

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**X- Zwingli, Ulrich**

*by James Strong & John McClintock*

*To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:*

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE  
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

**AGES Software Rio, WI USA**  
**Version 1.0 © 2000**

# X

## Xavier, Francis

one of the most celebrated members of the Order of the Jesuits, was born of noble parentage at the Castle of Xavier, in Navarre, April 7, 1506. He was the youngest child of a large family, and fondly loved by his doting parents. Early developing remarkable talents, and devoted to literary pursuits, he was sent, at the age of eighteen, to the College of St. Barbara in Paris. The straitened circumstances of his parents threatened to cut short his course of study; but the affection of his eldest sister, and her almost prophetic insight into his wonderful future career, prompted to the practice of the strictest economy in home expenditures that this gifted brother might have the means to complete his collegiate education. It was not long before, as a public teacher of philosophy, he was able to procure the means for his own support and begin to make that impression in the world for which he afterwards became so renowned. It was at this time that he became acquainted with Ignatius Loyola, who threw around the brilliant young man the fascination which he was unable to resist, and in due time he was enrolled as a member of the Society of Jesuits. He followed his leader with an unquestioning obedience to Rome, and united with him in his effort to raise a band of devoted missionaries, who should go forth in all directions to extend the triumphs of the Church and bring the nations under the sway of the Christian faith.

After the discoveries of Vasco de Gaama, the Portuguese had sent out colonies to India. By them the city of Goa was founded. Acting in accordance with the spirit of the age, John III, king of Portugal, resolved to set up the Christian Church in his Eastern territories, and by the suggestion of Loyola and of his own envoy at Rome, Govea, he selected Xavier to commence the enterprise. "A happier selection could not have been made, nor was a summons to toil, to suffering, and to death ever so joyously received." He embarked in a ship, which bore a regiment of a thousand men, sent out to reinforce the garrison of Goa. A long, dismal, sickly, and in many instances deadly, voyage was the fearful experience through which they were destined to pass. Xavier, although himself weakened by constant sea-sickness, was an angel of mercy and kindness to

his fellow-voyagers, and “lived among, the dying and the profligate the unwearied minister of consolation and peace.” Five months were passed in this dreary voyage when the ship reached Mozambique. Here Xavier was brought to the borders of the grave by: a raging fever, and so slow was the return of his strength that it was months before he set foot in the city of Goa. A dismal moral scene met his eye, and a less heroic spirit would have been appalled in view of the mighty task he had undertaken to perform. But with apostolic zeal he commenced and prosecuted his work. Wearing the coarsest garments, and pale and haggard with his long sickness, he traversed the gay streets of Goa, swinging a large bell in his hand, and calling everywhere upon the parents whom he met to place their children under his spiritual care. Gathering these little ones under his tuition, he taught them the rudiments of religion, and sent them to their homes to carry to their parents the lessons which they had been taught by the missionary of the Cross. The wretched and the diseased were not forgotten by him. He frequented the most loathsome hospitals, and had words of sympathy and kindness for the suffering ones whom he found there. More than a year did he remain in Goa; and when his work there was done, the city was not what it was when first he took up his abode within its walls.

On the coast of Malabar there was, then, as there is now, a pearl fishery. Those engaged in this dangerous business formed a low and degraded caste, which seemed to be forsaken of God and man. Thither Xavier directed his steps. Once more were heard the tones of his ringing bell calling the rude, neglected children to his side and giving them such religious instruction as he had to impart. He prepared for them a catechism, from which they could learn the elements of Christian doctrine. He remained among these degraded pearl fishers for fifteen months, sharing in all the hardships of their abject lot, and living among them in the humblest and most self-sacrificing way, if by any means he might win them to the acceptance of the faith, which he taught. He found inexpressible joys in his missionary work. “I have nothing to add, thus he wrote to Loyola, “but that they who came forth to labor for the salvation of idolaters receive from on high such consolations that, if there be on earth such a thing as happiness, it is theirs.”

His mission on the coast of Malabar accomplished, Xavier moved on -to make other conquests for the Church. The kingdom of Travancore was next entered, and the most marvelous success followed his labors. He tells us that in one month he baptized ten thousand natives. With a zeal and

energy not surpassed by any missionary of the Cross, he explored the islands of Mora, Maney, Ceylon, the Moluccas, and every part of the Indies which had been made known to the world by European travelers. "Weak and frail he may have been, but from the days of Paul of Tarsus to our own the annals of mankind exhibit no other example of a soul borne on so triumphantly through distress and danger in all their most appalling aspects." In 1549 he landed on the shores of Japan, and was soon able to preach to the natives of that great island the Gospel as he believed it. The story of the labors of Xavier and his associates among the Japanese is one of the most marvelous in the annals of missionary adventures. The details of this story are too long to be recited in a sketch like this, and the reader must look elsewhere to find them. With his ambition as a missionary still ungratified, and resolved to find a still larger field within which to operate, he turned his eye towards the great empire of China, and resolved to make that vast country the scene of his consecrated toil. Overcoming obstacles which would have terrified any other man, he embarked in the "Holy Cross," and at length reached Sancian, an island near the mouth of the Canton River, where the Portuguese had a commercial factory. Here he was prostrated by a disease which proved fatal. His iron frame was worn out by -his ten years and a half of incessant work, and he was compelled to bow before a Power whose mandate he could not withstand. He died Dec. 2, 1552. His last words were, "Inte, Domine, speravi; non confundar in aeternum" ("In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust; let me never be confounded"). His body was removed to Goa, where it was deposited in the Church of St. Paul. In 1619 he was beatified, and in 1622 was canonized as a saint. The "festive day" of Xavier in the calendar of the Romish Church is Dec. 3. See Stephens, *Miscellanies*, s.v. "Ignatius Loyola and his Associates;" *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier* (Lond. 1872, 2 vols.); *Christian Review*, June, 1842. (J. C.S.)

### Ximenes, Francisco de Cisneros

cardinal-archbishop, grand-inquisitor of Castile, and regent of Spain, was descended from a family belonging to the inferior nobility of Castile, and originally resident in the town from which its appellative was derived. He was born in 1436, and named *Gonzales*, the name Francisco being a later monastic substitute. Early destined for the Church, he studied ancient languages at Alcala, at the age of fourteen entered the University of Salamanca, and six years later became bachelor of both civil and canon law. He was driven by poverty to engage in the practice of law at Rome.

On the death of his father, however, he returned home, having in the meantime obtained a papal brief assuring to him the first benefice which might become vacant in the archdiocese of Toledo; but the archbishop took offence at the interference of the pope in the affairs of his see, and had, besides, another candidate for the benefice. He accordingly imprisoned Ximenes to compel a renunciation of his claim, and did not liberate him until after six years. In 1480 a chaplaincy was obtained which removed him from under the jurisdiction of the archbishop and afforded him opportunity for the study of theology and also of the Hebrew and Chaldee languages; and soon afterwards he became vicar to Mendoza, bishop of Sigüenza, and administrator of the estates of Court Cisuentes, who was a captive among the Moors. His fortunes seemed to be assured for life when he suddenly renounced all his emoluments and entered himself in the order of Franciscan Observants at Toