daughters as significant of the transition into the period of, art, which took place in his time, and the corresponding change  in the position of the woman. “Naamah signifies the lovely, beautiful woman; while the wife of the first man was simply Eve, the life-giving.... The women were, in the age of Lamech, no more regarded merely as the propagators of the human family; beauty and gracefulness began to command homage.... Even the wives of Lamech manifest the transition into this epoch of beauty; for while one wife, Zillah, reminds still of assistance and protection (shadow), the other, Adah, bears a name almost synonymous with Naamah, and likewise signifying ornament and loveliness.” In the apocryphal book of Jasar, Adah and Zillah are both daughters of Cainan. Adah bare children, but Zillah was barren till her old age, in consequence of some noxious draught which her husband gave her to preserve her beauty and to prevent her from bearing. SEE LAMECH.

## Ziller, Tuiskon[[@Headword:Ziller, Tuiskon]]

             a German philosopher, was born December 22, 1817, and died April 20, 1882, at Leipsic, doctor and professor of philosophy. He was a pupil of Herbart, whose system he followed. Ziller published, Die Regierung der Kinder (1859): — Grundlegung zur, Lehre vom erziehenden Unterricht (1861): — Vorlesungen uber allgemeine Padagogik (1876): — Allgemeine philosophische Ethik (1880). In 1860 he started with Allihn the Zeitschrift fur exakte Philosophie im Sinne des neueren philosophischen Realismus. He also organized the society of scientific pedagogics, whose organ, the Jahrbucher, he edited for fourteen years. (B.P.)

## Zillerthal[[@Headword:Zillerthal]]

             a valley of Tyrol, stretching for about five miles along the Ziller, between Salzburg and Innsbrtick, and inhabited by about 15,000 souls, has become memorable in Church history on account of the infamous manner in which the Roman Catholic clergy succeeded in suppressing an evangelical rising which took place in our century. As in other countries of Germany, the Reformation found its way into Salzburg and Tyrol, but it was suppressed, in the latter part of the 16th century, in Salzburg, by the archbishops, and in Tyrol by the government, in connection with the nobility and the ecclesiastics. In 1730 archbishop Frinian inaugurated a cruel persecution, with a view of exterminating all adherents to the evangelical faith. Nevertheless it reappeared in the Zillerthal in the beginning of the present century. As soon as the Roman clergy became aware of the danger, the number of, priests was doubled in the villages and the strictest watch was kept. When, in 1832, the emperor Francis of Austria visited the valley, the evangelical Zillerthalers petitioned him in behalf of their religion. The emperor promised to do what he could. When the Roman clergy became aware of this, they resorted to violent measures. The toleration edict of Joseph II, and the stipulations of the congress of Vienna, were thrown  aside, and, instigated by the fanatical clergy, the provincial estates of Tyrol decreed that no split in the Church of the country should be allowed, that those who would not conform to the Church of Rome should leave the country and settle under an evangelical prince. But before this could be effected the Evangelicals had to suffer many things. Being under the ban of the Church, their neighbors were warned against holding any kind of intercourse with them. The children of the Evangelicals were forced to frequent the Roman Catholic schools where they were placed on separate seats, as "children of the devil," apart from the "Christian children." When, after eleven years of perpetual chicanery, the Evangelicals were advised from Vienna that they could emigrate, they addressed themselves to Friedrich Wilhelm III of Prussia, in 1837, and by his humane intercession they were allowed to sell their estates and remove to his dominions, where they were settled, four hundred and forty-eight souls, in Hohen-Mittel, and Nieder-Zillerthal, in Silesia. See Rheinwald, Die Evangelischegesinnten im Zillerthal (Berlin, 1837); Evangelische Kirchenzeitung (1835), pages 813- 815, 820-823; (1836), page 132; (1837), page 343; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Zilliox, Jacob, D.D[[@Headword:Zilliox, Jacob, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic monk, was born October 14, 1849, in Newark, N.J. He was educated at St. Mary's Academy and St. Vincent's College, in Pennsylvania, then went to the American College at Rome, and from there to the Jesuit University at Innspruck. He returned to America in 1875, and became professor of theology in St. Vincent's College, and in 1880 prefect. In 1885 he was elected abbot of the Order of St. Benedict, with headquarters at Newark. He died December 31, 1890.

## Zilpah[[@Headword:Zilpah]]

             (Heb. Tsilpah', זַלַפָּה, a trickling; Sept. Ζελφά v.r. Ζελφάν; Josephus, Ζελφά,l Ant. 1, 19,7; Vulg. Zelpha), a female servant of Laban, whom he gave to Leah on her marriage with Jacob (Gen 29:24), and whom Leah eventually induced him to take as a concubine wife, in which capacity she became the mother of Gad and Asher (Gen 30:9-13; Gen 35:26; Gen 37:2; Genesis 46, 18). B.C. 1919.

## Zilthai[[@Headword:Zilthai]]

             (Heb. Tsiltay', צַלְתִּיshady or my shadows; Sept. Σαλαθί v.r. Σαλεί and Σαμαθί; Vulg. Salathi and Selathai), the name of two Hebrews.

1. Fifth named of the nine “sons” of Shimhi, and one of the Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:20). B.C. post 1612.

2. Last named of the seven Manassite captains who joined David at Zik-lag (1Ch 12:20). B.C. 1054.

## Zimmah[[@Headword:Zimmah]]

             (Heb. Zimmah', זַמָּה, purpose; Sept. Ζεμμά v.r. Ζαμμάμ and Ζεμάθ; Vulg. Zemma or Zamma), the name of two or three Levites.

1. A Gershonite, “son” of Jahath and father of Joah (1Ch 6:20); probably the same with the “son” of Shimei and father of Jahath (1Ch 6:42). B.C. post 1874.

2. Father or ancestor of Joah, which latter was a Gershonite in the reign of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12). B.C. ante 726. At a much earlier period we find the same collocation of names, Zimmah and Joah as father and son (1Ch 6:20). This is but an evidence of the frequent recurrence of the same names in a family (comp. “Mahath the son of Amasai” in 2Ch 29:12 with the same in 1Ch 6:35; “Joel the son of Azariah” in 2Ch 29:12 ‘and 1Ch 6:36; and “Kish the son of Abdi” in 2Ch 29:12 with “Kishi the son of Abdi” in 1Ch 6:44).

## Zimmer, Patriz Benedict[[@Headword:Zimmer, Patriz Benedict]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born February 22, 1752. He studied theology and philosophy, received holy orders in 1775, was made professor of dogmatics at Ingolstadt in 1789, and died at Steinheim, October 16, 1820. He wrote, Theologiae Christianae Theoreticae Systema (Detlingen, 1787): — Veritas Christianae Religionis (Augsburg, 1789- 90): — Theologia Christiana Specialis et Theoretica (Landshut, 1802- 1806): — Philosophische Religionslehre (ibid. 1805): — Untersuchung uber den allgemeinen Verfall des menschl. Geschlechts (ibid. 1809): — Untersuchung uber den Begriff und die Gesetze der Geschichte (Munich, 1818). See his biography in Widmer's edition of Sailer's works, 38:117 sq., and appendix to his biography (Uri, 1823); Denzinger, Religiose Erkenntniss, 1:209 sq., 540 sq.; Werner, Gesch. der kathol. Theologie, page 254 sq., 310 sq.; Theol. Universallexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Zimmermann, Ernst[[@Headword:Zimmermann, Ernst]]

             a brother of Karl, was born September 18, 1786. Like his brother, he studied theology and philology at Giessen. In 1805 he was "called as assistant preacher and teacher to Auerbach (where he published an edition  of Euripides [Frankfort, 1808 sq.], and Suetonius's History of the Roman Emperors [Darmstadt, 1810]). In 1809 he was appointed deacon at Grossgerau, in 1814 advanced as court-deacon and in 1816 made court- preacher, at the same time acting as tutor of prince Ludwig of Anhalt- Kochen. He died June 24, 1832, having been appointed prelate. He was an excellent preacher, and his homiletical works are still of great value. Besides sermons, he published, Homiletisches Handbuch fur denkende Prediger (Frankfort, 1812-22, 4 volumes): — Monatsschrift fur Predigerwissenschaften (Darmstadt, 1821-24, 6 volumes): — Jahrbuch der theol. Literatur (Essen, 1832-36, 4 volumes): — Geist aus Luther's Schriften (Darmstadt, 1828-31, 4 volumes). In 1822 he commenced the Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung, which is still published. See Karl Zimmermann, Ernst Zimmermann nach seinem Leben, Wirken u. Character geschildert (Darmstadt, 1833); Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:1497 sq.; Theo. Universallexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Zimmermann, Johann Christian[[@Headword:Zimmermann, Johann Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Langenwiesen, near Ilmenau, August 12, 1702. He studied at Leipsic, and was appointed court- chaplain at Hanover in 1738. In 1743 he was called as provost and superintendent to Ueltzen, in Hanover, where he died, May 28, 1783. He is the author of several hymns, which are found in Vermehrtes Hanoverisches Kirchen-Gesangbuch (edited by Zimmermann, Hanover, 1740). See Koch, Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:566 sq. (B.P.)

## Zimmermann, Johann Jakob (1)[[@Headword:Zimmermann, Johann Jakob (1)]]

             an eloquent German preacher, was born in the duchy of Wurtemberg in 1644. He was generally regarded as a disciple of Boehman and Brouqnelle, whose doctrines he rendered highly popular, making many converts in Germany and the united provinces of the Netherlands. He was for some years professor of mathematics at Heidelberg. He was about to depart for America to escape the persecution to which his preaching had subjected him, when he died at Rotterdam, in 1693. The most noted of his works is entitled a Revelation of Antichrist.

## Zimmermann, Johann Jakob (2)[[@Headword:Zimmermann, Johann Jakob (2)]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born in 1685, became professor at Zurich in 1737, and died in 1756. He introduced more liberal views in his teaching than had  been current hitherto, and was often suspected of heresy. See Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:113; Frintzsche, Dissertation (Zurich, 1841); Schweitzer, Centraldogmen, 2:791 sq.

## Zimmermann, Karl[[@Headword:Zimmermann, Karl]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Darmstadt, August 23, 1803. He studied theology and philology at Giessen, and, after having labored for some nyears in the department of education, was appointed deacon to the court-church at Darmstadt in 1832. From that time he remained in the ministry, advancing rapidly, and was appointed in 1842 first preacher to the court. In 1847 he was made prelate and member of consistory, and filled this high position till 1872, when he retired. He died June 12, 1877. To him the Gustavus Adolphus Society (q.v.) is much indebted for the great interest and activity he showed in its behalf. His publications, mostly sermons, are all specified by Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:1495-97. See also Theol. Universallexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Zimmermann, Mathias[[@Headword:Zimmermann, Mathias]]

             a German theologian, was born at Ypres, September 21, 1625. He began his studies in his native village, and afterwards went to the College of Thun (1639), and thence (1644) to the University of Strasburg, where he studied philosophy. Having decided upon a religious career, he studied at Leipsic, and in 1651 returned home. He was soon nominated rector of the College of Leutsch, in Upper Hungary, but the next year (1652) returned home again. Soon afterwards the elector of Saxony appointed him a colleague of the superintendent of Colditz, and the minister and superintendent of Meissen. He had prepared himself for those positions by a license in theology (November 1661), and in 1666 was made doctor in the university at Leipsic, but died suddenly, November 29, 1689, leaving many religious works, which are enumerated in the Biog. Universelle, s.v.

## Zimmermann, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Zimmermann, Wilhelm]]

             historian and controversialist of Neustadt, in the duchy of Wurtemberg, was preacher at Wimpfew in 1569, member of consistory and court- preacher at Heidelberg in 1578, and finally (in 1586) inspector of churches and schools at Grotz. He left a Historia Germanicae, and some Litterae, which are inserted by Fecht in his collection of Epistola Theologicae.

## Zimran[[@Headword:Zimran]]

             (Heb. Zimran', זַמְרָן, celebrated; Sept. Σομβρᾶν v.r. Ζεμβράμ, Σεβραν, etc.; Vulg. Zama and Zacinr-imr), first named of the nine sons of Abraham by Keturah (Gen 25:2; 1 Chronicles 1, 32). B.C. cir. 2020. His descendants are not mentioned, nor is any hint given that he was the founder of a tribe; the contrary would rather appear to be the case. Some would identify Zimran with the Zimri of Jer 25:25, but these lay too far to the north. The Greek form of the name, as found in the Sept., has suggested a comparison with Ζαβράμ, the chief city of the Cinaedocolpitae, who dwelt On the Red Sea, west of Mecca. But this is extremely doubtful, for this tribe, probably the same with the ancient Kenda, was a branch of the Joktanite Arabs, who in the most ancient times occupied Yemen, and may only have come into possession of Zabram at a later period (Knobe], Genesis). Hitzig and Lengerke propose to connect the name Zimrari with Zimi? is a district of Ethiopia mentioned by Pliny (36, 25); but Grotius, with more plausibility, finds a trace of it in the Zameneni, a tribe of the interior of Arabia (Pliny, 6:32). ‘The identification of Zimran with the modern Beni Omrnan and the ..Banin Zomneis of Diodorus, proposed by Mr. Forster (Geogr. of Arabia, 1, 431), cannot be seriously maintained. Winer (Handw. s.v.), suggests the Zimara of Asia Minor (Ptolemy, 5, 7, 2; Pliny, 10:20) or Zimycra (Zilpa) of Asia (Ptolemy, 6:17, 8). SEE ARABIA.

## Zimri[[@Headword:Zimri]]

             (Heb. Zimni', זַמַרַי, my song or celebrated; Sept. Ζαμβρί; Josephus, Ζαμάρης, Ant. 8:12, 5; Vulg. Zambri), the name of several Hebrews, and apparently one foreign tribe.

1. First named of the five sons of Zerah the son of Judah (1Ch 2:6). B.C. post 1874.

2. The son of Salu, a Simeonitish chieftain slain by Phinehas with the Midianitish princess Cozbi (Num 25:14). B.C. 1618. When the Israelites at Shittim were smitten with plagues for their impure worship of Baal Peor, and were weeping before the tabernacle, Zimri, with a shameless disregard of his own high position and the sufferings of his tribe, brought into their presence the Midianites, in the sight of Moses and in the sight of the whole congregation. The fierce anger of Phinehas was aroused, and in the swift vengeance with which he pursued the offenders, he gave the first indication of that uncompromising spirit which characterized him in later life. The whole circumstance is much softened in the narrative of Josephus (Ant. 4:6, 10-12), and in the hands of the: apologist is divested of all its vigor and point. In the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel several traditional details are added. Zimri retorts upon Moses that he himself had taken to wife a Midianitess, and twelve miraculous signs attend the vengeance of Phinehas. SEE PHINEHAS.

In describing the scene of this tragedy an unusual word is employed the force of which is lost in the rendering, “tent” of the A.V. of Num 25:8. It was not the ohel or ordinary tent of the encampment, but the קָה, kupbah (whence Span. alcoba and our alcove), or dome-shaped tent to which Phinehas pursued his victims. Whether this was the tent which Zimri occupied as chief of his tribe, and which was in consequence more elaborate and highly ornamented than the rest, or whether it was, as Gesenius suggests, one of the tents which the Midianites used for the worship of Peor, is not to be determined, though the latter is favored by the rendering of the Vulg. lupanar. The word does not occur elsewhere in Hebrew. In the Syriac it is rendered a “cell,” or inner apartment of the tent. See Harem.

3. The son of Azmaveth (rather Jehoadah or Jarah) and father of Moza in the lineage of king Saul (1 Chronicles 3:36; 9:42). B.C. cir. 945.

4. The fifth sovereign of the separate kingdom of Israel, of which he occupied the throne for the brief period of seven days in the year B.C. 926. Originally in command of half the chariots in the royal army, he gained the crown by the murder of king Elah son of Baasha, who, after reigning for something more than a year (comp. 1Ki 16:8; 1Ki 16:10), was indulging in  a drunken revel in the house of his steward Arza at Tirzah, then the capital. In the midst of this festivity Zimri killed him, and immediately afterwards all the rest of Baasha's family. But the army which at that time was besieging the Philistine town of Gibbethon, when they heard of Elah's murder, proclaimed their general Omri king. He immediately marched against Tirzah and took the city. Zimri retreated into the innermost part of the late king's palace, set it on fire, and perished in the ruins (1Ki 16:9-20). Ewald's inference from Jezebel's speech to Jehu (2Ki 9:31) that on Elah's death the queen mother welcomed his murderer with smiles and blandishments seems rather arbitrary and far-fetched. The word is אִרַמוֹן, which Ewald (after J. D. Michaelis) in both the above passages insists on translating “harem,” with which word he thinks that it is etymologically connected, and hence seeks confirmation of his view that Zimri was a voluptuous slave of women. But its root seems to be אָרִם“to be high” (Gesenius); and in other passages, especially Pro 18:19, the meaning is “a lofty fortress,” rather than “a harem.” Ewald, in his sketch of Zimri, is perhaps somewhat led astray by the desire of finding a historical parallel with Sardanapalus. SEE ISRAEL.

5. An obscure name, mentioned (Jer 20:5) in probable connection with Dedan, Tema, Buz, Arabia (עֲרָב, the mingled people “ereb'” (הָעֶרֶב) all of which immediately precede it, besides other peoples, and followed by Elam, the Medes, and others. The passage is of wide comprehension, but the reference, as indicated above, seems to be to a tribe of the sons of the East, the Beni-Kedem. Nothing further is known respecting Zimri, but it may possibly be the same as, or derived from, ZIMRAN SEE ZIMRAN (q.v.).

## Zin[[@Headword:Zin]]

             (Heb. Tsin צַן [with. ה directive, Tsinah, צַנָה, Num 34:4; or Tsintnah, צַנָּה, Joshua 10; Joshua , 3 ], a flat [plain or palm-tree]; Sept. Σίν v.r. Σινά ‘etc.; Vulg. Sin), a wilderness (מַדַבָּר) or open, uncultivated region on the south of Palestine and westward from Idumaea, in which was situated the city of Kadesh-barnea (Num 13:22; Num 20:1; Num 27:14; Num 33:36; Num 34:3; Deu 32:51; Jos 15:1). It evidently was a portion of the desert tract between the Dead Sea, Ghor, and Arabah (possibly including the two latter, or portions of them) on the east and the general plateau of the Tih which stretches westward. The country in  question consists of two or three successive terraces of mountain converging to an acute angle (like stairs where there is a turn in the flight) at the Dead Sea's southern verge, towards which also they slope. Here the drainage finds its chief vent by the Wady el-Fikreh into the Ghor, the remaining waters running by smaller channels into the Arabah, and ultimately by the Wady el-Jeib also to the Ghor. Judging from natural features in the vagueness of authority, it is likely that the portion between and drained by these wadies is the region in question; but where it ended westward, whether at any of the above -named terraces or blending imperceptibly with that of Paran, is quite uncertain. Josephus (Ant. 4:4, 6) speaks of a “hill called Sin” (Σίν) where Miriam, who died in Kadesh, when the people had “come to the desert of Zin,” was buried. This “Sin” of Josephus may recall the name Zin, and, being applied to a hill, may, perhaps, indicate the most singular and wholly isolated conical acclivity named Moderah (Madura, or Madara), standing a little south of the Wady Fikreh, near its outlet into the Ghor. This would precisely agree with the tract. of country above indicated (Num 20:1; see Seetzen,Reisen, 3, Hebron to Madara; Wilton, Negeb, p. 127, 134). SEE KADESH.

## Zina[[@Headword:Zina]]

             (Heb. Zina', זַינָא, perhaps abundance; Sept. Ζιζά, Vulg. Ziza), second named of the four sons' of Shimei the Gershonite (1Ch 23:10). B.C. 1043. In 1Ch 23:11.he is called ZIZAH SEE ZIZAH (q.v.), and some MSS. here have Ziza (זיזא), like the Sept. aid Vulg.

## Zingerle, Pius[[@Headword:Zingerle, Pius]]

             a Roman Catholic Orientalist, was born at Meran, March 17, 1801, and died January 10, 1881. at Mariaberg, Tyrol. He published, Echte Akten heiliger Martyrer des Morgenlandes, aus dem Syrischen ubersetzt (Innsbruck, 1836, 2 volumes): — Clemens Romanus' zwei Briefe an die Jungfrauen, aus dem Syrischen mit Anmerkungen (Vienna, 1827): — Ephraem Syrus' auserwahlte Schriften (Innsbruck, 1830-34, 5 volumes); besides, he contributed largely to the Zeitschrift of the German Oriental Society. (B.P.)

## Zinzendorf, Nicholas Lewis, Count Von, D.D[[@Headword:Zinzendorf, Nicholas Lewis, Count Von, D.D]]

             founder of the Herrnhuters, or Moravian Brethren, was born at Dresden, May 26, 1700. According to his own account (in his Natural Reflections on Various Subjects), he aspired to form a society of believers from his boyhood. On coming of age in 1721, he settled, with this object in view, on his estate at Berthelsdorf, in Upper Lusatia and was there joined by several proselytes from Bohemia. By 1732 the numbers who had flocked around him amounted to six hundred, and all these were subject to a species of ecclesiastical discipline or monastic despotism which brought them in spirit and body, or was intended so to do, under the most absolute control of their leader. From an adjacent hill called the Luthberg was derived the name of the colony, Huth des Herrn, contracted to Herrnhut, and from this the name of the sect. The appellation Moravian Brethren was assumed for  his party by count Zinzendorf for the sake of connection with the separatists of Bohemia and Moravia, partly derived from Valdo, the forerunner of Luther, some of these, indeed, were among his colonists. Zinzendorf assumed various titles as the chief of the Herrnhuters, all of which really pointed to a pontificate as his function.

From 1733 his missionaries began to spread, not only over parts of Europe but in Greenland and North America; even Africa and China were not forgotten. To him, in fact, Wesley was directly indebted both for his religious organization at his missionary plans which became so eminently successful, that indefatigable laborer having passed some time with count Zinzenidorf at Herrnhut. The interference of the government with the count's projects can hardly be regarded as a measure of persecution, as secret doctrines were undoubtedly held by him, and thus motives given to his followers, and objects sought, of which, whether good or evil, the established authorities could take no cognizance. The history of the sect is curious and interesting. Next to its organization in classes, the use of singing, which furnished the Wesleys with a valuable hint, is one of its most remarkable characteristics; under this head some singular details might be given. Something might be said also on the connection of a certain marriage-rite with the theory of regeneration, the efficacy of which was probably tried by the Herrnhuters in common with the Quakers. Count Zinzeldorf died among his people, May 9, 1760. SEE MORAVIANS. (W. P. S.)

ADDENDUM FROM VOLUME 12:

Zinzendorf, Nicholas Lewis, Count Von is entitled to a fuller notice than space allowed in volume 10. The founder of the modern Moravian Church was born at Dresden, May 26, 1700, and died at Herrnhut, Saxony, May 9, 1760. He was descended from an ancient Austrian family. For the sake of the Protestant faith his grandfather relinquished broad domains in Austria, and settled in Franconia. When he was but six weeks old, his father, one of the cabinet ministers of the elector of Saxony, died while several years later his mother married the field- marshal Von Natzmar, of the Prussian army, and removed to Berlin. Young Zinzendorf did not accompany her, but remained with his grandmother, the baroness Catharine von Gersdorf, one of the most distinguished women of her day, who had organized a Spenerian ecclesiola in her castle of Gross Hennersdorf. That he was intrusted to her care proved to be an important event in his life. Amid the influences of that ecclesiola he spent his childhood, daily breathing the atmosphere of a transparent piety. His grandmother and aunt Henrietta shaped his religious development. When he was not yet four years old he grasped, with a clear perception and a flood of feeling, Christ's relation to man as a Savior and divine brother. This consciousness produced a love for Jesus which was the holy and perpetual fire on the altar of his heart; so that in mature years he could truthfully exclaim: "I have but one passion; and it is He — He only!"

In 1710 he was sent to the Royal Paedagogium at Halle, at the head of which stood the celebrated Francke; in 1716 he entered the University of Wittenberg; and in 1719, in accordance with the custom of young nobles of that day, began his travels. During all these years he confessed Christ with youthful enthusiasm, and labored for his cause with manly courage. At Halle he organized a fraternity among the students, known as "The Order of the Grain of Mustard Seed;"' at Wittenberg he exercised no little  influence; in Paris, where he spent an entire winter, neither the blandishments of the royal court nor the flatteries of the highest nobles could seduce him from the path of godliness. His commentary on the French capital, with its hollow gayeties and carnal frivolities, was: "O Splendida Miseria!" while the impression which an exquisite Ecce Homo — with the inscription, "Hoc feci pro te, quid facis pro me?" — in the picture-gallery of Dusseldorf made upon his heart followed him through life.

When Zinzendorf returned from his journey, it was his earnest wish to devote himself, in spite of his rank, to the ministry of the gospel. But neither his mother nor grandmother would listen to such a proposition, and insisted upon his adopting, like his father, the career of a statesman. With a heavy heart he yielded, and in 1721 accepted a position as Aulic and Justicial Councillor at Dresden. His purpose to promote the cause of Christ remained, however, unshaken, and soon after attaining his majority he purchased the domain of Berthelsdorf in Upper Lusatia, with the intention of making that the centre of his Christian activity. In what such activity was to consist he did not as yet know. He was supported in his purpose by his young wife, the countess Erdmuth Dorothy von Reuss, whom he married in 1722, and through whom he became connected with several of the royal houses of Europe. Of the manner in which he was led to grant an asylum on his newly-purchased estate to the remnant of the Moravian Brethren, of the renewal of their Church through his agency, and of the peculiar character which he gave to it, a full account may be found in the article on the MORAVIAN BRETH-REN, 2, 6:585, etc.

In all that he undertook in this respect his aim was, not to interfere with the established Church, but rather to make the Moravians, a Church within that Church. His course was misunderstood and excited bitter opposition. In 1736 he was banished from Saxolny, and, two years later, as he refused to sign a bond. acknowledging himself guilty of "of fences," banished "forever." The same result which generally grows out of religious persecutions appeared in this case also. His enemies overreached themselves. Instead of putting a stop to his Christian activity, it grew in importance and extended far and wide.

A "Church of Pilgrims," as it was called, gathered around Zinzendorf, composed of the members of his family and his chief ministerial coadjutors, and itinerated to various parts of Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and England, everywhere making known. the renewal of the Unitas Fratrum, and attracting large numbers to its communion. Zinzendorf, with the aid of his fellowlaborers, directed the entire work of the Moravians in Christian and heathen lands. He had long since resigned his civil office at Dresden,  and devoted himself to the ministry; and now, May 25, 1737, at the recommendation of the king of Prussia, he was consecrated, at Berlin, a bishop of the Unitas Fratrum, by bishops Jablonsky and David Nitschmann. In the following year he set out on a tour of inspection to the mission in St. Thomas, and in 1741 visited America. His course continued to excite opposition, and brought upon him personal defamation of the grossest character.

Few servants of the Lord have suffered more in this. respect. But he leaned upon the strong arm of his divine Master, and gradually won the victory. The Saxon government recalled him,to his native country, and fully acknowledged the Renewed Church of the Brethren; the British parliament recognised the Church, and passed an act encouraging the Moravians to settle in the British colonies; the government of Prussia granted the most favorable concessions. At the time of his death the Church for whose renewal God had appointed him the instrument was everywhere firmly established, and in Germany, over against the State Church, had gained a position even more independent than he had intended to secure. Zinzendorf died full of joy and peace, triumphing in the thought of his "going to the Savior," blessing his children, and fellow-workers, and when speech failed him, looking upon them with a countenance that was irradiated with the brightness of coming glory. Thirty-two presbyters and deacons from Germany, Holland, England, Ireland, North America, and Greenland bore his remains to their last resting-place on the Hutberg, at Herrnhut.

Zinzendorf was an extraordinary man, a heroic leader in the Church of Christ, a "disciple whom Jesus loved," a priest of the living God. Like all great men he had his faults, and some of them were of a grave character. He was often impetuous when he ought to have been calm; he allowed himself to be unduly swayed by his feelings; in one period of his career his theological views and utterances, which, however, he subsequently laid aside, were very objectionable; while his efforts to renew the Unitas Fratrum and yet make it a part of the established Church of Germany brought him into dilemmas the inevitable outcome of which was offences on the score of insincerity and double-dealing, although nothing was further from his thoughts. On the other hand, his sterling piety, his intense love to the Savior, his Johannean intercourse with him, his work for. the Moravian Church, his labors for the Church universal, the principles which he originated, often misunderstood and ridiculed in his day, but now the common and cherished property of all evangelical Christians, the missions  which he inaugurated among the heathen, the lifelong efforts which he made to promote the unity of the children of God of every name, and to bring about the fulfilment of Christ's high-priestly prayer — "that they may be one" — assign to him an exalted place in ecclesiastical history, give him an imperishable name, and justify the epitaph on his tombstone: "He was ordained that he should go and bring forth fruit, and that his fruit should remain." In many respects — and this truth explains to a great degree the opposition with which he met — Zinzendorf was more than a century in advance of his age. His writings number more than one hundred, and consist of sermons, hymnals, offices of worship, controversial works, catechisms, and historical collections. He was a gifted hymnologist. In public service he frequently improvised hymns, which were sung by the congregation as he announced them line by line. Many of his compositions, both in point of the sentiments and the poetry, are worthless; many others are beautiful, and take their place among the standard hymns of the Christian Church. The best collection of them was edited by Albert Knapp, Geistliche Lieder des Grafen von Zinzendorf (Stuttgart and Tubingen, 1845).

We append a brief account of Zinzendorf's labors in America. His chief purpose was not to found Moravian churches, but to care for his neglected German countrymen in Pennsylvania. He landed at New York on Dec. 2, 1741, accompanied by his daughter, the countess Benigna, his private secretary, and several others. From New York he proceeded to Philadelphia, and established himself at Germantown, where he rented a house which is still standing. Keeping in view the main object of his visit to America, he opened, in that dwelling, a school for German children; preached the gospel wherever he came, in churches, school-houses, and barns; accepted from the Lutherans of Philadelphia, who were without a minister. an appointment as their temporary pastor, a thing that led, on Muhlenberg's arrival from Europe, to bitter animosities, for wlnhich both sides were responsible; and organized the so-called Pennsylvania Synod. This last was his favorite undertaking. He conceived the idea of uniting the German churches and sects of Pennsylvania, upon the basis of experimental religion, into what he called "The Congregation of God in the Spirit."

Gaining over to his views Henry Antes, a prominent magistrate of the Reformed persuasion (see McMinn, Life and Times of Henry Antes, Moorestown, N.J., 1886), a call was addressed to all German religious bodies within the colony to send representatives to a Union Synod to be  held at Germantown. It convened on January 12, 1742, and met again, at various places, seven times during Zinzendorf's stay in America, and eighteen times after his return to Europe. But, however beautiful the ideal, it was premature — no real union was brought about; the interest in the movement gradually waned, and, in the end, it served but to augment the differences among the German religionists of Pennsylvania. Reports of the first seven meetings of this Synod, together with cognate documents, were published by Benjamin Franklin, and form a volume which is as valuable as it is rare. The title of the first report is Authentische Relation von dem Anlass, Fortganog und Schlusse der in Germantown gehaltenen Versammlung einiger Arbeiter derer meisten Christlichen Religionen und vieler vor sich selbst Gott-dienenden Christen-Menaschen in Pennsylvania (Philadelphia: by Benj. Franklin). Zinzendorf's labors among his own brethren resulted in the organization of several churches, particularly the one at Bethlehem. After he had left the country Moravian enterprises were begun at nearly all the places where he had preached. The Indian mission attracted his earnest attention. He undertook three journeys to the aboriginal domain — the first, in July 1742, to the Delawares of Pennsylvania; the second, in August, to the Mohicans of New York; and the third, in September, to the Shawnees of the Wyoming Valley. He was probably the first white man who encamped on what is now the site of Wilkesbarre, and he would have been murdered by the savages had it not been for the opportune arrival of Conrad Weisser, the government agent. The rattlesnake story, which has found its way into so many books and is so often quoted as an instance of God's special providence, is a fable. During his stay in America Zinzendorf laid aside his rank as a count, and was known as Lewis von Thurnstein, which name formed one of his titles. On January 9, 1743, he set sail for Europe in a chartered vessel commanded by captain Garrison, who afterwards, for many years, was the captain of the Moravian missionary vessel which plied between England and the American colonies.

Literature. — The books in relation to Zinzendorf are very numerous. Besides the works noted in the article on the Renewed Moravian Brethren, the most important are the following: Spangenberg, Leben des Grafen von Zinzendorf (Barby, 1772-75, 3 volumes; an abridged English translation by Jackson, Lond. 1838); Verbeek, Leben von Zinzendorf (Gnadau, 1845); Vanhagen nvon Ense, Leben des Grafen Zinzendomf (Berlin, 1846); Pilgram, Leben des Grafen Zinzendorf (Leipsic, 1857), from a Roman  Catholic standpoint; Kolbing, Der Graf von Zinzendorf dargestellt aus seinen Gedichten (Gnadan, 1850); Braun, Leben des Grafen von Zinzendorf (Bielefeld, eod.); Bovet, Le Conmte de Zinzendorf (Paris, 1865; an English translation under the title of The Banished Count, by John Gill, Lond. eod.); Zinzendorfs Theologie, dargestellt von H. Plitt (Gotha, 1869-74, 3 volumes); Becker, Zinzendorf im Verhdaltniss zu Philosophie und Kirchentum seiner Zeit (Leipsic, 1886). (E. DE S.)

## Zion[[@Headword:Zion]]

             (Heb. Tsiyon', צַיּוֹן, sunny [Gesen.] or fort [Fürst]; Sept. [usually] and New. Test. Σιών, Vulg. Sion; A. V. “Sion” in New. Test.), a prominent hill (הִי) of Jerusalem, being generally regarded as the south-westernmost and the highest of those on which the city was built. It included the most ancient part of the city with the citadel, and, as first occupied for a palace, was called the city of David (2Ch 5:2). Being the original site of the tabernacle pitched by David for the reception of the ark, it was also called the holy hill, or hill of the sanctuary (Psa 2:6). By the Hebrew prophets the name is often put for Jerusalem itself (Isa 8:18; Isa 10:24; Isa 30:19; Isa 33:14; Psa 48:2; Psa 48:11-12; comp. Rom 9:33; Rom 11:26; 1Pe 2:6; Rev 14:1); also for its inhabitants, sometimes called sons or daughters of Zion (Isa 1:27; Isa 12:6; Isa 40:9; Isa 49:14; Isa 52:1; Psa 9:14; Psa 97:8; Zec 2:7; Zec 2:10; Zec 9:9; Zec 9:13; Zep 3:14; Zep 3:16; Joe 2:23; Mat 21:5; Joh 12:15); and for the spiritual Sion,  the church or city of the living. God (Heb 12:22; Heb 12:28; Gal 4:26; Rev 3:12; Rev 21:2; Rev 21:10).

There never has been any considerable doubt as to the identity of this hill. Josephus, indeed, singularly enough appears to ignore the name Zion; but he evidently calls the same hill the site of the Upper City. In modern times Fergusson has attempted to identify it with Mount Moriah (Jerusalem Revisited; the Temple, etc.), and Capt. Warren, with equal futility, has contended for its identity with Akra (The Temple or the Tomb [Lond. 1880]). The mistake of the latter has originated from not observing that Josephus uses ἄκρα, the summit in two senses: (a) the citadel on Mount Zion (Ant. 7:3,1, where it is clearly distinguished from “the lower city”), and (b) the hill Akria (ibid. 2, where it, is clearly distinguished from “the upper city”). SEE ACRA.

Of the several hills on which Jerusalem was built, Zion is the largest and, in many respects, the most interesting. It extends considerably farther south than the opposite ridge of Moriah and Ophel. The western and southern sides -rise abruptly' from the beds of the valley of Hinnom, and appear to have originally consisted of a series of rocky precipices rising one above another like stairs; — but now they are partially and in some places deeply covered with loose soil and the debris of buildings. The southern brow of Zion is bold and prominent; and its position, separated from other heights and surrounded by deep valleys, makes it seem loftier than any other point in-the city, though it is in reality lower than the ground at the north-west corner of the wall.. The elevation of the hill above the valley of Hinnom at the point where it bends eastward is 300 feet, and above the Kidron, at en- Rogel, 500 feet. On the south-east, Zion slopes down in a series of cultivated terraces steeply, though not abruptly, to the site of the “King's Gardens,” where Hinnom, the Tyropoeoai, and the Kidron unite. Here and round to the south the declivities; are sprinkled with olive-trees, which grow luxuriantly among narrow strips of corn. The scene cannot but recall the words of Micah, “Zion shall be ploughed like a field” (Jer 26:18).

On the east, the descent to the Tyropceon is at first gradual, but as we proceed northward to the modern wall it becomes steeper; and about 300 yards within the wall, directly facing the-south-west angle of the Haram, there is a precipice of rock from twenty to thirty feet high. The declivity is here encumbered with heaps of filth and rubbish, overgrown in  places with prickly-pear. The Tyropoeon was anciently much deeper at this point than it is now; it has been filled up by the ruins of the bridge, the Temple walls, and the palaces of Zion to a depth of more than 130 feet. The best view of the eastern slopes of Zion and the southern section of the Tyropoeon is obtained from the top of the wall in descending from Zion Gate to the Dung Gate. From the descriptions and incidental notices of Josephus the following facts may be gathered that the “Upper City,” built on Zion, was' surrounded by ravines; that it was separated from the “Lower City” (Aklca) by a valley called the Tyropoeon; that upon a crest of rock thirty cubits high on the northern brow of Zion stood three great towers — Hippicus, Phasaelus, and Mariamne; that the wall enclosing the Upper City on the north ran by these towers to a place called the Xystus and joined the western wall of the Temple area; that there was a gate in that western wall northward of this point of junction opening into Akra; that the Xystus was near to amid commanded by the western wall of the Temple area, though not united to it, and that the royal palace adjoined and overlooked the Xystus on the west, while it was also attached to-the great towers above mentioned; and, lastly, that both the Xystus and palace were connected at their southern end by a bridge with the Temple area (see Josephus, War, 5, 4; 6:6,2; 2, 16, 3;. Ant. 5, 1, 5). On the summit of Zion there is a level tract extending in length from the citadel to the Tomb of David, about 600 yards; and in breadth from the city wall to the eastern side of the Armenian convent about 250 yards. A much larger. space, however, was available for building purposes and was at one time occupied. Now not more than one half of this space is enclosed by the modern wall, while fully one third of that enclosed is taken up with the barrack-yards, the convent gardens and the waste ground at the city gate. All without the wall, with the exception of the cemeteries and the cluster of houses round the Tomb of David, is now cultivated in terraces and' thinly sprinkled with olive trees.

Zion was the first spot in Jerusalem occupied by buildings. Upon it stood the stronghold of the Jebusites, which so long defied the Israelites, and was at last captured by king David (Num 13:29; Jos 15:63; Jud 1:21 Amo 2:2 av.). Upon it that monarch built his palace, and there for more than a thousand years the kings and princes of Israel lived and ruled (Amo 2:9 etc.). In Zion, too, was David buried, and fourteen of his successors on the throne were laid near him in the royal tomb (1Ki 2:10; 1Ki 11:43; 1Ki 14:8; 1Ki 14:31, etc.). Zion was the last spot that held out when the Romans under Titus captured the city. When the rest of Jerusalem was in ruins, when the enemy occupied the courts of the Temple, the remnant of the Jews from the walls of Zion. Haughtily refused the terms of the conqueror, and perished in thousands around and within the palaces of their princes.

The city which stood on Zion was called successively by several names. It was probably the Slem of Melchizedek (comp. Gen 14:18 Ninth Psa 76:2); then it became Jebus under the Jebusites, so called from a son of Canaan (Gen 10:16; 1Ch 11:4-5); then the “city of David” and Jerusalem (2Sa 5:7). Josephus, as above stated, calls it the “Upper City,” adding that it was known also in his day as the “Upper Market.” SEE JERUSALEM.

## Zior[[@Headword:Zior]]

             (Heb. Tsior', צַיעֹר, smallness; Sept. Σιώρ v.r. Σωραίθ; Vulg. Sior), a town in the highland district of Judah (Jos 15:54), where it is mentioned in the group around Hebron to the south. SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v.. Σιώρ) call it a village between Jerusalem and Eleutheropolis. It probably corresponds to the small village still called Sair on the road about six miles north-east of Hebron towards Tekoa (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 1, 488), traditionally pointed out as the site of the grave of Esau (Schwarz, Palest. p. 106).

## Ziph[[@Headword:Ziph]]

             (Heb. idn. זַי, battlement [Gesen.] or melting place [Fürst]; Sept. Ζίβ or Ζίφ, with many v.r.; Vulg. Ziph or Siph), the name of a man and of one or two places in Judah.

1. First named of the four sons of Jehaleleel of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:16). B.C. post 1618.

2. A town apparently in the south or Simeonitish part of Judah (Jos 15:24), where it is mentioned between Ithnan and Telem; but the enumeration and the absence of the copula require us to join it with the former, i.e. Ithnan-ziph, and in that case it may be an appendage retaining a trace of the Zephath (q.v.) of that region. SEE ITHNAN.

3. A town in the mountain district of Judah (Jos 15:55), where it is mentioned between Carmel and Juttab, in the south-east group. SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF. The place is immortalized by its connection with David, some of whose greatest perils and happiest escapes took place in its neighborhood (1Sa 23:14-15; 1Sa 2:4; 1Sa 26:2). It had been built by Mesha the son of Caleb (1Ch 2:42), and was eventually fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:8). “Zib” is mentioned in the Onomasticon as eight miles east of Hebron; “the village,” adds Jerome, “in which David hid is still shown.” This can hardly be the spot above referred to, unless the distance and direction have been stated at random, or the passage is corrupt both in Eusebius and Jerome. Elsewhere (under “Zeib”and “Ziph”) they place it near Carmel, and connect it with Ziph the descendant of Caleb. The place, in question is doubtless the Tell Zif, about three miles south of Hebron, a rounded hill of some hundred feet in height, with a spring adjacent. About half a mile east of the tell are some considerable ruins, standing at the head of two small wadies, which, commencing here, run off towards the Dead Sea. These ruins are pronounced by Robinson (Bibl. Res. 1, 492) to be those of the ancient Ziph. There was originally a desert (מַדַבָּר) and a wood (חֹרֶשׁ, choresh, 1Sa 23:15) attached to the place, traces of the latter of which have been supposed to exist in the present Khirbet Khoreisa, about one mile south of Tell Zif (Quar. Statement of the “Palest. Explor. Fund,” Jan, 1875, p. 45). SEE HACHILAH.

## Ziphah[[@Headword:Ziphah]]

             (Heb. Ziphah', זַיפָה, fem. of Ziph [lent, Fiirst]; Sept; Ζεφά v.r. Ζαφά or Ζαιφά; Vulg. Zipha), second named of the four “sons” of Jehaleleel of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:16).B.C. post 1618.

## Ziphim[[@Headword:Ziphim]]

             (Psalms 54, title). SEE ZIPHITE.

## Ziphion[[@Headword:Ziphion]]

             (Genesis 46, 16). SEE ZEPHON.

## Ziphite[[@Headword:Ziphite]]

             (Heb. with the art. [except 1Sa 23:19] haz-Ziphi, הִזַּיפַי[always in the plur., but abbreviated זַפַיםin 1Sa 23:19; 1Sa 26:1]; Sept. Ζειφαῖοι; Vulg. Ziphcei; A. V. “Ziphites,” but “Ziphims” in Psalms 54 title), the partial designation of the inhabitants of the town of ZIPH SEE ZIPH (q.v.).

## Ziphron[[@Headword:Ziphron]]

             [some Ziph'ron] (Heb. Ziphron', זַפְרֹן, fragrance [Gesen.] or beautiful top [Fürst]; Sept. Ζεφρωνά v.r. Δεφρωνά; Vulg. Zephrona, both from the directive הof the Heb.), a place on the northern boundary of the Promised Land, and consequently also of Naphtali (Num 34:9, where it is mentioned between Zedad and Hazar-enan; possibly the present Kaukaba, a village high. up the western slope of Wady et-Teim (Robinson, Laier Res. p. 385). In the parallel passage (Eze 47:16), Hazar- hattieon (q.v.) occurs in a similar connection. According to Jerome (ad loc. Ezech.), it was the Zephyrium Ciliciae (Mannert,VII, 2, 66,76). But this is too far away. Wetzstein thinks it is the extensive river Zifran, fourteen hours north-east of Damascus (Reisebericht über Hauran, p. 88); but this is equally out of the question (comp. Schwarz, Palest. p. 27). SEE TRIBE.

## Zippor[[@Headword:Zippor]]

             (Heb. Tsippor', צַפּוֹר[briefly צַפֹּר, Num 22:10; Num 23:18], sparrow [comp. Zipporah]; Sept. Σεπφώρ; Vulg. Sephor), father of Balak, king of Moab, who is always designated by this patronymic title (22, 2, 4, 10, 16; 23:18; Jos 24:9 Jdg 11:25). B.C. ante 1618. He is possibly the king referred to in Num 21:26. SEE BALAK; SEE MOAB.

## Zipporah[[@Headword:Zipporah]]

             (Heb.Tsipporah', צַפֹּרָה. fem. of Zippor; Sept. Σεπφώρα; Josephus, Σαπφώρα Ant. 3, 3, 1 Vulg. Sephora), one of the seven daughters of Retiel or Jethro the priest of Midian, who became the wife of Moses and mother of his two sons Gershom and Eliezer (Exodus 2, 21; Exo 4:25; Exo 18:2; comp. Exo 18:6). The most noteworthy incident in her life is the account of the circumcision of the former, who had remained for some time after his birth uncircumcised; but an illness into which Moses fell in a khan when on his way to Pharaoli, being accounted a token of the divine displeasure, led  to the circumcision of the child, when Zipporah, having, it appears, reluctantly yielded to the ceremony, exclaimed, “Surely a bloody husband thou art to me” (im, 26; see Frischmuth, De Circumcisioine Zippor-e [Jen. 1663]; Hase, De Sponso Sanguineo [Hal. 1753]). This event seems to have caused some alienation of feeling, for Moses sent his wife back to her father, by whom she was again brought to her husband while in the desert, when a reconciliation took place, which was ratified by religious rites:(Gen 18:1 sq.). B.C. 1658. It has been suggested that Zipporah was the Cushite (A.V. “Ethiopian”), wife who furnished Miriam and Aaron with the pretext for their attack on Moses (Num 12:1, etc.). A slight confirmation for this appears to be that in a passage of Habakkuk (Hab 3:7) the names of Cushan and Midian are mentioned together. Another suggestion is that of Ewald (Gesch. 2, 229, note), namely, that the Cushite was a second wife, or a concubine, taken by Moses during the march through the wilderness-whether after the death of Zipporah (which is not mentioned) ‘or from other circumstances must be uncertain. SEE MOSES.

## Zipporis[[@Headword:Zipporis]]

             SEE SEPPHORIS.

## Zipser, Maier[[@Headword:Zipser, Maier]]

             chief rabbi at Stuhlweissenburg and afterwards at Rechnitz, in Hungary, was born August 14, 1815, and died December 10, 1870. He contributed largely to the Literaturblatt des Orients from 1846 to 1850, Ben- Chananja, and the Jewish Chronicle, published in London. His contributions to the latter periodical, headed "The Talmud and the Gospels," which were called forth by Mr. Newdegate in the British House of Commons, when he opposed the admission of Jews into Parliament, were published separately under the title, The Sermon on the Mount (Lond. 1852). After his death, Dr. A. Jellinek published his Des Flavius Josephus' Werk "Ueber das hohe Alter des jud. Volkes gegen Apion" nach hebr. Originalquellen erlautert... (Wien, 1871). See Maier Zipser, eine Biographie, in the Beth el-Ehrentempel verdienter ungarischer Israeliten, by Ig. Reich (Pesth, 1862, 4 Heft), pages 1-30; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:552 sq. (B.P.)

## Zirkel, Gregorius[[@Headword:Zirkel, Gregorius]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Silbach,, near Hassfurth, July 28, 1762, and died at Wtirzburg, December 18, 1807, as doctor and professor of theology and regent of the clerical seminary. He is the author of, Der Prediger Salomon, ubersetzt und erklart (Wurzburg, 1792): — Untersuchungen uber den Prediger nebst kritischen und philologischen Bemerkungen (ibid. eod.). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:213; 2:208; Furst, Bibl. Theol. 3:554. (B. P.)

## Zisca (or Zizka), John[[@Headword:Zisca (or Zizka), John]]

             the military leader of the Hussites, was born at Trocznow, in the circle of Budweis, Bohemia, about 1360. He was of a noble Bohemian family, and in his boyhood lost an eye. At the age of twelve he became a page to king Wenceslas at the court of Prague, but his gloomy and thoughtful temperament unfitted him at this period for the frivolous occupations of the court. Embracing the career of arms, he served as a volunteer in the English army in France, and afterwards joined king Ladislas of Poland, with a body of Bohemian and Moravian auxiliaries. and greatly distinguished himself in the war against the Teutonic knights, deciding the battle of Tannenberg (July 15, 1410), in which the knights suffered a terrible defeat. High honors were heaped upon him by the king; but the war being now over, his restless spirit led him to join the Austrians against the Turks in Hungary, and afterwards to enter the English army, in which he engaged in the battle of Agincourt in 1415.

He returned, to Bohemia soon after the death of John Huss, and became chamberlain to king Wenceslas. He had early embraced the doctrines of the Hussites, and entered deeply into the feelings of resentment which the execution of Huss and Jerome of Prague excited throughout Bohemia. A powerful party was soon formed, which urged upon the king a policy of resistance to the decisions of the Council of Constance. Zisca was one of the prominent leaders of this party, and his personal influence with the king gained for it the latter's sanction to offer resistance, though the king's vacillating disposition incapacitated him from giving effect to his own honest convictions, and taking open part with his subjects against their oppressors. About the time of the outbreak at Prague (July 30, 1419), Zisca was chosen leader of the Hussite party.

On that day, as a procession of Hussite priests was marching to St. Stephen's Church, one of them was struck by a stone which came from the town house, where the magistrates (Roman Catholics) were assembled. Zisca and his followers immediately stormed. the building, and threw thirteen of the city council into the yard below, where they were instantly killed by the mob. This was the beginning of the first great religious controversy of Germany, known as the Ulussited war. The shock produced by the news of this outbreak was fatal to Wenceslas, and his death gave more of a political character to the contest, for when his brother, the emperor Sigismund, attempted to obtain the throne by advancing an army of 40,000 men into the country, his project was frustrated for a time by the Hussites, who insisted on their religious and political liberties being secured, and totally defeated his army with a force of not more than 4000. In this contest he had captured Prague in the spring of 1420, and he completed the conquest of Bohemia by capturing the castle of Prague in 1421. He secured his hold of the country by the erection of fortresses, the chief of which was that of Tabor, whence his party received the name of Taborites (q.v.).

The varied experience acquired by Zisca in foreign warfare was now of immense service to his party; his followers were armed with small firearms, and his almost total deficiency in cavalry was compensated for by the introduction of the wagenburg, or "cart-fort," constructed of the baggage-wagons, to protect his little army from the attacks of the mailclad knights. In 1421 he lost his remaining eye by an arrow shot from the enemy while besieging the castle of Raby; and, though now entirely blind, he continued to lead his armies with the same masterly generalship. He was carried in a car at the head of his troops, and was enabled to give orders for their disposition from the description of the ground given him by his officers, and from his own minute knowledge of the country. About the close of 1421 Sigismund led a second large army into Bohemia, which included a splendid body of 15,000 Hungarian horse. A battle took place at Deutsch-Brod in January, 1422, in which the imperial army was totally routed. Followed closely by Zisca in their retreat to Moravia, the fleeing troops, in crossing the Iglawa on the ice, broke through and 2000 were drowned. He repeatedly vanquished the citizens of Prague who were not disposed to obey his orders, and the uniform success of his arms at last convinced Sigismund that there was no prospect of the reduction of Bohemia. After a short time, therefore, he proposed an arrangement with the Hussites, by which full religious liberty was allowed; and Zisca, who had an interview with the emperor on the footing of an independent chief, was to be appointed governor of Bohemia and her dependencies.

But the war-worn old chief did not live long enough to complete the treaty, for while besieging the castle of Przibislaw he was seized with the plague, and died October 12, 1424. He was buried in a church at Czaslaw, and his battle-axe was hung up over his tomb. The story that, in accordance with his express injunction, his skin was flayed off, tanned, and used for the cover of a drum which was afterwards employed in the Hussite army, is a fable. Zisca was victor in more than one hundred engagements, and won thirteen pitched battles. Once only, at Kremsir, in Moravia, he suffered a reverse; and even then the evil consequences were warded off by the skilful manner in which he conducted his retreat. The only accusation which can with justice be made against Zisca is on the ground of excessive cruelty, the victims being the  monks who fell into his hands. It would have been strange if Zisca had not laid himself open to such a reproach; for the burning alive of the propagators of the faith to which he adhered, the atrocious cruelties practiced on such Hussite priests as fell into the hands of the imperialists, and the seduction of his own favorite sister by a monk, were events in calculated to induce him to moderate the hatred entertained by himself and his followers against their opponents.

Zisca considered himself the chosen instrument of the Lord to visit his wrath upon the nations, and a fanaticism which asked no mercy for its defenders gave none to its opposers. His line of march could be traced through a country laid waste with fire and sword, and over the ruins of plundered towns. One of the dogmas held by his followers was, "that when all the cities of the earth should be burned down and reduced to the number of five, then would come the new kingdom of the Lord;. therefore it was now the time of vengeance, and God was a God of wrath." The cries and groans of the monks and priests whom he sent to the stake he was wont to call the bridal song of his sister. His victories were generally won by the decisive charge of a chosen band of his followers named the invincible brethren. In his great victory at Aussig over the German crusading army, commanded by Frederick the Warlike of Saxony, and the elector of Brandenburg, the furious onset of the Hussites was steadily sustained by the Saxons, and the Bohemians recoiled in astonishment at a successful resistance which they had never before encountered Zisca, being apprised of the circumstance, approached on his cart, thanked the men for their past services, and added, "If you have now done your utmost, let us retire." Thus stimulated, they made a second charge, still more furious than before, broke the Saxon ranks, and left 9000 of the enemy dead on the field. See Millatuer, Diplomatisch-historische Aufsutze uber Johann Ziska von Trocznow (Prague, 1824). SEE HUSSITES; SEE TABORITES.

## Zithri[[@Headword:Zithri]]

             (typographical error in some eds. at Exo 6:22). SEE ZICHRI.

## Zittel, Karl[[@Headword:Zittel, Karl]]

             a Protestant theologian and doctor of theology of Germany, was born at Schmieheim, in, Baden, June 21, 1802. He studied theology at Jena, was called in 1824 as pastor to Bahlingen, in 1849 to Heidelberg, where he died, August 28, 1871. Zittel is known as leader of the Liberal Church  movement in Baden. He published, Zustande der evangelisch- protestantischen Kirche in Baden (Carlsruhe, 1843): — Motion auf Gestaltung einer Religionsfreiheit (ibid. 1846): — Begrundung der Motion uber Religionsfreiheit (Berlin, eod.): — Die Sonntagsfeier (Heidelberg, 1851): — Der Bekenntnisstreit in der protestantischen Kirche mit besonderer. Berucksichtigung der Schrift von Hundeshagen (Manheim, 1852). He also edited the Sonntagabend. Blatter fur christliche Erbauung und fur kirchliches Leben (Berlin, 1857-63). See Holtzmann, in Protest. Kitchenzeitung, 1871; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:1500; Theol. Universallexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ziz[[@Headword:Ziz]]

             (Heb. with the art. hats-Tsits, הִצַּי, the projection; Sept. Α᾿σαέ v.r. Α᾿σσεῖς; Vulg. Sis), the name of a cliff (מִעֲלֶה, ascent) or pass-by which the band of Moiabites' Ammonites, and Mehunim who attacked Jehoshaphat made. their way up from the shores of the Dead Sea to the wilderness of Judah near Tekoa (2Ch 20:16; comp. 2Ch 20:20). There can be very little doubt that it was the pass of Ain-Jidy “the very same route,” as Robinson remarks, “which is taken by the Arabs in their marauding expeditions at the present day; along the shore as far as to Ain Jidy, and then up the pass, and so northward below Tekua” (Bibl. Res. 1, 508,530). The pass, although exceedingly precipitous, is still a great thoroughfare. (Tristram Lanr I Moab. p. 41). The name haz-Ziz may perhaps be still traceable. in el-Hussah, which is attached to a large tract of table-land lying immediately above the pass of Ain Jidy, between it and Tekuia, and bounded on the north by a wady of the same name (Bibl. Res. 1, 527). Lieut. Conder remarks that there is a ruin called Khirs-bet Aziz south of Yutta (Qsar. Statement of the “Palest. Explor. Fund,” Jan, 1875, p. 15).

## Ziza[[@Headword:Ziza]]

             Heb. Ziza', זַיזַא, abundance [Gesen.] or shining [Furst]; Sept. Ζιζά or Ζουζά), the name of two men. SEE ZIZA.

1. Third named of the four obis of Rehoboam by Maachall the granddaughter of Absalom (2Ch 11:20). B.C. post 973.

2. Son of Seiphisad one of the chiefs of the Simeonites, who in the reign of Ilezekiah made a raid upon the peaceable Hamite shepherds of Gedor and smote them, “because there was pasture there for their flocks” (1Ch 4:37). B.C. cir. 725.

## Zizah[[@Headword:Zizah]]

             (Heb. Zizah', זַיזָהi.e. Ziza; Sept. Ζιζά; Vulg. Ziza), a Gershonite Levite, second son of Shimei (1Ch 23:11); elsewhere (1Ch 23:10) called ZINA SEE ZINA ; (q.v.).

## Zizanion[[@Headword:Zizanion]]

             SEE TAKE.

## Zizka, John[[@Headword:Zizka, John]]

             SEE ZISCA.

## Zju-gwats[[@Headword:Zju-gwats]]

             (or Zju-gen), in Japanese mythology, is the New-year festival, which takes place on the first day of the first month (February).

## Zlata Baba[[@Headword:Zlata Baba]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was a goddess worshipped by the Poles, whose golden statue (whence her name, golden woman) is said to have stood in a temple on the Obi River. Many sacrifices were made to her because she announced oracles to those desiring them.

## Zlebog[[@Headword:Zlebog]]

             [pron. Zliebog], in Slavonic mythology, is the supreme evil deity, and at the same time a surname of all evil black deities, as the reverse of Dobribog. Czernebog is identical with Zlebog.

## Znicz[[@Headword:Znicz]]

             in Slavonic mythology is a deity of the Russians that was worshipped at Kiev through an eternal fire. It is thought that Znicz signifies. The priests of this god gave to the sick and suffering their advice in exchange for rich offerings.

## Zoan[[@Headword:Zoan]]

             (Heb. Tso'an, צעִן; Sept. Τανίς; ,Vulg. Taais), an ancient city of Lower Egypt, situated on the eastern side of the Tanitic branch of the Nile, and mentioned several times in the Old Test. (Num 13:22; Psa 78:12; Psa 78:43 Isa 19:11; Isa 19:13; Isa 30:4; Eze 30:14). Its ruins have lately been carefully explored (Petrie, Tanis, in “Mem. of Eg. Expl. Fund,' Lond. 1884-8).

I. The name, preserved in the Coptic Jane, the Arabic San (a village still on the site), and the classical Tayit, Tanis (whence the Coptic transcription Taneos), comes from the root צָעִן“he moved tents” (Isa 33:20), cognate with טָעִן: “he loaded a beast of burden;” and thus signifies “a place of departure” (like Zaanannim, Jos 19:33,or Zaanaim, Jdg 4:11, on a similar thoroughfare). Zoan lay near the eastern border of Lower Egypt. The senses of departure or removing therefore, would seem not to indicate a mere resting place of caravans, but a place of departure from a country. The Egyptian-name Ha-awar or Pa-awar (Avaris, Α᾿ουαρίς) means “the abode” or “house” of “going out” or “departure.” Its more precise sense fixes that of the Shemitic equivalent.

II. History. —

1. From Manetho. — At a remote period, between the age when the pyramids were built and that of the empire, Egypt was invaded, overrun, and subdued by the strangers known as the Shepherds, who, or at least their first race, appear to have been Arabs cognate with the Phoenicians, ‘How they entered Egypt does not appear. After .a time they made one of themselves king, a certain Salatis,' who reigned at Memphis, exacting tribute of Upper and Lower Egypt, and garrisoning the fittest places with especial regard to the safety of the eastern provinces, which he foresaw the Assyrians' would desire to invade. With this view, finding in the Saite (better elsewhere Sethroite) home, on the east of the Bubastite branch, a  very fit city called Avaris, he rebuilt and very strongly walled it, garrisoning it with 240,000 men. He came hither in harvest-time (about the vernal equinox),to give corn and pay to the troops, and exercise them so as to terrify foreigners.

The position of Tanis explains the case. Like the other principal cities of this tract-Pelusium, Bubastis, and Heliopolis it lay on the east bank of the river towards Syria. It was thus outside a great line of defence, and afforded a protection to the cultivated lands to the east and an obstacle to an invader, while to retreat from it was always possible, so long as the Egyptians held the river. But Tanis, though doubtless fortified partly with the object of repelling an invader, was too far inland to be the frontier fortress. It was near enough to be the place of departure for caravans, perhaps was the last town in the Shepherd period, but not near enough to command the entrance of Egypt. Pelusium lay upon the great road to Palestine; it has been until lately placed too far north, SEE SIN, and the plain was here narrow from north to south, so that no invader could safely pass the fortress; but it soon became broader, and, by turning in a south- westerly direction, an advancing enemy would leave Tanis far to the northward, and bold general would detach a force to keep its garrison in check and march upon Heliopolis and Memphis. An enormous standing militia, settled in the Bucolia, as the Egyptian militia afterwards was in neighboring tracts of the delta, and with its headquarters .at Tanis, would have overawed Egypt, and secured a retreat in case of disaster, besides maintaining hold of some of the most productive, land in the country, and mainly for the former two objects we believe Avaris to have been fortified.

2. From the Egyptian Monuments. — Apipi, probably Apophis of the fifteenth dynasty, a Shepherd-king who reigned shortly before the eighteenth dynasty, built, a temple here to Set, the Egyptian Baal, and worshipped no other god. According to Manetho, the Shepherds, after 511 years of rule, were expelled from all Egypt and shut up in Avaris, whence they were allowed to depart by capitulation by either Amosis or Thummosis (Aahmes or Thothmes IV), the first and seventh kings of the eighteenth dynasty. The monuments show that the honor of ridding Egypt of the Shepherds belongs tog Aahmmes. Rameses II embellished the great temple of Tanis, and was followed by his son Menptah.

After the fall of the empire, the first dynasty is the twenty-first, called by Manetho that of Tanites; its history is obscure, and it fell before the  stronger line of Bubastites, the twenty-second dynasty, founded by Shishak. The expulsion of Set from the pantheon, under the twenty-second dynasty, must have been a blow to Tanis, and perhaps a religious war. occasioned the rise of the twenty-third. The twenty-third dynasty is called Tanite, and its last king is probably Sethos, the contemporary of Tirhakah, mentioned by Herodotus. SEE EGYPT.

3. From the Bible we learn that Zoan was one of the oldest cities in Egypt having been built seven years after Hebron, which already existed in the time of Abraham. (Num 13:22; comp. Gen 22:2). It seems also to have been one of the principal capitals, or royal abodes, of the Pharaohs (Isa 19:11; Isa 19:13); and accordingly “the field of Zoan,” or the fine alluvial plain around the city, is described as the scene of the marvelous works. which God wrought in the time of Moses (Psa 78:12; Psa 78:33), and once more appears in sacred history as a place to which came ambassadors, either of Hoshea or Ahaz, or else possibly Hezekiah: “For his princes were at Zoan, and his messengers came to Hanes” (Isa 30:4). As mentioned with the frontier town Tahpanhes, Tanis is not necessarily the capital. But the same prophet perhaps more distinctly points to a Tanite line when saving, in “the burden of Egypt,” “The princes of Zoan are become fools; the princes of Noph are deceived” (Isa 19:13). The doom of. Tanis is foretold by Ezekiel: “I will set fire in Zoan” (Eze 30:4), where it occurs among the cities to be taken by Nebuchadnezzar.

III. Description and Remains. — Anciently a rich plain extended due east as far as Pelusium, about thirty miles distant, gradually narrowing towards the east, so that in a south-easterly direction from Tanis it was not more than half this breadth. The whole of this plain about as far south and west as Tanis, was anciently known as “the Fields” or “Plains,” “the Marshes” (τὰ ῾Ελη, Ε᾿λεαρχία), or “the pasture-lands” (Βουκολία). Through the subsidence of the Mediterranean coast, it is now almost covered by the great lake Menzaleh, of old, it was a rich marsh-land watered by four of the seven branches of the Nile, the Pathmitic, Mendesian, Tanitic, and Pelusiac, and swept by the cool breezes of the Mediterranean.

At present the plain of San is very, extensive, but thinly-inhabited; no village exists in the immediate vicinity of the ancient Tanis; and, when looking from the mounds of this once splendid city towards the distant palms of indistinct villages we perceive the desolation spread around it.  The ‘field' of Zoan is now a barren waste; a canal passes through it. without being able to fertilize the soil; ‘fire' has been set in ‘Zoan' and one of the principal capitals or royal abodes of the Pharaohs is now the habitation of fishermen, the resort of wild beasts, and infested with reptiles and malignant fevers. It is remarkable for the height and extent of its mounds, which are upwards of a mile from north to south, and nearly three quarters of a mile from east to west. The area in which the sacred enclosure of the temple stood is about 1500 feet by 1250, surrounded by mounds of fallen houses. The temple was adorned by Rameses II with numerous obelisks and most of its sculptures.

It is very ruinous, but its remains prove its former grandeur. The number of its obelisks, ten or twelve all now fallen, is unequalled, and the labor of transporting them from Syene shows the lavish magnificence of the Egyptian kings. The oldest name found here is that of Sesertesen III of the twelfth dynasty, the latest that of Tirhakah (Wilkinson, Handbook; p. 221-222). Two black statues and a granite sphinx, with blocks of hewn and occasionally sculptured granite, are among the objects which engage the attention of the few travelers who visit this desolate place. The modern village of San consists of mere huts, with the exception of a ruined kasr of modern date (id. Modern Egypt, 1, 449-4520; Narrative of the Scottish Deputation, p. 72-76). Recently, M. Mariette has made excavations on this site and discovered remains of the Shepherd period, showing a markedly characteristic style, specially in the representation of face and figure, but of Egyptian art, and therefore afterwards appropriated by the Egyptianl kings. The bilingual or rather trilingual inscription of Ptolemy III (Euergetes I) is of very great interest. See Lepsius, Das bilingue Decret von Kcnopus (Bel. 1867); Reinisch und Rosler, Die zweispraachige Inschrift von Tanis (Vienna, eod.); Proceedings of the Amer. Oriental Society, May, 1870, p. 8; Bibliotheca Sacra, 24:771; 26:581.

## Zoar[[@Headword:Zoar]]

             (Heb. צעִר, [fully צוֹעִר, Gen 19:22-23; Gen 19:30], smallness; Sept. Σηγώρ, Ζογορ, or Ζόγορα'; Josephus ᾿Ζοώρ, τὰ Ζόαρα or Ζώαρα; Vulg. Segor), one of the cities of the Jordan and Dead-Sea valley, and apparently, from the way in which it is mentioned, the most distant from the western highlands of Palestine (Gen 13:10). Its original name was BELA, and it was still so called at the time of Abram's first residence in Canaan (Gen 14:2; Gen 14:8). It  was then in intimate connection with the cities of the “plain of Jordan” — Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboiim (see also Gen 13:10; but not Gen 10:19)- and its king took part with the kings of those towns in the battle with the Assyrian host which ended in their defeat and the capture of Lot. The change is thus, explained in the narrative of Lot's escape from Sodom. When urged by the angel to flee to the mountain, he pointed to Bela, and said, “This city is near to flee unto, and it is a little one (מצער). Oh, let me escape thither, (is it not a little one?) and my soul shall live.” The angel consented and the incident proved a new baptism to the place, “Therefore the name of the city was called Zoar,” that is, “little” (Gen 5:22).

This incident further tends to fix its site, at least relatively to Sodom. It must have been nearer than the mountains, and yet outside the boundary of the plain or vale of Siddim, which was destroyed during the conflagration. It would seem from Gen 19:22-23; Gen 30:30 that it lay at the foot of the mountain into, which Lot subsequently went up, and where he dwelt. That mountain was most probably the western declivity of Moab, overlooking the Dead Sea. In. Deu 34:3 there is another slight indication of the position of Zoar. From the top of Pisgah Moses obtained his view of the Promised Land. The east, the north, and the west he viewed, and- lastly “the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, into Zoar. This is not quite definite; but, considering the scope of the passage, it may be safely concluded that the general basin of the Dead Sea is meant, and that Zoar was near its southern end. Isaiah reckons Zoar among the cities of Moab, but does not describe its position. It would seem, however, from the way in which it is mentioned, that it must have been on the utmost border,(Isa 15:5). Jeremiah is the only other sacred writer who mentions it, and his words are less definite than those of Isaiah (Jer 48:34).

In early Christian times Josephus says that it retained its name (Ζοώρ) to his day (Ant. 1:11, 4), that it was at the farther end of the Asphaltic Lake, in Arabia by which he means the country lying southeast of the lake, whose capital was Petra (War, 4:8, 4; Ant. 14:1, 4). The notices of Eusebius are to the same tenor the Dead Sea extended from Jericho to Zoar (Ζοορῶν; Onomast. s.v. θάλασσα ἡ ἁλυκή). Phseno lay between Petra and Zoar (ibid. s.v. Φινών). It still retained its name (Ζωαρά), lay close to (παρακειμένη) the Dead Sea, was crowded with inhabitants, and contained a garrison of Roman soldiers; the palm and the balsam still flourished, and testified, to its ancient fertility (ibid. s.v. Βαλά). To these notices of Eusebius, Jerome adds little or nothing. Paula, in her journey,  beholds Segor (which Jerome gives on several occasions the Hebrew form of the name, in opposition to Zoora, or Zoara, the Syrian form) from Caphar Barucha (possibly Beni Naim, near Hebron), at the same time with Enigedi, and the land where once stood the four cities; but the terms of the statement are too vague to allow of any inference as to its position (Epist. 108, §11). In his commentary on Isa 15:5, Jerome says that it was “in the boundary of the Moabites dividing them from the land of the Philistines,” and thus justifies his use of the word vectis to translate בריחה(A.V. “his fugitives,” marg. “borders;” Gesen. Fluchtlinge). The terra Philisthiim, unless the words are corrupt, can only mean the land of Palestine — i.e. (according to the inaccurate usage of later times) of Israel — as opposed to Moab. In his Quaestiones Hebraicae, on. Gen 19:30 (comp. 14:3), Jerome goes so far as to affirm the accuracy of the Jewish conjecture, that the later name of Zoar was Shallsha Bale primum et postea Salisa appellate. (comp. also his. co0ment on Isa 15:5). But this is probably grounded merely on an interpretation of shalishiyeh in Isa 15:5, as connected with bela, and as denoting the “third” destruction of the town by “earthquakes.” Zoar was included in the province of Palestina Tertia, which contained also Kerak and Areopolis. It was an episcopal see, in the patriarchate of Jerusalem and archbishopric of Petra; at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) it was represented by its bishop, Musonius, and at the Synod of Constantinople (A.,D. 536) by John (Le Quien, Oriens Christi, 743-746).

Among the statements of mediaeval travelers there are two remarkable ones —

(1.) Brocardus (cir. A.D. 1290) the author of the Descriptio Terrae Sanctae, the standard “Handbook to Palestine” of the Middle Ages, the work of an able and intelligent resident in the country, states, (c. 7) that he leagues (leucae) to the south of Jericho is the city Segor, situated beneath the mountain of Engaddi, between which mountain and the Dead Sea is the statue of salt. True, he confesses that all his efforts to visit the spot had been, frustrated by the Saracens; but the passage bears marks of the greatest; desire to obtain correct information, and he must have nearly approached the place, because he saw with his own eves the “pyramids” which covered the wells of bitumen, which he supposes to have been those of the vale of Siddim. This is in curious agreement with the connection between Engedi and Zoar implied in Jerome's Itinerary of Paula.

(2.) The statement of Thietmar (A.D. 1217) is even more singular. It is contained in the 11th and 12th chapters of his Peregriaatio (ed. Laurent, Hamburg, 1857). After visiting Jericho and Gilgal, he arrives at the “fords of Jordan” (11, 20), where Israel crossed and where Christ was baptized, and where then, as now, the pilgrims bathed (22). Crossing this ford (33), he arrives at “the field and the spot where the Lord overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.” After a description of the lake come the following words: “On the shore of this lake, about a mile (ad miliare) from the spot at which the Lord was baptized, is the statue of salt into which Lot's wife was turned” (47). “Hence I came from the lake of Sodom and Gomorrah, and arrived at Segor, where Lot took refuge after the overthrow of Sodom; which is now called in the Syrian tongue Zora, but in Latin the City of Palms. In the mountain hard by this Lot sinned with his daughters (12, 1-3). After this I passed the vineyard of Benjamin (?) and of Engaddi... Next I came into the land of Moab and to the mountain in which was the cave where David hid, leaving on my left hand Sethim (Shittim), where the children of Israel tarried.... At last I came to the plains of Moab, which abound in cattle and grain.... A plain country, delightfully covered with herbage, but without either woods or single trees; hardly even a twig or shrub (4-15). After this I came to the torrent Jabbok” (14, 1).

Zoar is very distinctly mentioned by the Crusading historians. Fulcher (Gesta Dei, p. 405, quoted by Raumer, p. 239) states that, “having encircled (giitato) the southern part of the lake on the road from Hebron to Petra, we found there a large village which was said to be Segor, in a charming situation, and abounding with dates. Here we began to enter the mountains of Arabia.” The palms are mentioned also by William of Tyre (22, 30) as being so abundant as to cause the place to be called Villa Palmarum, and Palmer (i.e. probably Paumier). Abulfeda (cir. A.D. 1320) does not specify its position more nearly than that it was adjacent to the lake and the Ghor, but he testifies to its then importance by calling the lake after it-Bahretzeghor (see, too, Ibn-Idris, in Reland, p. 272). The natural inference from the description of Fulcher is that Segor lay in the Wady Kerak, the ordinary road, then and now, from the south of the Dead Sea to the eastern highlands. The conjecture of Irby and Mangles (June 1, and see May 9), that the extensive ruins, which they found in the lower part of this Wady, were those of Zoar, is therefore probably accurate. The name Dra'a or Dera'ah, which they, Poole (Geogr. Journ. 26:63), and Burckhardt (July 15), give to the valley, may even without violence be accepted as a (Journey, 1, 307).

M. de Saulcy himself, however, places Zoar in the Wady Zuweirah, the pass leading from Hebron to the DeadSea. But the names Zuweirah and Zoar are not nearly so similar in the originals as they are in their Western forms, and there is the fatal obstacle to the proposal that it places Zoar on the west of the lake, away from what appears to have been the original cradle of Moab and Ammon. If we are to look for Zoar in this neighborhood, it would surely be better to place it at the Tellum-Zoghal, the latter part of which name is almost literally the same as the Hebrew Zoar. The proximity of this name and that of Usdulm, so like Sodom, and the presence of the salt mountain to this day splitting off in pillars which show a rude resemblance to the human form, are certainly remarkable facts. Other writers locate Zoar in the plain at the northern end of the Dead Sea. An insuperable objection to this is that in that case Lot must have crossed the Jordan in his flight; for Sodom was on the west side of the plain, and Zoar on the east. Mr. Birch (in the Quarterly Statement of the “Palest. Explor. Fund,” Jan. 1879, p. 15 sq.) is confident that the name and site are those of Tell es-Shagur, at the foot of Wady Hesban; but his arguments lack weight. Tristram's attempt (Land of Moab, p. 343) to identify Zoar with Ziara on Mount Nebo is based upon an error as to the latter name, which is properly Siaghhah; the position on a mountain, moreover, is preposterous. For the different views held regarding the site of Zoar, see Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2, 517; Reland, Palaest. p. 1064; De Saulcy Travels, 1, 481; Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 360; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1868, p. 136 sq. SEE SODOM.

## Zoarites[[@Headword:Zoarites]]

             SEE SEPARATISTS OF ZOAR.

## Zoba[[@Headword:Zoba]]

             (Heb. Tsoba', צוֹבָא, 2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8) or Zo'bah (Heb. Tsobah', צוֹבָה[briefly צֹבָה2Sa 23:36], station; Sept. Σώβα v.r. Σωβάλ, etc.; Vulg. usually Soba), the name of a portion of Aram or Syria, which formed a separate kingdom in the time of the Jewish monarchs Saul, David, and Solomon. It is difficult to fix its exact position and limits; but there seem to be grounds for regarding it as and east towards, if not even to the Euphrates (see 1Ch 18:3-9; 1Ch 19:6). It would thus have included the eastern flank of the mountain chain, which shuts in Coele-Syria on that side, the high land about Aleppo, and the more northern portion of the Syrian Desert. The Syriac interpreters take Zobah to be Nisibis, in Mesopotamia, and they have been followed by Michaelis (De Syria Soboea, in the Conmment. Soc. Götting. p. 57 sq.). Others would identify it with the classic Chalcis. It was so closely connected with Hamath that that great city was sometimes distinguished as Hamath-zobah (2Ch 8:3). Among the cities of Zobah were also a place called Tibhath or Betah (2Sa 8:8; 1Ch 18:8), which is, perhaps, Taibeh, between Palmyra and Aleppo; and another called Berothai, which has been supposed to be Beirut, but with little probability, for the kingdom of Hamath must have intervened between Zobah and the coast. SEE BEROTHAH. Zobah was a wide, arid plain intersected by several ranges of bare, white mountains, but having also a few fertile valleys. The inhabitants were probably semi-nomads, and chiefly shepherds. Like the modern Bedawin of that region, they were rich in horses (Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 4:1700; Porter, Handbook for Pal. p. 614). SEE SYRIA.

We first hear of Zobah in the tine of Saul, when we find it mentioned as a separate country, governed apparently by a number of kings who own no common head or chief (1Sa 14:47). Saul engaged in war with these kings and “vexed them,” as he did his other neighbors. Some forty years later than this we find Zobah under a single ruler, Hadadezer, son of Rehob, who seems to have been a powerful sovereign. He had wars with Toi, king of Hamath (2Sa 8:10), while he lived ‘in close relations of amity with the kings of Damascus, Beth-rehob, Ish-tob, etc., and held various petty Syrian princes as vassals under his yoke (10,19). He had even considerable influence in Mesopotamia, beyond the Euphrates, and was able on one occasion to obtain an important auxiliary force from that quarter (2Sa 8:16; comp. title to Psalms 9). David, having resolved to take full possession of the tract of territory originally promised to the posterity of Abraham (2Sa 8:3; comp. Gen 15:18), attacked Hadadezer in the early part of his reign, defeated his army, and took from him a thousand chariots, seven hundred (seven thousand, 1Ch 18:4) horsemen, and twenty thousand footmen. Hadadezer's allies, the  Syrians of Damascus, having marched to his assistance, David defeated them in a great battle, in which they lost twenty-two thousand men.

The wealth of, Zobah is very apparent in the narrative of this campaign. Several of the officers of Hadadezer's army carried “shields of gold” (2Sa 8:7), by which we are probably to understand iron or wooden frames overlaid with plates of the precious metal. The cities, moreover, which David took, Betlah (Tibhath) and Berothai, yielded him “exceeding much brass” (2Sa 8:8). It is not clear whether the Syrians of Zobali surfeited and became tributary on this occasion, or whether, although defeated, they were able to maintain their independence. At any rate a few years later they were again in arms against David. This time the Jewish king acted on the defensive. The war was provoked by the Ammonites, who hired the services of the Syrians of Zobah among others to help them against the people of Israel, and obtained in this way auxiliaries to the amount of thirty-three thousand, men. The allies were defeated in a great battle by Joab, who engaged the Syrians in person with the flower of his troops (2Sa 10:9). Hadadezer, upon this, made a last effort. He sent across the Euphrates into Mesopotamia and “drew forth the Syrians that were beyond the river” (1Ch 19:16), who had hitherto taken no part in the war. With these allies and' his own troops, he once more renewed the struggle with the Israelites, who were now commanded by David himself, the crisis being such as seemed to demand the presence of the king. A battle was fought near Helam — a place the situation of which is uncertain — where the Syrians of Zobah and their new allies were defeated with great slaughter, losing between forty thousand and fifty thousand men. After this we hear of no more hostilities. The petty princes hitherto' tributary to Hadadezer transferred their allegiance to the king of Israel, and it is probable that he himself became a vassal to David. Zobah, however, though subdued, continued to cause trouble to the Jewish kings. A man of Zobah, one of the subjects of Hadadezer-Rezon, son of Eliadah having escaped from the battle of Helam and “gathered a band” (i.e. a body of irregular marauders), marched southward, and contrived to make himself “master of Damascus, where he reigned (apparently) for some fifty years, proving a fierce adversary to Israel all through the reign of Solomon (1Ki 11:23-25). Solomon also was (it would seem) engaged in a war with Zobah itself. The Hamath-zobah against which he “went up” (2Ch 8:3) was probably a town in that country which resisted his authority, and which he accordingly attacked and subdued. This is the last that we hear of Zobah in Scripture. The name, however, is found at a later date in the inscriptions of  Assyria, where the kingdom of Zobah seems to intervene between Hamath and Damascus, falling thus into the regular line of march of the Assyrian armies. Several Assyrian monarchs relate that they took tribute from Zobah, while others speak of having traversed it on their way to or from Palestine.

## Zobebah[[@Headword:Zobebah]]

             (Heb. with the article, hats-Tsobebah', הִצֹּבֵבָה, the slow [Gesenius] or affable [Fürst]; Sept. Σωβηβά v.r. Σαβαθά; Vulg. Sobeba), last named of the two sons (or perhaps a daughter, as the word is feminine) of Coz (q.v.) of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:8). B.C. post 1618, Rabbi Schwarz regards it as the name of a town, “the village Beth-zaphapha two and a half English miles south of Jerusalem” (Palest. p. 116).

## Zoerard[[@Headword:Zoerard]]

             a Polish monk of the 10th century (or early part of the 11th), visited Hungary by invitation of king Stephen for the purpose of instructing the people in the Christian religion which had been recently introduced. See Neander, Hist. of the Church, 3:334.

## Zohar[[@Headword:Zohar]]

             (Heb. Tso'char, צֹחִר, light; Sept.. Σαάρ), the name of two or three men.

1. The father of Ephron the Hittite, from which latter Abraham purchased the cave of Machpelah (Gen 23:8; Gen 25:9). B.C. ante 2026.

2. Last named but one of the six sons of Simeon (Genesis 46, 10; Exo 6:15); elsewhere (1Ch 4:24) called ZERAIT SEE ZERAIT (q.v.).

3. A marginal reading in 1Ch 4:7 for JEZOAR (Heb. rather Yitschar', יצחר, which [as usual] takes the pointing of the Keri וַצַחִרand Zohar; the A.V. of 1611 has ‘Zoar”), second named of the three sons of Helah of the tribe of Judah. B.C. post 1618.

## Zohar (2)[[@Headword:Zohar (2)]]

             (זוֹהִר, i.e., light) is the name of the standard and code of the cabalistic system, and has been called "the Bible of the cabalists." The titles of the book vary: Midrash of R. Simnon ben-Jochia, from its reputed author; Midrash, Let there be light, from the words in Gen 1:4; but more commonly Sepher haz-Zohar, from Dan 12:3, where the word Zohar is used for "the brightness of the firmament." The title in full is, Sepher haz-Zohar al hat-Torah, me-ish Elohim Kodesh, hu nore meod hat-tana R. Simon ben-Jochai, etc., i.e., "The book of Splendor on the Law, by the very holy and venerable man of God, the Tanaite rabbi, Simon ben-Jochai, of blessed memory."

I. Contents. — The body of the work takes the form of a commentary, extending over the Pentateuch, of a highly mystic and allegorical character. But the Zohar is not considered complete without the addition of certain appendices, attributed either to the same author, or to some of his personal or successional disciples. These supplementary portions are,

1. Siphra de Tseniutha (מפרא ד צניעותא), — i.e., "the book of mysteries," given in volume 2, pages 176b-178b. It contains five chapters, and is chiefly occupied with discussing the, questions involved in the creation. It has been translated into Latin by K. v. Rosenroth, in the second volume of Lis Kabbala Denudata (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1684).

2. Iddera Rabba (אדרא רבא), i.e., "the Great Assembly," referring to the community or college of Simon's disciples, in their conferences for cabalistic discussion. It is generally found in volume 3, pages 1217b-145a, and has also been translated into Latin by Rosenroth, 1.c. SEE IDDERA.

3. Iddera Zuta ( אדרא זוטא), i.e., "the Small Assembly," referring to the few disciples who still assembled for cabalistic discussion towards the end of their master's life, or, after his decease. Tills treatise is given in 3:287b- 296b (ed. Amsterdam, 1805), and is also found in Latin in the Kabbala Denudata, l.c. To these three larger appendices are added fifteen other minor fragments, viz.:

4. Saba (סבא), "the aged man," also called Saba demishpatim (סבא דמשפטים), or the discourse of the aged in mishpatim, given in 2:94a-114a. The aged is the prophet Elias, who holds converse with R. Simon ben-Jochai about the doctrine of metempsychosis, and the discussion is attached to the Sabbatic section, called משפטי. i.e., Exo 21:1 to Exo 24:18.

5. Midrash Ruth (מדרש רות), a fragment.

6. Sepher hab-bahir (ספר הבהיר), "the book of clear light."

7 and 8. Tosephta and Mattanitan ( תוספתאand מתניתן), or "small additional pieces," which are found in the three volumes.

9. Raia mehemna (רעיא מהימנא), "the faithful shepherd," found in the second and third volumes.

10. Hekaloth (היכלות), i.e., "the palaces," found in the first and second volumes, treats of the topographical structure of paradise and hell.

11. Sithre Torah (סתרי תורה), "the secrets of the law."

12. Midrash han-neelam (מדרש הנעלם), i.e. "the concealed treatise." 13. Raze de Razin (רזי דרזין)1 , i.e., "mysteries of the mysteries," contained in 2:70a-75a.

14. Midrash Chazith (מדרש חזית), on the Song of Songs.

15. Maamar ta Chazi ( מאמר תא חזי), a discourse, so entitled from the first words "come and see.''

16. Yan-uka (ינוקא), i.e., "the Youth," and is given in 3:186a-192.

17. Pekuda (פקדא), i.e., "illustrations of the law."

18. Chibbura kadmaah (חבורא קדמאה), i.e., "the early work."

The body of the work is sometimes called Zohar Gadol (זוהר גדול), and the other portions Zohar Katoon (זוהר קטון). The editio princeps is that of Mantua (1558-1560, 3 volumes), which has often been reprinted. The best edition of the book of Zohar is that by Christian Knorr von Rosenroth, with Jewish commentaries (Sulzbach, 1684, fol.), to which his rare Kabbala Denudata (1677-1684, 4to) forms an ample introduction. This edition was reprinted with an additional index of matters (Amsterdam,,1714, 1728, 1772, 1805, 3 volumes 8vo). To this last- mentioned issue the references in this article apply. The latest editions are those of Breslau (1866, 3 volumes, large 8vo), Brody (1873, 3 volumes 8vo).

II. Authorship. — The Zohar pretends to be a revelation from God, communicated through R. Simon ben-Jochai (q.v.), to his select disciples, according to the Iddera Zuta (Zohar, 3:287b). This declaration and the repeated representation of R. Simon ben-Jochai, as speaking and teaching. throughout this production, made R. Simon the author of it, an opinion maintained not only by Jews for centuries, but even by such distinguished Christian scholars as Lightfoot, Gill (A Dissertation concerning the Antiquity of the Hebrew Language, Letters, Vowel-points, and Accents: Lond. 1767), Bartolocci (Magna Bibl. Rabb. 4:230 sq.); Pfeiffer (Critica Sacra), Knorr von Rosenroth (Kabbala Denudata), Molitor (Philosophy of History, volume 3, Munster, 1839), Franck (La Kabbale, Germ. transl. by A. Jellinek, Leipsic, 1844), and Etheridge (Introduction to Hebrew Literatture, Lond. 1856, page 314). On the other hand it has been clearly  demonstrated by such scholars as Zunz (Gottesdienstl. Vortrage, Berlin, 1831, page 405), Geiger (Melo Chofnajim, ibid. 1840, introd. page 17), Sachs (Religiose Poesie der Juden in Spanien, ibid. 1845, page 327), Jellinek (Moses ben-Shem-Tob de Leon, Leipsic, 1851), Gratz (Gesch. d. Juden, ibid. 1863, 7:73-87; 442-459; 487-50,7),. Steinschneider (Jeuish Literature, Lond. 1857, pages 104-122; 249-309), Ginsburg (The Kabbalah, pages 85-93), and a host of others, that it is not the production of R. Simon, but of the 13th century, by Moses de Leon (q.v.). For Simon ben-Jochai was a pupil of R. Akibah; but the earliest mention of the book's existence occurs in the year 1290; and the anachronisms of its style, and of the facts referred to, together with the circumstance that it speaks of the vowelpoints and other Masoretic inventions, which are clearly posterior to the Talmud justify J. Morinus (although too often extravagant in his wilful attempts to depreciate the antiquity of the later Jewish writings) in asserting that the author could not have lived much before the year 1000 of the Christian era (Exercitationaes Biblicae, pages 358-369). This later view of the authorship is sustained by the following reasons,

1. The Zohar most fulsomely praises its own author, calls him the Sacred Light (בוצניא קדישא), and exalts him above Moses, "the true shepherd" (Zohar, iii, 132n, 144a), while the disciples deify R. Simon (ii, 38a).

2. The Zohar quotes and mystically explains the Hebrew vowel-points (1:16b, 24b; 2:116a; 3:65a), which were introduced for the first time by R. Mocha of Palestine (q.v.).

3. The Zohar (רעיא מהימנה, "the faithful shepherd") — borrowed two verses (sect. קדושים, 3:82b) from Ibn Gabirol's (q.v.) celebrated hymn, "the royal diadem" ( כתר מלכות); comp. Sachs, l.c. page 229.

4. The Zohar (1:18b, 23a) quotes and explains the interchange, on the outside of the Mezuza (q.v.), of the words (יהוה אלהינו יהוה) Jehovah our God is Jehovah for ( כוזו במוכסז כוזו), Kuza Bemuchsaz Kuza, by substituting for each letter its immediate predecessor in the alphabet, which was transplanted from France into Spain in the 13th century (Ginsburg).

5. The Zohar (3:232b) uses the expression Esnoga which is a Portuguese corruption of synagogue, and explains it in a cabalistic manner as a compound of two Hebrew words, i.e., אש נוגה, brilliant light.

6. The Zohar (2:32a) mentions the Crusades, the momentary taking of Jerusalem by the Crausaders from the Infidels, and the retaking of it by the Saracens.

7. The Zohar records events which transpired A.D. 1264.

8. The doctrine of the En-Soph and the Sephiroth (q.v.), as well as the metempsychosian retribution, were not known before the 13th century.

9. The very existence of the Zohar, according to the stanch cabalist Jehudah Chayoth (fl. 1500), was unknown to such distinguished cabalists as Nachmanides (q.v. and Ben-Adereth (1235-1310); the first who mentions it is Todros Abulafia (1234-1306).

10. Isaac of Akko (fl. 1290) affirms that "the Zohar was put into the world from the head of a Spaniard." To the same effect is the testimony of Joseph ibn-Wakkarl, who, in speaking of later books which may be relied upon, recommends only those of Moses Nachmanides and Todros Abulafia, "but," he adds, "the Zohar is full of errors, and one must take care not to be misled by them." This, says Dr. Steinschneider, "is an impartial and indirect testimony that the Zohar was recognised scarcely fifty years after its appearing as one of the 'latter' works, and not attributed to Simon ben- Jocha " (Jewish Literature, page 113).

11. That Moses de Leon was the author of the Zohar, we have already stated in the art. MOSES EZ LEON, and the account given there is confirmed in the most remarkable manner by the fact that —

12. The Zohar contains whole passages which Moses de Leon translated into Aramaic, from his works, e.g. ס8 המשקל, ס8 הרמון, as the erudite Jellinek has demonstrated in his Moses de Leon, page 21 sq.; comp. also Gratz, 1.c. page 498 (2d ed. 1873, page 477 sq.). It is for these and many other reasons that the Zohar is now regarded as a pseudograph of the 13th century, and that Moses de Leon should have palmed the Zohar upon Simon benJochai was nothing remarkable, since this rabbi is regarded by tradition as the embodiment of mysticism.

III. Diffusion and Influence of the Book. — The birth of the Zohar formed the great landmark in the development of the cabala, and the history of this theosophy divides itself into two periods, the pre-Zohar period, and the post-Zohar period. During these two periods different schools developed themselves, which Dr. Gratz classifies as follows:

1. The School of Gerona. — To this school, which is the cradle of the cabala, belong Isaac the Blind (fl. 1190-1210) (q.v.), Ezra and Azariel his disciples, Jehudah b. Jakar, his pupil Moses Nachmanides (q.v.), and Jacob ben-Sheshet (q.v.). The characteristic feature of this school is that it, for the first time, established and developed the doctrine of the En Soph (סו אין), the Sephiroth ( ספירות), metempsychosis (סוד העבור), with the doctrine of retribution (סוד משיח) belonging thereto, and a peculiar christology (סוד משיח). It is the creative school; the cabalistic mode of exegesis is still subordinate in it.

2. The School of Segovia. — To this school belong Jacob of Segovia, his two sons Isaac and Jacob, jr., Moses ben-Simon of Burgos, Isaac ben- Todros, teacher of Shem-Tob Ibn Gaon (d. 1332), Todros Abulafia (d. 1305), and his son Joseph, the author of מערכת אלהות, and Isaac of Akko (fl. 1290). It is the exegetical school, endeavoring to interpret the Bible and the Hagada perfas et nefas in accordance with the cabala.

3. The Quasi-Philosophical School of Isaac ben-Latif or Allatif (q.v.), which in its doctrines stands isolated.

4. The School of Abulafia, so called after Abulafia, the founder (born in 1240, and died about 1292). To this school also belonged Joseph Gikatilla ben-Abraham (fl. 1260). The characteristics of this school are the stress laid on the extensive use of the exegetical rules called Gematria (גמטריא), Notaricon (נוטריקון) (q.v.), and Ziruph (צירו). In this employment of commutations, permutations, and reduction of each letter in every word to its numerical value, Abulafia and his followers are not original.

5. The Zohar School, which is a combination and absorption of the different features and doctrines of all the previous schools, without any plan or method; and we must not be surprised at the wild speculations which we so often find in the writings of the post-Zohar period. In Spain especially the study of the Zohar took deep root, and found its way to Italy, Palestine, and Poland.

As it penetrated all branches of life and literature, voices were also raised against the Zohar. The first among the Jews who opposed its authority was Elia del Medigo, of Candia, who, in his philosophical treatise entitled An Examination of the Law (בחינת הדת), which he wrote in 1491, brings forth three arguments against the genuineness of the Zohar, but his voice  and those of others had no power to check the rapid progress of the cabala. One of the most daring opponents was Leon da Modena (q.v.). In the meantime the Zohar had been published; Christians became somewhat acquainted with its contents by the extracts of the Zohar translated into Latin by Joseph de Voisin, in his Disputatio Cabalistica (Paris, 1635), and afterwards by the celebrated work entitled The Unveiled Cabalah, or Kabbala Denudata of Knorr v. Rosenroth (Sulzbach, 1677-78, 2 volumes; Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1684). With the 18th century a new sera in the criticism of the Zohar commenced, and without quoting the different scholars who made the criticism of the Zohar their special study, we can only state, what has already been said above, that almost the unanimous result of criticism is that the Zohar was not written, as has hitherto been believed, by R. Simon ben-Jochaim but by Moses de Leon.

IV. Literature. — Besides the authorities already quoted, we will mention Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:329-335; Jellinek, Beitrage zur Geschichte der Kabbala (Leipsic, 1852); Ben-Chananja, volumes 1, 2, 3, 4, where a most thorough and instructive analysis of the Zohar is given by Ignatz Stern (Szegedin, 1858-61); Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums u.s. Sekten, 3:70 sq.; Munk, Melanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe (Paris, 1859), page 275 sq.; Pauli, The Great Mystery, or How can Three be One (London, 1863), an endeavor to prove the doctrine of the Trinity from the Zohar; Wuinsche, Die Leiden des Messias (Leipsic, 1870), page 95 sq., gives some passages relating to the atonement and the Messiah. See also the article in the Theol. Universallexikon (B.P.)

V. Doctrines. — The treatise of the Zohar is difficult and fantastic, embracing, moreover, not merely the origin of the world, but likewise speculating on the essence of God and the properties of man; in other words, covering at once cosmology, theology, and anthropology. It sets out with the conception of divinity as the self-existing, eternal, all- embracing first cause, the active as well as passive principle of all being, for which thought has no adequate measure, or language a fit name, although, while other systems have therefore styled it the great Naught or Void, the Zohar terms it the Boundless or Infinite (אֶון סוֹ). Deity at length emerges from this absolutism and reveals itself, i.e., becomes at once active and capable of being known; and thus, through the division of its essence into attributes (which before did not separately exist, because they imply a reduction incompatible with the absolute), is established a connection  between the infinite and the finite, or real creator. These attributes are ten, called Sephiroth (סְפַירוֹת, numbers), constituting so many vessels of the infinite, which contain and are forms of its manifestation, subject always to the contained, like colored glasses that receive the light and irradiate it. The impartation of the contents — in other words, the creation of the Sephiroth, is thus also beaming or emanation; a fundamental principle of the speculation, as we shall see. The idea is further illustrated by various figurative applications, e.g. the cube, with its three dimensions and six surfaces, making up the perfect decade; and so man, with his limbs (the ten Sephiroth hence being sometimes designated as the first man, קִדְמוֹןאָדָם, or ideal form of divinity, in accordance with Eze 1:26; Dan 7:13), whose shape is represented by the so-called "cabalistic tree" as follows:

1. כֶּתֶר (Crown).

3. בַּינָה (Intelligence).

2. חָכַמָה (Wisdom).

5. דַּין (Judgment).

4. חֶסֶד(Mercy).

6. תַּפַאֶרֶת (Beauty).

8. הוֹד (Majesty).

7. נֶצִח (Splendor).

9. יְסוֹד (Foundation).

10. מִלְכוּת (Kingdoms)

To each of these Sephiroth correspond certain appellations of the Deity. To the first, which is the concentration and partial development of all the others (called also figuratively the old or the long face, אֲרַיךְ אִנְפַּון, a title indicative of personality), is assigned the undefined name אֶהְיֶה, "I am." The second and third are the active and passive forms of being growing out of the first, and are considered as the male (father) and female (mother), the knowing and the known, the subject and the object, which with their result, perception (דִּעִת, included as a son or product), or else with the unit at the head, make up the metaphysical trinity of the divine essence.

To these are attributed the sacred names יָהּ, Jah, and יהֵוַה, Jehovih; and they constitute the shoulders of the mystical body. The fourth and fifth (equivalent to Grace and Right, also called Greatness, גְּדוֹלָה, and  Power, גְּבוּרָה) represent the arms (still duplicate, or male and female, active and passive, external and internal, soul and body, like all the others), with the sixth as an intermediate principle combining them, like the heart. These correspond to the higher or ethical principles, and are respectively designated by the sacred epithets, אֵלEl, אֵֹלהַים, Elohim, and יַהוֹד, Jehovah (otherwise שִׁדִּי, Shaddai). The lower, or physical trinity, consisting of the seventh, eighth, and ninth Sephiroth (equivalent to Radiance [according to another exposition, Triumph], Glory, and Stability), and respectively corresponding to the divine appellations יְהוֹה צְבָאוֹת, Jehovah Sabaoth, אֵֹלהֵי צְבָאוֹת, Elohe Sabaoth, and אֶל חִי, El Chai, represent the hips and genitals of the body, and are apparently the symbols of motion, quantity, and strength. The last Sephirah, to which the name אֲדֹנָי, Adonai, is attached, is a sort of joint conception of all the others, as the feet or basis of the whole.

By further combinations of the different Sephiroth according to the above diagram or chart, the male triad (Nos. 2, 4, 7), or right column, separates from the female triad (3, 5, 8), or left column; but the middle column (Nos. 1, 6, 10), in which No. 9 is omitted, or included in No. 10, gives three fundamental conceptions, namely, absolute existence, ideal existence, and immanent strength, as the three phases of pre-worldly existence; or, if preferred, the three conceptions of Matter, Thought, and Life. In this connection, the sixth Sephirah is sometimes called the King or Messiah; and the tenth, the Queen or Matron, q.d. inhabitation (שְׁכַינָה). These two are also called the two persons (פִּרַצוּפַין, i.e., πρόσωπα). Elsewhere there are five persons counted, the first three Sephiroth being added to these (in both enumeriations the residue are included under those named). If we notice that the 6th, as a consequence of the 2d, is called Son, and the 10th, as a consequence of the 3d, the Spirit (the latter is also considered as female or mother), we will find at once the point of contact of the Gnostic speculation with the Christian, and also the unsolved question of the manner of this connection.

These ten sephiroth or "vessels" (כֵּלַים) of the Infinite, in so far as they are considered at once in their pluratlity and in their unity, are also called a world (עוֹלָם), and, in contradistiniction from the other worlds, of which we will speak hereafter, the world of effluence (or emanation, אִצַּילוּת). This does not mean to imply that the origin of things outside of that world  was in any special manner different from it, which would render the system inconsistent, but rather seeks to establish between the infinite and matter what is the object of every system of emanation — a medium by which, in spite of distance (in every sense of the word, not merely with regard to space) between effect and cause, this working could be understood. Now this medium is established by the two middle worlds, namely, the world of creation (בְּרַייאָה) and the world of formation ( יְצַירָה), in which we are not yet led to substantial elements. The first is described as the world of the pure spirit, the latter as that of the angels or heavenly bodies. We can already perceive by this distinction that neither of these names is to be taken in its popular acceptance. In fact, the one treats of ideas, the other of power, physical as well as ethic, but not of actual beings. In both worlds the decade is again found as a representative element. Each is considered as ma production of the preceding, which is therein improved, and, at the same time. reflects the original light in a more diffuse and imperfect manner, each also establishing for itself a new unity. Neither must we understand the expressions "creation " and "formation in their common acceptance. There is no mention made in either of any pre-existing matter, or a creation from nothing as usually understood. The Cabalist generally speaks of such, but mean thereby the original void, the En-soph, i.e., the absolute, which is the source of the whole metaphysics. But as by this the pre-existence of all things is implied, we consequently arrive at the principle of the immutability of existing things, while by means of the parallel propositions that these are the same, notwithstanding the mode of their origin, there is established a relative independence, which contains the possibility and cause of the fall and corruption of mind and nature.

This point, however, belongs to the obscure parts of the system, as it does not agree well with the premises, and the modern formula of its explanation has not yet been found (but, on the contrary, a different one, if we are to consider the fall as a materialization itself). Generally it is just ill the cosmology we find the greatest obscurity, the least development, so much so that the question as to its being absolutely or only relatively pantheistic is not yet decided. It is also in this part of the system that the poetic garb of personification is the most abundant; for instance, when the stars are represented as the hieroglyphics of the active (speaking divinity). It is often perplexing; as, for instance, when a number of angels' names, virtues, natural forces, etc., become personified as regents of separate spheres of the universe. We will here remark that the second world is called also the  throne of God; the divine, spiritual element of it, which other philosophical systems would perhaps call the soul of the world, is here called Sandalphon (συνάδελφος). It is similar to the third world, that of the natural forces, or the assembling, governing principle, and is then called the angel Metatron (מֵטָטַרוֹן, i.e., μετὰ θρόνον).

The expression "throne" brings us back to Ezekiel, from whose well-known vision the figurative expressions are here employed; so that the first world represents the Glory, and the third the four beasts. These are followed by the four wheels of God's chariot, by the fourth world, or that of action (עֲשַיָּה), i.e., the material, the rind of the spiritual, the residium of the substance of the divine light, As we had just now tell classes of angels, which were leaders of the natural and vital forces, and which were retained in the ethic sense, although not to be considered as endowed with personality, or as angels popularly so called, so are there also ten classes of devils as integuments of existence, i.e., as limits to intelligence and life. These last ten Sephiroth are, first, Wilderness (תֹּהוּ), Void (בֹּהוּ), and Darkness (חשֵׁךְ); then the seven houses of corruption (the lapse). Their chief, or principal unity, is Sammael (poison-god), the angel of death; next to him, as personification of evil, is the harlot, the former representing the active, the other the passive conception of the idea; while both, as a whole, are called the beast (חֵיוָא) From. all these metaphysical ground-ideas spring original views of the mature and destiny of man.

From the foregoing scheme itself it follows, in, short, that man, in the union of his soul and body, is a representation of the universe, a microcosm, while his body is, a raiment of his soul, as the world is of God; and this comparison is sometimes carried out with a greater number of poetical figures. But as more closely united to God himself, according to his divine essence, main in this system attains a higher standing, as was indicated from the first; for the self-manifesting divinity itself was called the original man, because all nature could produce no more noble image for the idea. Thus man is next the image of God, and, like him, a unit and a triad, the latter being spirit (נְשָׁמָה), soul (רוּחִ), and life (נֶפֶשׁ). The first is the principle of thought, the second of feeling, the third of, passions and instincts (we think the last call be so understood, although some consider it as a coarser organ of the soul, and some even as the body; at all events, the material substance is not meant thereby).

All three are likewise unmistakable consequences of the three middle Sephiroth, from which they at the same time derive their relative dignity. By this, what we may call the pre-existence of the soul is established, and  not only it, but also, in one sense, the pre-existence of the body so far as it is a prototype of corporealness — and even of a particular one for each, therefore called in later days יְחַידָה(individual). The entrance into life, and the latter itself, are not considered as an evil or as a state of exile, although the souls would certainly prefer remaining always with God. It is a means of education for the soul, and of redemption for the world: for while the spirit descends even to being mixed up with matter, it still possesses at one point a clear consciousness of itself and of its origin, and is thus the more eager to return to its former position; but, on the other hand, it elevates the matter with which it is combined, enlightening and purifying it. God knows beforehand the destiny of each individual soul, so far at least as it will be affected by this combination with matter, but he does not determine that destiny. In other words, the Cabalist does not speak of predestination, nor, on the other hand, does he solve the problem of the relation between free- will and omniscience; but, in order to afford full scope to this free-will, and yet maintain the apokatastasis, or restoration (a consequence of its fundamental idea), it introduces the wandering (גַּלְגּוּל) of the soul, i.e., an infinite range of probationary life, which is to end only on reaching the aim above mentioned. The souls in their pre-worldly existence are already male and female, and even bound in couples; appearing sometimes to enter into life separately, but they will unite again in matrimony, by which they are completed and merged into one essence: thus they strive jointly towards the great end, which is their junction in heaven, in the temple of love (הֵיכִל אִהֲבָה), with God, who takes them to himself with a kiss (earthly death); and by perfecting themselves in him in thought and in will they become partakers of eternal holiness.

See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. "Kabbalah," and comp. Aharon Selig, עִמּוּדֶי שֶׁבִע (Cracow, 1636), which is a full commentary on the Zohar. SEE CABALA.

## Zoharites[[@Headword:Zoharites]]

             so called from their attachment to the book Zohar, are properly to be regarded as a continuation of the sect formed by the famous Sabbathai Zevi (q.v.). Their creed is briefly as follows:

1. They believe in all that God has ever revealed, and consider it their duty constantly to investigate its meaning.

2. They believe the letter of Scripture to be merely the shell, and that it admits of a mystical and spiritual interpretation.

3. They believe in a Trinity of Parzuphim, or persons, in Elohim.

4. They believe in the incarnation of God; that this incarnation took place in Adam, and that it will again take place in the Messiah.

5. They do not believe that Jerusalem will ever be rebuilt.

6. They believe that it is vain to expect any temporal Messiah; but that God will be manifested in the flesh, and in this state atone, not only for the sins of the Jews, but for the sins of all throughout the world who believe in him.

This sect was revived about the year 1750 by a Polish Jew, of the name of Jacob Frank, who settled in Podolia, and enjoyed the protection of the Polish government, to which he was recommended by the bishop of Kamenetz, in whose presence he held disputes with the orthodox Jews, and who was astonished at the approximation of his creed to the principles of Christianity. On the death of the bishop, he and his adherents were driven into the Turkish dominions; and being also persecuted there by the Rabbinists, they resolved to conform to the rites of the Catholic Church. Frank at last found a place of rest at Offenbach, whither his followers flocked by thousands to visit him, and where he died in 1791. Their numbers do not appear to have increased much of late; but they are to be met with in different parts of Hungary and Poland. SEE ZOHAR.

## Zoheleth[[@Headword:Zoheleth]]

             (Heb. with the art. haz-Zocheleth הִזֹּחֶלֶת. a fem. participial form; Sept. Ζωελέθ v.r. Ζωελεθί; Vulg. Zoheleth), the name of a stone (אֶבֶן) which was “by” ( אֵצֶלbeside) Enrogel, and “by” ( עַםalong with) which Adonijah offered his coronation sacrifices (1Ki 1:9). If En-rogel be the present Bir-Eyub in the valley of the Kidron, the stone in question may be any of the boulders in that vicinity.

As to the signification of the name, the Targuimists translate it “the rolling stone” and Jarchi affirms that it was a large stone on which the young men  tried their strength in attempting to roll it.. Others make it “the serpent stone” (Gesenius and Fürst), as if from the root זחל, “to creep.” Jerome simply says, “Zoelet tractum sive protractum.” Others connect it with running water; but, there is nothing strained in making it “the stone of the conduit” (מזחילה, Mazchilah), from its proximity to the great rock conduit or conduits that poured into Siloam. Bochart's idea is that the Hebrew word zohel denotes “a slow motion” (Hieroz. I, 1, 9): “The fullers here pressing out the water which dropped from the clothes that they had washed in the well called Rogel.” It this be the case, then we have some relics of this ancient custom at the massive breastwork below the present Birket el-Hamra, where the donkeys wait for their load of skins from the well, and where the Arab washerwomen may be seen to this day beating their clothes.

The practice of placing stones, and naming them from a person or an event, is very common. Jacob did so at Bethel (Gen 28:22; Gen 35:14; see Bochart, Canaan, p. 785, 786); and he did it again when parting from Laban (Glen. 31:45). Joshua set up stones in Jordan and Gilgal, at the command of God (Jos 4:9-20), and again in Shechem (Jos 24:26). Near Bethshemesh there was the Eben-gedolh (“great stone,” 1Sa 6:14), called also Abel-gedolah (“the great weeping,” 1Sa 6:18). There was the Eben-Bohdn, south of Jericho, in the plains of Jordan (Jos 15:6; Jos 18:17), “the stone of Bohan the son of Reuben,” the Ehrenbreitstein of the Ciccar, or “plain,” of Jordan, a memorial of the son or grandson of Jacob's eldest-born, for which travelers have looked in vain, but which Felix Fabri, in the 15th century (Evagat. 2, 82), professes to have seen. The rabbins preserve the memory of this stone in a book called Eben-Bohan, or the touchstone (Chron. of Rabbi Joseph, transl. by Bialloblotzky, 1, 192). There was the stone set up by Samuel between Mizpeh and Shen, EbenEzer, “the stone of help” (1Sa 7:11-12). There was the Great Stone on which Samuel slew the sacrifices, after the great battle of Saul with the Philistines (1Sa 14:33). There was the Eben-Ezel (“lapis discessus vel abitus, a discessu Jonathanis et Davidis” [- Simonis, Onomast. p. 156]), where David hid himself, and which [some Talmudists identify with Zoheleth. Large stones have always obtained for themselves peculiar names, from their shape, their position, their connection with a person or an event. In the Sinaitic desert may be found the Hajar el-Rekab (“stone of the rider”), Hajar eh-Ful (“stone of the bean”), Hojar Musa' (“stone of Moses”). The subject of stones is by no  means uninteresting, and has not in any respect been exhausted. (See the notes of De Sola and Lindenthal in their edition of Genesis, p. 175, 226; Bochart, Canaan, p. 785; Vossius, De ldololatr. 6:38; Scaliger, On Eusebius, p. 198; Heraldus, On Arnobius, bk. 7; and Elmenhorstius, On Anrnobius; also a long note of Ouzelius, in his edition of Afnucius Felix, p. 15; Calmet, Fragments, Nos. 166, 735, 736; Kitto, Palestine. See, besides, the works of antiquaries on stones and stone circles; and an interesting account of the curious Phoenician Hajar Chem in Malta, in Tallack's recent volume on: that island, p. 115-127). SEE STONE.

M. Clermont Ganneau of the French consulate at Jerusalem, has found what he deems a strong confirmation of the name in question. In ez- Zehiwdee, a rocky plateau along the edge of the village of Silwuan. (Quar. Statement of the “Palest. Explor. Fund,” Jan. 1871, p. 252. sq,). This is adopted by Tristram (Bible-Places, p,124) and Lieut. Conder (Tenit Work, 2, 313), The boundary-line of Judah passed near this. SEE TRIBE.

## Zoheth[[@Headword:Zoheth]]

             (Heb. Zocheth', זוֹחֵת, sag [Fürst]; Sept. Ζωχάθ v.r. Ζωάν; Vulg. Zoheth), first named of the two “sons, of Ishi” of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:20), the other being called Ben-zoheth (q.v.). B.C. post 1618.

## Zollikofer, Georg Joachim[[@Headword:Zollikofer, Georg Joachim]]

             a famous preacher of Leipsic, was born at Saint Gall, Aug. 5 1730. He attended the gymnasia of Saint Gall and Bremen, and afterwards the University of Utrecht; giving attention rather to literature than theology at the latter place, and cultivating a finished, diction. He became a family tutor at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1749. In 1753 he returned to Saint Gall and vainly sought employment there and in other Swiss towns; but earned in the meantime, a reputation which obtained for him a call to become the pastor of the Reformed congregation at Leipsic. He served that congregation during thirty years, and until his death, which occurred Jan. 22, 1788. Zollikofer's tendency was in some measure in harmony with the spirit of his times. He was given to the exaltation of virtue, and loved to discuss the dignity of man, the ways of righteousness which alone lead to God, and which Jesus opened by teaching and example.

He asserted that persons who have always been virtuous need no conversion, but simply a perfecting of their characters. Christianity was to him God's own best means for the instructing, comforting, and improving of men, through  which progress they may attain to blessedness. He was not, however, an exponent of the “enlightenment” of that period for Christ's resurrection, ascension and eternal glory were held by him as positive facts. Christ was to him the only begotten Son of the Highest; though the atonement was regarded as simply an expression of God's readiness to forgive. As a preacher he may be ranked with Reinhard though superior to him as an expositor and in the definite aim of his discourse, as well as in the joy his fervor with which it was usually pervaded. Leipsic regarded it as an evidence of inferior culture and poor taste not to prefer him above the contemporary preachers. He wrote prayers which are mere reflections preceded by an address to God; e.g. Anreden u. Gebete bei dem gemeinschaftl. U. hauslichen Gottesdienste (1777):— Andachtsubungen u. Gentet, etc. (New ed. 1804,4 pts.). He also prepared a hymn book, Sammlung geistl. Lieder u. Gesange (1766). His sermons were repeatedly published; in 15 vols. In 1798-1804. His personal character was thoroughly upright and manly, and also kindly and benevolent. He was self-possessed and of an equitable temper. The care with which he chose the precise word he needed made him eloquent in the pulpit, but reticent in ordinary intercourse with men.

The sources for Zollikofer's life are Firscher, A Memorial Discourse; Hirsching Hist. lit. Handbuch (Ernests's supplement, Leips. — 1815), 17,: 272 sq;. Döring, Deutsche Kanzelrednerd. 18. u. 19. Jahrhunderts (Neustadt an d. Oder, 1830), p. 586 sq.; Larve, Charakterization (Leips. 1788); Lentz, Gesch. D. Homiletik, 2, 327 sq.; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. D. 18. u. 19. Jahrh. 1, 366 sq. See also Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Zollner, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Zollner, Johann Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born April 24, 1753. He studied at Frankfort, was in 1779 preacher at Berlin, declined a call as superintendent to Neu- Brandenburg in 1782, and remained at Berlin as pastor of St. Mary's, where he died, Sept. 12, 1804. He published, Disputcatio pro Unicitate Dei (Frankfort, 1776): — Ueber Mos Mendelssohn's Jerusalem (1784), besides a number of sermons. See Doring, Die gelehrten Kanzelredner, pages 580-585. (B.P.)

## Zonaras, Johannes[[@Headword:Zonaras, Johannes]]

             a Byzantine historian, was born in the last part of the 11th century, and died about 1130.. He was secretary to the emperor Alexius Comnenus.  After the death of Alexius (1118) he retired to the monastery of St. Elijah, in Mount Athos, and devoted himself to theological and literary studies. His Chronicle, from the creation till the death of Alexius, is a mere compilation from Josephus, Eusebius, Xenophon, Herodotus, Plutarch, Dio Cassius, etc., and was edited by Hieronymus Wolf (Basel, 1557), Du Fresne (Paris, 1686, 2 volumes), and Pinder (Bonn, 1841-44, 2 volumes). Of more value is his commentary on the Syntagma of Photius: Ε᾿ξήγησις τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ θείων κανόνων τῶν τε ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν Α᾿ποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκουμενικῶν, etc. In Latin and Greek the work was published at Paris in 1619; the best edition, however, is the one published at Oxford in 1672 fol. Zonaras also wrote scholia on the New Test., on which see Zonarae Glossiae Sacrae Novi Testamenti Illustratae a F.W. Schurz (Grimma, 1818-20). On the first two works see Schmidt, Ueber die Quellen des Zonaras, in Zimmermann's Zeitschrift fur die Alterthumswissenschaft (Darmstadt, 1839), volume 6, No. 30-36; Zander, Quibus e Fontibus Joh. Zonaras Hauserit sueos Annales Romanos (Ratzeburg, 1849); Biener, De Collectionibus Canonum Ecclesiae Gricecc (Berlin, 1827); the same, Das Kanonische Recht der griechischen Kirche, in Mittermaier's Zeitschrift (Heidelberg, 1855), volume 28, pages 201-203; Mortreuil, Histoire du Droit Byzantin (Paris, 1843), 3:423-428; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Zoolatry[[@Headword:Zoolatry]]

             (Greek ξῶον and λατρεία), the worship of animals. SEE ANIMAL WORSHIP; SEE IDOLATRY.

## Zoology, Biblical[[@Headword:Zoology, Biblical]]

             This, like all other scientific subjects, is practically and incidentally, rather than systematically and designedly, treated in the Scriptures, yet many animals are mentioned, and their characteristics are given with substantial accuracy. In the Talmud a more copious and minute description is given of many animals (see Lewysohn, Die Zoologie des Talmuds [Frankfort-on- the-Main, 1858]). The popular and general classification into beasts, birds, reptiles, etc. is the usual Biblical one, and they are further distinguished as clean and unclean. See each of these designations under its proper head. The following is a full list of all the animals (including certain animal products) mentioned in the Bible, in the alphabetical order of the names in  the original, with the ordinary rendering in the A.V., and the real name as nearly as modern research has identified it. See each term in its proper place in the body of this Cyclopaedia. SEE NATURAL HISTORY.
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## Zopf, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Zopf, Johann Heinrich]]

             a German theological writer, who lived in the 18th century, is the author of, Introductio ad Lectionem Veteris Testamenti, etc. (Leipsic, 1763): — Josephus, Zeuqniss von Jesu Christo (ibid. 1759 ): — Quadriga Dissertt.: 1. De Versione lxx. quos Vocant, Interpretum; 2. De Serpente Protoplastorum Seductore, etc. (ibid. 1763): — Introductio in Antiquitates Sacras Veterums Ebraeorum (Halle, 1734): — Diss. de Jephtae in Filiamn Mitigata Credulitate, etc. (Essen, 1730): — Diss. de Pseudo-Samuelis ex 1 Samuel c. 28 (ibid. 1747): — Compendium Grammaticae Hebraeae Danziance (ibid. 1748). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:555. (B.P.)

## Zophah[[@Headword:Zophah]]

             (Heb. Tsophach', צוֹפִח[in pause. צוֹפָח], a cruse [Gesen.]; Sept. Ζωφά v.r. Ζωφάρ and Ζωχάθ; Vulg. Supha), an Asherite, first named of the four sons Hof Heiam or Hotham (1Ch 7:35 comp; 1Ch 7:32), and fathers of many sons (1Ch 7:36). B.C. cir. 1618.

## Zophai[[@Headword:Zophai]]

             (Heb; Tsophay', צוֹפִי‘, patronymic; from Zuph [Fürst]; Sept. Ζουφί; Vulg. Sophat), a Kohathite Levite, son of Elkanah and father of Nahath (1Ch 6:26 [Hebrews 11]); elsewhere (Heb 11:35) called simply ZUPH SEE ZUPH (q.v.).

## Zophar[[@Headword:Zophar]]

             (Heb. Tsohar צוֹפִר, sparrow, [Gesen.] or shaggy [Fuirst]; Sept. Ζωφα; Vulg. Sophar), the last named of Job's three friends and opponents in argument (Job 2:11; Job 11:1; Job 20:1; Job 42:9). B.C. cir. 2000. He is called a Naamathite, or inhabitant of Naamah, a place whose situation is unknown, as it could not be the Naamah mentioned in Jos 15:41. Wemyss, in his Job and his Times (p. 111), well characterizes this interlocutor: “Zophar exceeds the other two, if possible, in severity of censure; He is the most inveterate of the accusers, and, speaks without feeling, or pity. He does little more than repeat and exaggerate the arguments of Bildad. He unfeelingly alludes (Job 11:15) to the effects of Job's disease as appearing in his countenance. This is cruel and invidious. Yet in the same discourse how nobly does he treat-of the divine, attributes, showing that any inquiry into then is far beyond the grasp of the human mind! And though them hortatory part of the first discourse bears some resemblance to that of Eliphaz, yet it is diversified by the fine imagery which he employs. He seems to have had a full conviction of the providence of God as regulating and controlling the actions of men; but he limits all his reasonings to the present life, and makes no reference to a future world. This circumstance alone accounts for the weakness and fallacy of; these men's judgments. , In his second discourse there is much poetical beauty in the selection of images, and the general doctrine is founded, in truth; its fallacy: lies in its application to Job's peculiar case. The whole indicates great warmth of temper, inflamed by misapprehension of its object and by mistaken zeal.” It is to be observed that Zophar has but two speeches, whereas the others have three each. When Job had replied, (ch. 26-31) to the short address of Bildad (ch. 25), a rejoinder might have been expected from Zophar; but he said nothing, the three friends, by, common consent, then giving up the contest in despair (32, 1). SEE JOB.

## Zophim[[@Headword:Zophim]]

             (Heb. Tsophim', צוֹפַים[briefly צפַים. in Numbers], watchers, as often; but Fürst thinks, fertile), the name either in whole or part of two places in Palestine.

1. (Sept σκοπιάν; Vlg. sublimis.) The designation of a field (שָׂדֶה) or spot on or near the top of Pisgah, from which Balaam, had his second view of the encampment of Israel (Num 23:14). If the word sadeh (“field”)  may be taken in its usual sense, then the “field of Zophim” was a cultivated spot high up on the top of the range of Pisgah. But that word is the almost invariable term for a portion of the upper district of Moab, and therefore may have had some local sense which: has hitherto escaped notice, and in which it is employed in reference. to .he spot in question. The position of the fieldof Zophi m is not defined; it is only said that it commanded merely a portion of the encampment of Israel. Neither do the ancient versions afford any clew. The Targum of Onkelos, the Sept., and the Peshito-Syriac take Zophim in the sense of “watchers” or “lookers out” and translate it accordingly. But it is probably a Hebrew version of an aboriginal n ame, related to that which, in other places of the present records, appears as Mizpehi or Mizpah. Mount Nebo, or Pisgah, is now undoubtedly identified as Jebel Neba; near Hesban. SEE NESO.

De Saulcy appears to have even heard the ancient name given to it by the Bedawin (Voyage en Tere Sainte, 1, 289). Along its eastern side, and reaching from the ruins of Maan to Hesban, is a plateau of arable land, still cultivated in part by the Arabs, which appears to be the place in question (Portner Handbook for Palestine; p. 300.). In this view Tristram at length concurs (Bible Places, p. 346). Prof Paine, of the American Exploring Party, regards it as Wady Haisa, on the south east of Jebel Neba. SEE PISGAH.

2. (Sept. Σωφίμ v; r. Σιφά; Vulg. Sophim.) Ramathaim-zophim was Samuel's birthplace (1Sa 1:1). ‘The dual form of the first term, according to some, signifies one of the two Ramahs: to wit, that of the, Zophites (Lightfoot, 2, 162, ed. 1832); and the second term, according to others, means speculatores, i.e. prophets, and denoting that at this place was a school of the prophets a hypothesis supported by the Chaldee paraphrast, who renders it “Elkanah, a man of Ramatha, a disciple of the prophets.” Others find in the dual form of Ramthaim a reference to the shape of the city, which was built on the sides of two hills; and in the word Zophim see an allusion to some watch-towers, or places of observation, which the high situation of the city might favor (Clerici Opera, 2, 175). Others, again, affirm that the word Zophim is added because Ramah or Ramatha: was inhabited by a clan of Levites of the family of Zuph (Calmet, s.v.). Winer asserts (Realwort. art. “Samuel”) that the first verse of the book declares Samuel to be an Ephraimite. This term, however, if the genealogy in Chronicles remain undisturbed, must signifyl not an Ephraimite by birth, but by abode. We find that the Kohathites, to whom Samuel belonged, had their lot in Mount Ephraim (Jos 21:5-20),  where not the hill of' Ephraim is meant, but the hill country of Ephraim (Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.). The family of Zoph, living in the hill country of Ephra1m, might be termed Ephrathite, while their ancestor's name distinguished their special locality as Ramathaim zophim. The geography of this place has been disputed. SEE RAMAH. Eusebius and Jerome confound it with Arimathsa of the New Test. (Onomast. art. “Armatha Sophim”). The Sept. renders it Α᾿ρμαθαὶμ Σωφίμ, Cod. A, or Cod. B,'Α᾿ρμαθὶμ Σιφά 2.0a. For an account of the place now, and for long called Neby Samwl, and the impossibility of its being the ancient Ramah, see Robinson, Palestine, 2, 141; and for an interesting discussion as to the site of Ramath-zophim, the latter name being yet retained in the Arabic term Sobah, the curious reader may consult the same work (p. 830), or Biblioth. Sacra (p. 46). The hilly range of Ephraim extended southward into other cantons, while it bore its original name of Mount Ephraim; — and so the inhabitants of Ramathaim-zophim might be termed Ephrathites, just as Mahlon and Chilion are called “Ephrathites of Bethlehem-judah” (Rth 1:2). SEE RAMATHAIM; SEE ZUPH.

## Zorababel[[@Headword:Zorababel]]

             (Ζοροβάεβλ), the Greek form (1Es 4:13; 1Es 5:5-70; 1Es 6:2-29; Sir 49:11; Mat 1:12-13; Luk 3:27) of the name of Zerubbabel (q.v.)

## Zorah[[@Headword:Zorah]]

             (Heb. Tsorah', צָרְעָה, hornet; Sept. Σαραά v.r. Σοράθ, Σαράλ, Σαρά, etc.; Josephus, Σαρασά, Ant. 5, 8, 12; Vulg. Saraa; A. V. “Zareah,” Neh 11:29; “Zoreah,” Jos 15:33), one of the towns near the border of the tribe of Dan (Jos 19:41), but really within-the limits of Judah, being in the north-western corner of the “valley district” (Jos 15:33). It is almost always mentioned in connection with Eshtaol (see also Jdg 13:25; Jdg 16:31; Jdg 18:2; Jdg 18:8; Jdg 18:11; and comp. 1Ch 2:53). Zorah was the residence of Manoah and the native place of Samson. The place both of his birth and his burial is specified with a curious minuteness as “between Zorah and Eshtaol,” “in Mahaneh-Dan” (Jdg 13:25; Jdg 11:31). In the genealogical records of 1 Chronicles (1Ch 2:53; 1Ch 4:2) the “Zareathites and Eshtaulites” are given as descended from (i.e. colonized by) Kirjathjearim. Zorah is mentioned among the places fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:10) and it was re-inhabited by the men of Judah after the return from the Captivity (Neh 11:29). In the Onomasticon (s.v. Σαρδά and “Saara”) it is mentioned as living some ten miles north of Eleutheropolis on the road to Nicopolis. By the Jewish traveler Hap-Parchi (Zunz, Benjamin of Tud. 2, 441) it is specified as three hours south-east of Lydd. These notices agree  in direction though in neither is the distance nearly sufficient with the modern village of Sur'ah which has been visited by Robinson (Bibl. Res. 3; 153); and Toblern (Dritte Wanzd. p.a18-183).

It lies just below the brow of, a sharp pointed conical hill at the shoulder of the ranges which there meet, and form the north side of the Wady Ghurab, the northernmost of the two branches which unite just below, Sir'ah, and form the great wady Surar. Near it are to be seen the remains of Zanoah, Bethshemesh, Timnai, there and other places more or less frequently mentioned with it in the narrative. Eshtaol, however, has not yet been identified. The position of Sir'ah at the entrance of the valley, which forms one of the inlets from the great low land, explains its fortification by Rehoboam. The spring is a short distance below the village” “a noble fountain” this was at the end of April “walled up square with large hewn stones and gushing over with fine water. As we passed on,” continues Robinson, with a more poetical tone than is his wont, “we overtook no less than twelve women toiling upwards to the village, each with her; jar of water on her head. The village, the fountain, the fields, the mountain the females bearing water, all transported us back to ancient times, when in all probability the mother of Samson often in like manner visited the fountain and toiled homeward with her jar of water. See also Schwarz, Palestine, p. 102; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 361; Porter, Handbook for Pal. p. 285; Tristram, Bible Places, p. 468. Consider Tent Work. 1, 274.

## Zorathite[[@Headword:Zorathite]]

             (Heb. Tsorathi', צָרְעָתַי, patronymic from Zorah; Sept. Σαραθί v.r. Α᾿ραθί; Vulg. Sorathi; A.V. “Zorathites”), a designation of the inhabitants of Zorah (q.v.), mentioned in 1Ch 4:2 as descended from Shobal, one of the sons of Judah, who in 2, 52 is stated to have founded Kirjath jearim, from which again “the Zareathites and the Eshtaulites” were colonized. SEE ZAREATHITE; SEE ZORITE.

## Zoreah[[@Headword:Zoreah]]

             (Jos 15:33). SEE ZORAH.

## Zorite[[@Headword:Zorite]]

             (Heb. Tsori', צָרְעַי, a patronymic; Sept. Σαραϊv v.r. ῾Ησαρί; Vulg. Sarai; A.V. “Zorites”), the designation apparently of the inhabitants of Zorah (q v.), mentioned in 1Ch 2:54 as descended from Salma the  brother of Shobal, and hence classed with the descendants of the latter the “Zareathites and the Eshtaulites” (1Ch 2:53).

## Zorn, Peter[[@Headword:Zorn, Peter]]

             a German theological writer, was born at Hamburg, May 22, 1682. In 1715 he was called as rector to Plon, in Holstein; in 1725 became professor of history, in 1729 that of Church history at the gymnasium in Stettin, and died at Thorn, January 23, 1746. He published, De Scholis Publicis quas Antiqui Judaei Prope Lacuum, Amn. et Fluviorum Crepidinibus, etc., Exstruxerunt (Act 16:13) (Ploense, 1716): — De Epithalamiis sive Carminibus Veterum Hebraeorum Nuptialibus (Hamburg, s.a.): — De Antiquis AEnigmatibus in Coenis Nuptialibus Hebraeorum, Graecorum et Romanorum (Leipsic, 1724): — Historia Bibliorum ex Hebraeorum Diebus Festis et Jejuniis lllustrata, etc. (ibid. 1741): — Diss. de Baptismo Proselytor. Judaico Sacrament. V.T. juxta Lightfootum (ibid. 1703): — Hecataei Abderitae Eclogae (Altona, 1730): — Historia Fisci Judaici sub Imperio Veterum Romanorum (ibid. 1734). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:555; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:32, 140, 632, 899. (B.P.)

## Zoroaster[[@Headword:Zoroaster]]

             (more correctly Zarathustra, which in Greek and Latin was corrupted into Zarastrades and Zoroastres, while the Persians and Parsees changed it into Zerdusht) was the founder of the Parsee religion. The original meaning of the word was probably that of "chief," "senior," "high-priest," and it was a common designation of a spiritual guide and head of a district or province. Indeed, the founder of Zoroastrianism is hardly ever mentioned woithout  his family name Spitima. He was a native of Bactria. He applied to himself the terms Manthran (reciter of "Manthras"), a messenger sent by Ahura- Mazda, or a speaker, one who listens to the voice of oracles given by the spirit of nature, one who receives sacred words from Ahura-Mazda through the flames. His life is covered with obscurity. The accounts of him are legendary and unhistorical. In the Zend writings he is to a great extent represented, not as a historical, but as a dogmatical personality, vested with superhuman, or even divine, powers, standing next to God. His temptations by the devil, whose empire was threatened by him, form the subject of many traditional stories and legends. He is represented as the fountain of all wisdom and truth, and the master of the whole living creation. One of the prayers of the Fravardiul Yasht declares —

"We worship the rule and the guardian angel of Zarathustra Spitima, who first thought good thoughts, who first spoke good words, who first performed good actions who was the first priest, the first warrior, the first cultivator of the soil, the first prophet, the first who was inspired, the first who has given to mankind nature, and reality, and word, and hearing of word, and wealth, and all good things created by Mazda, which embellish reality; who first caused the wheel to turn among gods and men, who first praised the purity of the living creation and destroyed idolatry, who confessed the Zarathustrian belief in Ahura-Mazda, the religion of the living God against the devils.... Through him the whole true and revealed word was heard, which is the life and guidance of the world.... Through his knowledge and speech the waters become desirous of growing; through his knowledge and speech all beings created by the Holy Spirit are uttering words of happiness." In the older Yasna alone he appears like a living reality, a man acting a great and prominent part, both in the history of his country and that of mankind.

I. History. — Zoroaster's father seems to have been called Purusbaspa, and his daughter, the only one of his children mentioned, Puruchista. But the time when he lived remains very obscure. He is usually said to have flourished in the reign of a king Gushtasp, who has, on apparently sufficient grounds, been identified with the Darius Hystaspis of the classical writers (Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, 1:234).

The dates generally given are as follows: Xanthos of Lydia places him about six hundred years before the Trojan war; Aristotle and Eudoxus place him six thousand years before Plato; others, again, five thousand years before the Trojan war. Berosus, a Babylonian historian, makes him a Babylonian king, and the founder of a  dynasty which reigned over Babylon between 2200 and 2000 B.C. .The Parsees place him at the time of Hystaspes, the father of Darius, whom they identify with a king mentioned in the Shah-Nameh, from whom, however, Hystaspes is wholly distinct. This account would place Zoroaster at about 550 B.C. Yet there is scarcely a doubt that he must be considered as belonging to a much earlier age, not later than 1000 B.C. It is almost certain that Zoroaster was one of the Sosbyantos, or five priests, with whom the religious reform first arose, which he boldly carried out. The Aryans seem to have originally led a nomad life, until some of them, reaching, in the course of their migrations, lands fit for permanent settlements, settled down into agriculturists. Bactria and the parts between the Oxus and the Jaxartes seem to have attracted them most. The Iranians became gradually estranged from their brother tribes, who adhered to their ancient nomad life, and by degrees came to consider those peaceful settlements a fit prey for their depredations and inroads. The hatred thus engendered and nourished soon came to include all and everything belonging to those devastators — even their religion, originally identical with that of their own. The Deva religion became, in their estimation, the source of all evil. Moulded into a new form, styled the Ahura religion, the old elements were much more changed than was the case when Judaism became Christianity. Generation after generation further added and took away, until Zarathustra, with the energy and the clear eye that belongs to exalted leaders and founders of religions, gave to that which had originally been a mere reaction and spite against the primitive Brahminic faith a new and independent life, and forever fixed its dogmas, not a few of which sprang from his own brain.

II. Doctrines. — Zoroaster is commonly spoken of as the great reformer of the Magian system after it had suffered corruption; but it would be more correct to say that on the primitive dualistic worship pf the Persians he superinduced some notions borrowed from the element-worship, with which Magism at a later period coalesced. His doctrines, as far as they call be gathered from the extant fragments of the Zend-Avesta, especially the Vendidad Sade, and from the Ulemai Islan (a treatise on the Parsee doctrine by an Arabic writer, supposed to belong to the 6th or 7th century of our mera), relate principally to theology and ethics, with occasional references to questions of a cosmological and physiological character. The problem of the world in relation to God he answers by reference to the antithesis of light and darkness, good and evil; all things, according to him,  consist in the mingling of antitheses. His primary physical principle is the Zerwane Akerene, the Endless Time (with which may be compared the τὸ ἄπειρον of Anaximander; see Arist. Physic. 1:4, 5; 3:4-7).

Everything else save time has been made. The original spiritual power was Ormuzd, the luminous, the pure, the fragrant, devoted to good and capable of all good. Gazing into the abyss, he beheld, afar off, Ahriman, black, unclean, unsavory, the evil-doer. He was startled at the sight, and thought within, himself, I must put this enemy out of the way; and set himself to use the fit means for this end. All that Ormuzd accomplished was by the help of Time. After the lapse of twelve hundred years the heavens and paradise were made, and the twelve signs which mark the heavens were fixed there. Each sign was formed in one thousand years. After the first three were formed, Ahriman arose to make war on Ormuzd, but failing of success he returned to his gloomy abode, and remained there for other three thousand years, during which the work of creation advanced, and three other signs were made. During this period the earth and the sea were also formed, man was created, and plants and animals produced. Again Ahriman assailed heaven with all his: might, but failing in this, he attacked the world. He afflicted Kajumert, the first man, with a thousand plagues till he was destroyed; but was himself taken and driven into hell through the same opening by which he had come into the world.. In man there is much of Ormuzd and much of Ahriman: in his body are fire, water, earth, and air; he has also soul, understanding, judgment, a ferver ("principe des sensations," Anquetil), and five senses. By the soul are moved all the members we possess, and without the soul we are nothing. All these he has from Ormuzd. From Ahriman he has desire, need, envy, hatred, impurity, falsehood, and wrath. When a man dies, the four elements of which his body is composed mingle with the four primitive elements; his soul, understanding, and judgment unite with the ferver, and all become one. In this state man goes to judgment, and according as his good works or his bad works have preponderated during life, he is rewarded with immortality in paradise, or punished by being cast into hell. During life he is in constant conflict with the Dews or Divas, a class of beings possessing a body formed of the four elements beings essentially evil, and who tempt men to sin but at the resurrection they shall be annihilated, and all men at last shall be received into paradise. Even Ahriman himself shall be accepted and blessed; for the Dews are gradually abstracting from him the evil and darkness that are in him, so that at last he shall be left pure and bright (see Hyde, Hist. Rel. Vet. Pers. [Oxon. 1700]; Anquetil du Perron, Zend-Avesta [Par. 1771, 3  volumes, 4to]; Vullers, Fragmente uber die Rel. des Zoroaster [Bonn, 1831]).

It is chiefly from the Gathas, however, that Zarathustra's real theology, unmutilated by later ages, can be learned. His leading idea was monotheism. While the five priests before him, the Sosbyantos, worshipped a plurality of good spirits called Ahuras, as opposed to the Indian Devas, he reduced this plurality to unity. This one supreme being he called Ahuru- Mazda, or the creator of the universe-the Auramazda of the cuneiform inscriptions of the Achemenidian kings, the Ahurmazd of Sassanian times, and the Hormazd, or Ormuzd, of the modern Parsees. This supreme god is, by Zoroaster, conceived to be "the creator of the earthly and spiritual life, the lord of the whole universe, at whose hands are all the creatures." Ahura-Mazda is to Zoroaster the light and the source of light. He is wisdom and intellect; he possesses all good things, temporal and spiritual, among them the good mind, immortality, wholesomenesss, the best truth, devotion, piety, and abundance of all earthly good. All these gifts he grants to the pious man who is pure in thought, word, and deed. He rewards the good and punishes the wicked; and all that is created, good or evil, fortune or misfortune, is his work alone.

Nothing was further from Zoroaster's mind than to assume anything but one supreme being, one and indivisible. But the great problem of the ages, the origin of evil and its incompatibility with God's goodness, holiness, and justice, he attempted to solve by assuming two primeval causes, which, though different, were united, and produced the world of the material things as well as that of the spirit. The one who produced the reality is called Vohu-Mano, the good mind; the other, through whom the non- reality originated, is the Akem -Mano, the evil mind. To the former belong all good, true, and perfect things; to the second, all that is delusive, bad, wicked. These two aboriginal moving causes of the universe are called twins. They are spread everywhere, in God as in man. When united in Ahura-Mazda they are called Spento-Manyus and Angro-Manyus, i.e., white or holy, and dark or evil, spirit. It is only in later writings that these two are supposed to stand opposed to each other in the relation of God and devil. The inscriptions of Darius know but one God, without any adversary whatsoever. But while the one side within him produced all that is bright and shining, all that is good and useful in nature, the other side produced all that is dark and apparently noxious. Both are as inseparable as day and night, and, though opposed to each other, are indispensable for the  preservation of creation. The bright spirit appears in the blazing flame, the presence of the dark is marked by the wood converted into charcoal. The one has created the light of the day, the other the darkness of the light; the former awakens men to their duty, the other lulls them to sleep. Life is produced by the one and extinguished by the other, who also, by releasing the soul from the fetters of the body, enables her to go up to immortality. SEE DUALISM.

Thus the original monotheism of Zoroaster did not last long. False interpretations, misunderstandings, changes, and corruptions crept in, and dualism was established in theology. The two principles then, for the first time, became two powers, hostile to each other, each ruling over a realm of his own, and constantly endeavoring to overthrow the other. Hence monotheism was, in later times, broken up and superseded by dualism. But a small party, represented by the Magi, remained steadfast to the old doctrine, as opposed to that of the followersof the efalse interpretation, or Zend, the Zendiks. In order to prove their own interpretation of Zoroaster's doctrines they had recourse to a false and ungrammatical explanation of the term Zervana Akarana, which, merely meaning time without bounds, was by them pressed into an identity with the Supreme Being; while the passages on which the present Parsee priests still rest their faulty interpretation, simply indicate that God created in the boundless time, or that he is from eternity, self-existing, neither born nor created.

The following is a brief summary of the principal doctrines of Zoroaster, drawn from certain passages from the Gathas, which probably emanated from Zoroaster himself.

1. Everywhere in the world a duality is to be perceived, such as the good and the evil, light and darkness; this life and that life, human wisdom and divine wisdom.

2. Only this life becomes a prey to death, but not that hereafter, over which the destructive spirit has no power.

3. In the universe there are, from the beginning, two spirits at work, the one making life, the other destroying it.

4. Both these spirits are accompanied by intellectual powers, representing the ideas of the Platonic system on which the whole moral world rests. They cause the struggle between good and evil, and all the conflicts of the world, which end in the final victory of the good principle.

5. The principal duty of man in this life is.to obey the word and commandments of God.

6. Disobedience is punished with the death of the sinner.

7. Ahura-Mazda created the idea of the good, but is not identical with it. This idea produced the good mind, the Divine Spirit, working in man and nature, and devotion — the obedient heart.

8. The Divine Spirit cannot be resisted.

9. Those who obey the word of God will he free from all defects and immortal.

10. God exercises his rule in the world through the works prompted by the Divine Spirit, who is working in man and nature.

11. Men should pray to God and worship him. He hears the prayers of the good.

12. All men live solely through the bounty of God.

13. The soul of the pure will hereafter enjoy everlasting life; that of the wicked will have to undergo everlasting punishment, or as modern Parsee theologians explain, to the day of the resurrection.

14. All creatures are Ahura-Mazda's.

15. He is the reality of the good mind, word, and deed.

III. Literature. — Haug, Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees (Bombay, 1862); Spiegel, Evanische Aterthumskunde (Leipsic, 1871-78, 3 volumes); Darmsteter, Ormuzd et Ahriman (Paris, 1877); Ursinus, De Zoroastre (Nuremberg, 1661); Mulert, De Nomine et Vita Zoroastris (Wittenberg, 1707); Clarke, Ten Great Religions (Boston, 1871); Hardwick, Christ and Other Masters (London, 1855-57; 2d ed. 1863); Muller, Chips from a German Workshop (Index). See also the following with the references under them: SEE AHRIMAN; SEE GUEBERS; SEE MAGI; SEE ORMUZD; SEE PARSEES; SEE ZEND-AVESTA.

## Zorphi[[@Headword:Zorphi]]

             (Heb. with the art. hats-Tsorephi', הִצֹּרְפַי; Sept. τοῦ Σαρεφί; Vulg. aurificis; A.V. "the goldsmith ") is a marginal suggestion in Neh 3:31, for the name of the father of Malchiah, as if a proper name, but probably without good reason.

## Zosimus[[@Headword:Zosimus]]

             pope in A.D. 417418, successor to Innocent I, was by birth a Greek and is noteworthy as a participant in the doctrinal controversies of his time, in which he first endorsed and then rejected doctrines regarded as heretical, and also for his assertion of authority and his energetic labors in behalf of the supremacy of the Roman see. He countermanded the condemnation of Pelagius and Coelstids, denounced by Innocent and the African synods; and in a letter to bishop Aurelius of Carthage and others he censured the treatment they had received declared them orthodox, and warned the bishops against, sophistries in speculation. He also cited before his bar Paulinus, the accuser of Pelagius. The African bishops however, held another synod 418, which defined their course and censured Zosimuis for a reopening a settled case, besides forbidding the departure of Paulinus for Rome. Zosimus, endeavored to fortify his position by a reference to the ecclesiastical authority derived by his see from Peter; but when tithe, Africans obtained a sacrum rescriptum against the Pelagians from the emperor Hoisorius, he gave way, and, for his art pronounced the condemnation of Pelagius and Coelestius in an Epistola Tractatoria. This time he was opposed by eighteen Italian bishops whom he at once declared deposed. The deposition of the presbyter Apiarius of Sicca, in Numidiaand his appeal to Zosimus against his bishop, Urbaitus, led to fresh disputes with the Africans. Zosimus refused to recognize the deposition, and sent three delegates to a synod convened at Garthage to demand the restoration of Apiarius.

Zosimus also interfered in the affairs of the Gallican bishops by appointing bishop Patroclus of Arelate his vicar in Gaul, and conferring upon him the rights of metropolitan over the province of Vienne. His course excited much opposition; but death put an end to his plans for aggrandizement in 418. See Schröckh, Kirchengesch. (Leips. 1782), 8:148 sq.; Gieseler, Kirchengesch. (4th ed. Bonn. 1845), 1, 2, 111 sq. — Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.

## Zouch, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Zouch, Thomas, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, was born at Sandal, near Wakefield, Yorkshire, in 1737. He was educated at Wakefield School and at Trinity College,  Cambridge, where he graduated in 1761. He became a fellow of his college in 1763, and was appointed assistant tutor. In 1770 he became rector of Wycliffe, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, where he remained until 1793. In 1791 he was appointed deputy commissary of the archdeaconry of Richmond, and in 1793 was chaplain to the Master of the Rolls and rector of Scrayingham. By the death of his elder brother, the Rev. Henry Zouch, in 1795, he succeeded to an estate at Sandal, where he resided until his death. He became prebendary of Durham in 1805; declined the bishopric of Carlisle in 1808; and died in 1816. He was the author of, The Crucifixion (Canterbury, 1765), a Seaton prize poem: — An inquiry into the Prophetic Character of the Romans as Described in Dan 8:23-25 (1792): — Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Sir Philip Sidney (York, 1808): — and other works. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Zschokke, Johann Heinrich Daniel[[@Headword:Zschokke, Johann Heinrich Daniel]]

             a German writer, was born at Magdeburg, March 22, 1771. He was erratic in his early youth, but studied at the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and although proficient in philosophy, history, and mathematics, was refused a position as professor on account of his opposition to the government. Leaving Prussia, therefore, he travelled through Germany and Framice, and settled in Switzerland as a teacher, but the French revolution compelled him to take refuge in Aarau, where he played an active part in those times. He died there, January 22, 1848. His later productions were chiefly poetical and historical, many of them novels. His best known is Stunden der Andacht (1806; twice trans]. in English, Meditations on Death); but, as might be expected from his career, it is neither profound nor inspiring. His collected works were published at Aarau (1825, 40 volumes, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Zuar[[@Headword:Zuar]]

             (Heb. Tsuar', צוּעִר, littleness; Sept. Σωράρ; Vulg. Suar), the father of Nethaneel, which latter was the chief of the tribe of Issachar at the time of the Exode (Num 1:8; Num 2:5; Num 7:18; Num 7:23; Num 10:15). B.C. ante 1658.

## Zubly, John Joachim, D.D[[@Headword:Zubly, John Joachim, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at St. Gall, Switzerland, Aug. 27,1724. He was ordained to the ministry Aug. 19, 1744; took charge of the Independent Presbyterian Church of Savannah, Ga., in 1760; and was a delegate from Georgia to the Constitutional Congress in 1775-76, but opposed separation from England, and returned to Savannah, which i his unpopularity forced him to leave. He died July 23, 1781. Dr. Zubly was a man of great learning and unaffected piety, devoted to his call as a preacher of the Gospel, and zealous for the success of his labors.

He published, The Real Christians Hope in Death, etc. (Charlestown, 1756, 12mo), with a Preface by the Rev. Richard Clarke: — Sermon on the Repeal of the Stamp Act (Savannah, 1766, 8vo): — Amenable Inquiry into the Nature of the Dependency of the American Colonies upon the Parliament of Great Britain, and the Right of Parliament to Lay Taxes on the said Colonies, by a Freeholder of South Carolina (1769, 4to): — Sermon on the Value of that Faith without which it is Impossible to Please God (1772): — Sermon on the Death of Rev. John Osgood, of Midway (1773): — The Law of Liberty (Phila. 1775; 8ro;, Lond. eod. 8vo; Phila. 1778, 8vo), a sermon on  American affairs. See. Allibone, Dict. of Brit and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 219; London Monthly Review, Feb. 1776, p. 167; Georgia Analytic Repository, 1, 49. (J. L. S.)

ADDENDUM FROM VOLUME 12:

a Presbyterian minister, was born about the year 1730. In 1775 he took an active part in political matters, and was selected as one of the Georgia delegates to the Continental Congress at Philadelphia. The Georgia divine did not prove loyal to the Whig side, and a correspondence of his with the royal governor of the state having been discovered, he was compelled to resign his position in Congress, and subsequently his property was forfeited under the Confiscation Act. He died at Savannah, before the war ended, in July 1781. He is said to have been "a man of great learning, of vigorous and penetrating mind." See Sabine, Royalists in the Rev. War, 2:467. (J.C.S.)

## Zuckrigl, Jakob[[@Headword:Zuckrigl, Jakob]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Austria, was born July 26, 1807, at Grossolkowitz, in Moravia. In 1831 he received holy orders, in 1837 was appointed professor of Christian religious philosophy and university- preacher in Vienna, and in 1847 the Freiburg University honored him with the doctorate of divinity. In 1848 he was called to the chair of apologetics, theological encyclopedia, and philosophy at Tubingen, where he died, June 9, 1876. He wrote, Wissenschaftliche Rechtfertigung der christl. Trinitatslehre, etc. (Vienna, 1846): — Die Nothwendigkeit der christl. Offenbarungsmoral (Tubingen, 1850). Besides, he contributed largely to the Tubingen Theological Quarterly, the Freiburger Kirchenlexikon, and the Bonner theologiscne Literaturblatt. See Literarischer Handweiser, 1867, page 1; 1876, page 288; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:1503. (B.P.)

## Zulu Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Zulu Version Of The Scriptures]]

             In this language, which is vernacular to the Kaffres, a translation of the New Test. has existed since 1869. It was published by the aid of the American Bible Society. It was formerly supposed that the analogies and general principles subsisting between the Kaffre and Zulu dialects were so proximate that one translation would meet the wants of the two tribes. This idea has been relinquished, and a translation was prepared by American missionaries to provide the Word of God for, a million of benighted heathen. From the annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1879 we see that an edition of the New Test., slightly revised, but conforming to the society's rule, has been issued by the American Zulu Mission, and that this society has shared largely, as on former occasions, in the work. (B.P.)

## Zunz, Leopold[[@Headword:Zunz, Leopold]]

             a famous Jewish writer, was born at Detmold, Germany, August 10, 1794. He studied at. Berlin, was in 1820 preacher at the new synagogue there, in 1835 at Prague, and in 1839 director of the Teacher's Seminary at Berlin. When that institution was closed, in 1850, Zunz retired to private life, devoting all his energies to the production of works which have made him famous in the republic of letters. Zunz died at Berlin, March 18,1886. He was a voluminous writer, and of his many works we especially mention Lebensgeschichte des Salonso Jizchaki, genannt Raschi (Lemberg, 1840): — Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, historisch entwickelt (Berlin, 1832): — Zur Geschichte und Literatur (1845): — Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters (1855): — Die Ritus des synagogalen: Gottesdienstes (1859): — Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie (1865). His minor writings were issued under the title of Gesammelte Schriften (1875, 1876, 3 volumes). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:555-558; Morais, Eminent Israelites of the 19th Century (Philadelphia, 1880), page 360 sq. (B.P.)

## Zunz, Leopold Piieinkard[[@Headword:Zunz, Leopold Piieinkard]]

             a Hebrew scholar, was born at Detmold, Germany, August 10, 1794. He was educated at the University of Berlin, and became rabbi of a synagogue there in 1820. After two years he organized a society for Jewish culture. One of its members was Heine. The society, however, soon broke up. In 1824-32 Zunz was director of the new Jewish Congregational School; in 1825-35 he edited the Spener'sche Zeitung; in 1835-39 was rabbi again at Prague; in 1839-50 director of the Normal Seminary in Berlin. He died March 21, 1886. His life was one of literary activity, and his works were many.

## Zuph[[@Headword:Zuph]]

             (Heb. Tsuph, צוּ, honey-comb [Gesen.] or moist [Fürst]; Sept. Σούφ v.r. Σώφ and Σούπ; but in 1Sa 9:5 Σίφ, apparently reading צַע, Tsiph, as the text of the Heb there does), the name of a man and of a place.

1. A Kohathite Levite, the son of Elkanah and father of Tohu, or Toah or Nahath in the ancestry of the prophet Samuel (1Sa 1:1; 1Ch 6:35 [Heb. 20]). B.C. cir. 1310. In the parallel passage (1Ch 6:26) he is called ZOPHAI.

2. A district (אֶרֶ, land) at which Saul and his servant arrived after passing through those of Shalisha, of Shalim, and of the Benjamites (1Sa 9:5). It evidently contained the city in which they encountered Samuel (1Sa 9:6), and that, again, if the conditions of the narrative are to be accepted, was certainly not far from the “tomb of Rachel,” probably the spot to which that name is still attached, a short distance north of Bethlehem. The name Zuph is connected in a singular manner with Samuel. One of his ancestors (see above) was named Zuphl (1Sa 1:1; 1Ch 6:35) or Zophai (1Ch 6:26), and his native place was called Ramathaim- zophim (1Sa 1:1). The name, too, in its various forms of Zophim, Mizpeh, Mizpah, Zephathah, was common in the Holy Land, on both sides of the Jordan. The only possible trace of the name of Zuph in modern Palestine, in any suitable locality, is to be found in Soba, a well known place about seven miles due west of Jerusalem, and five miles south-west of Naby Samwil.

This Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 2, 8, 9) once proposed as the representative of Ramathaim-zophim; and although on topographical grounds he virtually renounces the idea (see the, foot-note to the same pages), yet those grounds need not similarly affect its identity with Zuph, provided other considerations do not interfere. If Shalim and Shalisha were to the north-east of Jerusalem, near Taiyibeh, then Saul's route to the land of Benjamin would be south or south-west, and pursuing the same direction lie would arrive at the neighborhood of Soba. But this is at the best no more than conjecture, and unless the land of Zuph extended a good distance east of Soba, the city in which the meeting with Samuel took place could hardly be sufficiently: near to Rachel's sepulcher. The signification of  the name Zuph is too doubtful to be of use in identifying the place. Zophim is usually considered to signify watchmen or lookers-out, hence prophets, in which sense the author of the Targum has actually rendered 1Sa 9:5 “they came into the land in which was a prophet of Jehovah.” Rabbi Schwarz regards the name Zuph as having the same root (from צָפָה, to spy out), and thinks it denotes an eminence or look-out. He also (Palest. p. 156) ingeniously traces Saul's route, and seeks to identify “the land of Zuph” with Ramathaim-zophim itself. Wolcott (in the Biblioth. Sacra, 1, 604) suggests that the city of Ziph (so the name reads in. the Kethib and Sept.) gave its name to this whole region; but this town was too far south for that. It is probable that the district in question was a wide one, at least from north to south, and extended from the hills of Ephiraim to the vicinity of Bethlehem. SEE RAMAH.

## Zur[[@Headword:Zur]]

             (Heb. Tsur, צוּר, a rock, being substantially the same as the Heb. name of Tyre [q.v.]; Sept. Σούρ v.r. Ι᾿σούρ; Vulg. Sur), the name of two men.

1. Third named of the five princes of Midian who were slain by the Israelites when Balaam fell (Num 31:8). B.C. 1618. His daughter Cozbi was killed by Phinehas, together with: her paramour Zimri, the Simeonitish chieftain (Num 25:15).. He appears to have been in some way subject to Sihon king of the Amorites (Jos 13:21).

2. Second named of the eight sons of Jehiel (the founder of Gibeon) by his wife Maachah (1Ch 8:30; 1Ch 9:36). B.C. post 1612.

## Zurich Letters[[@Headword:Zurich Letters]]

             is the name of an English publication of the Parker Society. On the accession of queen Mary, more than a thousand of the Reformers sought refuge on the Continent, and many of them settled in Zurich. On the return of the Zurich exiles to England, at the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, they naturally maintained a correspondence with the minister and magistrates of  Zurich, who had so kindly welcomed them and given them shelter. A portion of these letters have been published, and show the opinion of that time on subjects which afterwards produced such agitation. To these letters is added a letter of later date, written in 1590, by queen Elizabeth to the thirteen Swiss cantons; also a few letters from Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and Gualter, in reply to some of the English Reformers before mentioned.

## Zurich Refugees[[@Headword:Zurich Refugees]]

             SEE ZURICH LETTERS.

## Zuriel[[@Headword:Zuriel]]

             (Heb. Tsuriel', צוּרַיאֵל, my rock is God; Sept. Ζουριήλ; Vulg. Suriel), the son of Abihail and chief of the Merarite Levites at the time of the Exode (Num 3:35). B.C. 1658.

## Zurishaddai[[@Headword:Zurishaddai]]

             (Heb. Tsurishadday', צוּרַישַׁדִּיmy rock is the Almighty-Zuriel [comp. Ammishaddai in the context]; Sept. Σουρισαδαί; Vulg. Surisaddai), the father of Shelumiel, which latter was chief of the tribe of Simeon at the time of the Exode (Num 1:6; Num 2:12; Num 7:36; Num 7:41; Num 10:19). B.C. ante 1658.

## Zuzim[[@Headword:Zuzim]]

             (Heb. Only in the plur and with the art. haz-Zuzim', הִזּוּזַים, the Zuzites; Sept. translates ἔθνη ἰσχυρά, like Jerome in Quaest. Heb. “gentes fortes;” but the Vulg. has Zuzim; A.V. “the Zuzims”), the name of an ancient people, who, lying in the path of Chedorlaomer and his allies, were attacked and overthrown by them (Gen 14:5 only). Of the etymology or signification of the name nothing is known. The Sept., Targum of Onkelos, and Samar version (perhaps reading or mistaking for

עֲזוּזים) render it “strong people.” ‘The Arabic' version of Saadiah (in Walton's Polyglot) gives ed-Dahakin, by which it is uncertain whether a proper name or an appellative is intended. Others understand by it “the wanderers” (Le Clerc, from זוּז) or “dwarfs” (Michaelis, Suppl. No. 606). Hardly more ascertainable is the situation which the Zuzim occupied. The progress of the invaders was from north to south. They first encountered the Rephaim in Ashteroth-karnaim (near the Leja, in the north of the Hauran); next the Zuzim in Ham; and next the Emim in Shaveh-kiriathaim. The last-named place has not been identified, but was probably not far north of the Arnon. There is therefore some plausibility in the suggestion of Ewald (Gesch. 1, 308, note), provided it is etymologically correct, that Ham, הם is עם Am, i.e. Ammon; and thus that the Zuzim inhabited the country of the Ammonites, and were identical with the Zamzummwim (q.v.), who are known to have been exterminated and succeeded in. their land by the Ammonites. See Journal of Sacred Literature, Jan. 1852, p. 363. SEE CANAANITE.

## Zwick, Johann[[@Headword:Zwick, Johann]]

             preacher and Reformer in the city and region of Constance, Switzerland, was born about 1496. He studied theology and jurisprudence, being made doctor of laws at Padua, and priest about 1518. He then came under the influence of Luther and Zwingli, married, and entered on a pastorate at Riedlingen in 1522; from which he was expelled, on account of his evangelical tendencies, by the Nuremberg Diet of 1525. After a time he was associated with Ambrose Blarer as preacher, and in the conduct of the Reformation at Constance, which was brought to a successful consummation in 1531. Zwick was especially concerned with the settling of plans for the education of the young, and with the introduction of an order of discipline in the Church. After the completion of such labors, the  preachers of Constance engaged in the work of extending the Reformation over surrounding regions in Wirtemberg and Switzerland, Blarer being prominent in such service, while Zwick was by that fact obliged to restrict his efforts to more limited areas.

He gave twelve years of most arduous and exacting toil to the Church, and exhausted his entire patrimony before he applied to the council (1538) that provision might be made for his support. The union efforts of Bucer engaged the attention of Zwick in common with the Protestant clergy in general, but did not commend themselves to his judgment, though Luther's personality had somewhat impressed him at the Wittenberg Concord (May, 1536); and he thought that some concessions might be made to a man so eminent, especially since a meaning which the Swiss churches could endorse might be found in the great Reformer's doctrine of the bodily presence in the sacrament. He was eventually, however, constrained to see that no true agreement was possible upon this question; and his influence, joined with that of the other clergymen of Constance, gave to that city the unpleasant notoriety of being the only one which had not replied to Luther's agreement with Bucer. Zwick was also involved in the Schwenkfeldian disputes. He obtained possession of manuscripts written by Schwenkfeld, circulated them among friends, and aided in bringing the writings of Vadian against that agitator before the public. Zwick died as the clouds of the Smalcald war began looming in the distance.

After being repeatedly unwell, he went to Bischoffszell, in Thurgvia, to minister to an orphaned congregation, in which the ravages of pestilence were carrying away from ten to thirty adults, and as many children, in each week to the grave. He was himself attacked, and lay for several weeks rejoicing in the triumphs of faith, and died Oct. 23,1542. Dr. Voegeli, the physician whom Constance had sent to care for her favorite preacher, came away from the sickbed, where, he said, he had learned how to die, and soon followed his friend into the other world. Zwick was constantly busy with his pen; but he preferred to publish the works of others rather than his own productions. He caused the publication of a Latin-German New Testament at Zurich in 1535, and wrote a preface for it. He also prepared a number of catechisms. His principal importance to literature lies, however, in the field of hymnology. He issued a hymn-book in. 1536 (?), and a second enlarged edition in 1540. A collection of Latin hymns and prayers for educated young people, entitled Rhapsodie, whose date and authorship were long unknown, has recently been found attributed to Zwick in a note of the .16th century written in the Zurich copy of the Rhapsodie. See Zwick, Works and  Letters, generally unpublished; Schelhorn, Sammlungen fir d. Geschichte, 1, 41 sq.; the more recent biographies of Blarer; and Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Zwickau Prophets[[@Headword:Zwickau Prophets]]

             a local sect of fanatic Lutherans (A.D. 1521), who believed themselves to be the subjects of immediate inspiration. The leaders of the party were Nicholas Storch (q.v.), a weaver of Zwickau, Mark Thomas, of the same trade and place, Mark Stubner, a former student at Wittenberg, and Thomas Miinzer, Lutheran pastor of Zwickau, subsequently the rebel chief of the Anabaptist rebellion. These fanatics rejected the Bible, considered human learning a hinderance to religion, and predicted the overthrow of the existing governments to make way for the millennial reign of the saints (themselves). Storch declared that the angel Gabriel had appeared to him in a vision, saying to him, "Thou shalt sit on my throne;" and in anticipation of the new kingdom the prophets chose from the number of their followers twelve apostles and seventy evangelists. They drew after them a great many of the laboring classes and tradespeople; but when open sedition broke out, the magistrates drove the leaders out of Zwickau. SEE ABECEDARIANS; SEE ANABAPTISTS.

## Zwinger, Johann[[@Headword:Zwinger, Johann]]

             a son of Theodor, and grandson of the younger Buxtorf, was born August 26, 1634, became professor of the Old Test. at Basle in 1675, and of the New Test. in 1685. He died of apoplexy, while engaged in lecturing to his students, in 1696.. He was a rigid predestinarian, a correspondent of Megarius, the pupil of Gomarus, and an opponent of Copernicus, concerning whose system he waged a literary war with the Basle mathematician, Peter Mezerlin.

## Zwinger, Johann Rudolf[[@Headword:Zwinger, Johann Rudolf]]

             a son of Johann, was born September 12, 1660, and died November 18, 1708, and was antistes to the Basle Church and theological professor. He wrote dissertations and sermons, and also a book on the conversion of the Jews, entitled Der Trost Israel's (1706).

## Zwinger, Theodor[[@Headword:Zwinger, Theodor]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born November 21, 1597, at Basle. He was a strict Calvinist, and defended the doctrine of predestination in a disputation it Heidelberg. In 1630 he was made antistes to the Church of Basle, to which position was attached a professorship of theology. The breaking of bread instead of the use of the host in the sacrament was introduced at Basle under his administration, respecting which event he published a report in his work on the Lord's Supper (1655). Of other works by his pen we mention a Commentary on Romans (1655). Both these works were published soon after his death, which occurred December 27, 1654. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Zwingli (Zwingle, Or Zuingli; Lat. Zwinglius Or Zuinglius), Ulrich[[@Headword:Zwingli (Zwingle, Or Zuingli; Lat. Zwinglius Or Zuinglius), Ulrich]]

             the prime mover in the Reformation in Switzerland nearly as much as Luther in Germany, was born Jan. 1, 1484, in Wildhans, a village in the upper valley of the Toggenburg, in the Canton of St. Gall. Such was the precocity which he displayed in his youth that his father resolved to send him to Basel to be educated. He made such rapid progress in his studies that he soon accomplished the work upon the prosecution of which he had entered at Basel, and he was removed to Berne, and placed under the tuition of Lupulus, a distinguished scholar of his day, with whom he studied for some time. The Dominican monks in this place, attracted by his talents and rising reputation, sought to entrap him into their order; but his father, in order to remove him from the scene of temptation, sent him off to Vienna.

Here he remained for a brief period and then returned to Basel, where he pursued his theological studies. Under the instruction of Thomas Wyttenback, he was led into a more liberal course of study than theological students had been wont to pursue. The charms of the classics were unfolded to him under the tuition of his learned master, and were cheerfully substituted for the dry husks of scholastic theology. In 1506 he became a pastor in Glarus, not far from, his native village. Here he devoted himself most diligently to the study of God's Word, copying with his own hand the original of Paul's Epistles, and transferring it to memory. During the same period he mingled in the strife of arms against the French. Influences which we will not stop to explain induced him to leave Glarus and become pastor in Einsiedeln, a famous spot in popish pilgrimage and superstition, where he preached doctrines which he had drawn from his study of the Holy Scriptures; and when, in 1519, he was called to the Cathedral Church of Zurich, he proclaimed the same truths which he had preached in the Church of the Virgin of the Hermitage in Einsieden. Multitudes flocked to hear him, attracted by the novelty of the doctrines he taught and the eloquence with which he spoke. He delivered expository discourses on Matthew and the Epistles of Paul and of Peter.

The effect of his honest preaching of the Gospel soon became apparent in the city and country, and his general character and opinions produced a deep and universal sensation. While this  state of transition was so marked, the orisis was hastened, in 1518, by the arrival of Samson, the seller of indulgences. The traffic in these “Roman wares” roused the indignation of Zwingli, and led to a keen exposure and a successful resistance. Luther's writings were, at the same time, largely circulated at the recommendation of the Reformer. The plague broke out, and, during its, continuance, though I weak ‘himself' from exhaustion, Zwingli assiduously tended the sick and dying. His zealous labors grew in number and results, the simplicity of the Gospel was more distinctly apprehended by him; but the friends of the popedom were enraged, and Zwingli was tried, in January, 1523, on a charge of heresy. Rome gained nothing by the trial. Zwingli presented sixty-seven propositions, and defended them from Scripture. The Reformer gathered courage with growing difficulties, and in 1524 the Council of Zurich remodeled the public worship: according to the views and wishes of Zwingli. Pictures, statues, and relics were removed from the churches, and mass was abolished. Opposition to the Reformed doctrines was meanwhile gathering in the other cantons.

The question arose, whether each canton was free to choose its own form of religion, or whether the Confederation should interfere; Zurich contended for its individual liberty and independence, but was opposed by the Waldstatter, or the primitive democratic cantons of Schwytz, Unterwald, Uri, and Lucerne. The triumph of the Reformation at Benle and other places threw those forest cantons into wilder commotion, and, in consonance with their views of their federal polity, they took up arms for Rome. Zurich encouraged by Zwingli, called out its troops and put itself into a posture of defense. Efforts were made to maintain peace, but it was of no long duration, and after various diplomatic negotiations, hostilities finally commenced. Zurich had also lost somewhat of its earlier evangelical purity, while the neighboring states were conspiring for its ruin. In the awful emergency, when the public mind was alarmed by a series of omens and prodigies, the Reformer maintained tranquility. The war began. Zurich was cowardly, dilatory, and far from being prepared; but the horn of the enemy echoed among their hills, and the devoted Zwingli monitored his caparisoned horse, took farewell of his wife and children, and went forth as a patriot and warrior to share in the common danger. His official position in the army, however, was that of chaplain, according to Swiss custom. The Zurichers marched to meet the Waldstatter, but were defeated at Cappel with great slaughter, Oct. 11, 1531. Zwingli was found, after the battle lying on his back and his eyes uptirned to heaven, with his helmet on his head, and his battle-axe in his hand. He had been struck near the  commencement of the engagement, and then as he fell and reeled, he was several times pierced with a lance. According to some accounts, he was wounded while stooping to comfort a dying soldier. His last audible words were, “What of that? They can indeed kill the body, but they cannot kill the soul.” He as living when discovered, in the evening; but the infuriated fanatics soon dispatched him. Next day his dead body was barbarously quartered and burned. Thus perished this hero a martyr. A plain monument in granite, erected in 1838, marks the spot where he died.

But the Protestant faith gained the victory not in Zurich alone, nor was Zwingli the only Swiss reformer. AEcolampadius did a good work at Basel. In Berne, also, the Reformation was successful.. The Reformation being not only a religious movement, but in some respects a political one, it attracted to its support many persons who were, contending for the spread of more liberal opinions throughout Switzerland Zwingli was a patriot, and those who were immediately associated with him were patriots, and he believed that there could be no influence so potent to reach and transform the characters of his countrymen as the Gospel.

There was substantial agreement between Luther and Zwingli on all the cardinal doctrines of the Protestant faith. On the doctrine of the eucharist there was, however, a radical difference of opinion. Luther held to “consubstantiation,” declaring that there were present, in some mysterious way, the body and the blood of the Lord Jesus in the elements administered at the Lord's supper; while Zwingli contended that the sacrament was designed to be merely a reminder of the sufferings and death of the Savior. The controversy was a bitter one. Neither party could convince the brother. All that could be done was to lay down fourteen articles of faith, which were to be received by both parties on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. But these minor controversies, for such they seem to us to be, must have lost all their interest in the presence of the grave dangers, which threatened the very existence itself of the Reformation in Switzerland. Zwingli led the Reform movement in the other German cantons of Switzerland, and attended the conference at Berne in 1528, which resulted in the abolition of the mass. He was invited to a personal conference with Luther and Melancthon at Marburg, September, 1529, to adjust the only serious doctrinal difference between them on them eucharistic Presence.

He counseled energetic measures for the promotion of the Reform in his native land, but was defeated by the policy of hesitation, which prevailed in. Berne. He also entered into bold political combinations with Philip of Hesse for the  triumph of the Protestant cause in Germany, and addressed the emperor of Germany and the king of France with a confession of his faith. Zwingli was a bold Reformer, an able scholar, in eloquent preacher, a patriotic republican, and farsighted statesman. He lacked the genius and depth of Luther and Calvin, the learning of Melancthon and AEcolampadius; but he was their equal in honesty of purpose integrity of characters heroic courage, and devotion to the cause of Reformation, and surpassed them in liberality is prominent intellectual trait was clear, strong common-sense. Zwingli's principal works are a Commentary on the True and False Religion (1525):— sermon on Providence (preached at Marburg, 1529): — his Confession of Faith, addressed to Charles V of Germany (1530): — a similar Exposition of Faith, addressed to Francis I of France (July, 1531, three months before his death). This last document is clear, bold, spirited, and full of hope for the triumph of the truth; warns the king against the slanderous misrepresentations of Protestant doctrines, and entreats him to give free course to the, Gospel, and to forgive the boldness with which he dared to approach his majesty. A few years afterwards (1536) Calvin dedicated, in a most eloquent preface, his famous, Christian Institutes to the same monarch, but with equal want of direct: success. Zwingli represents only the first stage the history of the Reformed Church. His work was completed after his death by ‘his' successor, Bullinger, at Zurich, and still more by Calvin at Geneva. See I. Zwingli Opera, edit. Schuler and Schulthess. (Zurich, 1828-42, 8 vols); a popular edition of; his Works by Christoffel, (ibid. 1843 sq. 15 vols.); Biographies of Zwingli, by Myconius (1536), Nuscheler (1776); Hess -(1811; transl. by Aikini; Lond. 1812), Schuler (1819), Hottinger (1843; transl. by Themas. C. Porter, Harrisburg, 1856) Robins. (in Bibliotheca. Sacra for 1851), Roder (1855), Christoffel (1857; transl. by. John Cochran, Edinburgh, 1858) Gilder (in Herzog Real- Encyklop. 1864), and especially Morikoferi (Ulrich Zwinglinach den Quellen. [Leipsic, 1867-69 2 vols.]), On the theological system of Zwingli see Zeletr, as theol. System Zwingli's (1583); Siegwart, Ulrich Zwingli der. Charakterseiner Theologie (1855); — Sparri, Zwingli-Studien (1866). Compare also D'Aubigne, History of the Reformation, vol. 4; Hagenbach, Geschichte, der Reformation (1870), p. 183 sq.; and Fisher, The Reformation (1873), p. 137 sq.

## Zwinglianism[[@Headword:Zwinglianism]]

             SEE ZWINGLI; SEE ZWINGLIANS.

## Zwinglians[[@Headword:Zwinglians]]

             a name given to the early Swiss Protestants from their leader Zwingli (q.v.). It is also used as a controversial designation of those who hold Zwingli's view respecting the mere memorial character of the eucharist. The theology of Zwingli is of interest as having influenced the English Puritans to a considerable extent, until Zwingli was overshadowed by Calvin during the reign of queen Elizabeth. Zwingli's innovations respecting the ministerial office began, like those of Luther, with the principle that every one, in virtue of the priesthood common to all Christians, is at liberty to preach, preaching being the chief function of the ministry. The irregularities of the Anabaptists, however, compelled him to have recourse to some form of mission from the Church. He lays down the necessity of a call to the ministry, notices three modes of election named in the Scripture, and states that it is proper for the election to rest with the body of the faithful, advised by learned men (Eccles. 2:52-54).

But he rejected all notion of priesthood or holy orders. The Basle Confession  places the election in the ministers and church deputies, and mentions imposition of hands. The Helvetic Confession decrees that ministers be called by an ecclesiastical and lawful election, either by the Church or its deputies. It adheres strictly to the Zwinglian principle that all ministers have one and the same power and function; but it departs from this principle in assigning them some power of governing, and in vesting in them some power of excommunication. Zwingli considered the exercise of the power of the keys to be nothing more than the general preaching of the gospel. His magisterial excommunication was only an external, not a spiritual sentence. The Helvetic Confession gives the same account of the power of the keys, and the excommunication which it restores to the ministers still belongs, therefore, only to the forum externum, not to the forum conscientiae.

Zwingli's doctrine of the sacraments is peculiar. He holds that they are mere signs of initiation or of pledging of continuance. They confer no grace; they do not free the conscience; they are not even pledges of grace. Every spiritual efficacy which has been attributed to them is denied. Baptism does not make sons of God, but those who are sons already receive a token of their sonship. It does not take away sin. The baptism of Christ and his apostles was the same as the baptism of John. The eucharist is regarded in the same way.

The liturgical forms of Zwingli and his followers were constructed on the basis of the doctrines held. The form of baptism in Zwingli's Works (2:98) has a prayer for the infant that God would give him the light of faith, that he may be incorporated into Christ, buried with him, etc. This refers all to a faith to be given to the child as he grows up to a capacity of faith. The form carefully avoids, either in prayer or declaration, any mention of remission of sins or of regeneration. The Liturgia Tigurina has the same prayer, and reads the same gospel from St. Mark. It adds the Creed, recited to the sureties as the belief in which the child is to be brought up, and the minister addresses the sureties: "We will bring unto the Saviour this child as far as it lieth in our power; that is, through baptism we will receive him in his Church, and give him the earnest of the covenant and of the people of God." The form of administration of the eucharist in the liturgy is the same as that in Zwingli's Works (2:563), and is adapted to the doctrine of sacraments already stated.  Theoretically, Zwingli did not view the community in its two capacities, civil and ecclesiastical, and recognise as belonging to it two independent jurisdictions, temporal and spiritual; the community to him was a Church, and nothing else. His magistrates were Church officers, deriving their authority equally with the ministry from the body of the faithful, and distinguished from them only by the character of the work which a division of labor assigned to each. Practically, however, the result was that the sovereignty in spiritual as well as in temporal matters was vested in the civic authorities of each community.

The system of Zwingli was in some measure modified by Bullinger, who introduced something approaching to a recognition of a clergy and of efficacy in sacraments; and, again, the influence of the Geneva ministers added to the Zurich doctrine of. the Lord's Supper something of that Calvinistic teaching regarding receiving the body and blood of Christ, which corresponds to the present accepted belief. It was Swiss theology, so modified by Bullinger, that found advocates in England. Hooper was a faithful follower of Bullinger. Peter Martyr, a Lasco, Dryander, and Ochino were on the same side, and with them acted most of the party of the Marian exiles, SEE ZURICH LETTERS, who had been received with great hospitality at Zurich. Hoadley's doctrine of then Lord's Supper is not distinguishable from Zwingli's. See Zwingli's Works, by Gualter (154445), especially the treatises Expositio Fidei Christiana, De Vera et Falso Religione, Ecclesiastes, Archeteles; also Basle Confession (1536), Helvetic Confession (1566), In Sylloge Confessio (Oxford, 1827), and Liturgia Tigurina (Engl, transl. Lond. 1693). SEE EUCHARIST; SEE REAL PRESENCE; SEE SACRAMENT; SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

## Zyro, Ferdinand Friedrich[[@Headword:Zyro, Ferdinand Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian, and formerly professor of theology at Berne, who died May 10, 1874, at Rheinfeldern, is the author of, Ein freies Wort uber die gegenwartigen Verhaltnisse der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche und ihrer Diener im Kanton Bern (Berne, 1831): — Des praktischen Theologen Gesinnung in dieser Zeit (ibid. 1834): — Die evangelisch reformirte Kirche u. ihre Fortbildung im XIX. Jahrhundert (ibid. 1837): — De Optima Theologos, qui Dicuntur, Practicos Formandi via ac Ratione (ibid. 1845): — Des Apostels Paulus Sendschreiben an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser u. Thessalonicher. Neu iibeisetzt  (Aarau, 1860): — Handbuch zum Heidelberger Katechismus (Berne, 1848). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:1509. (B.P.)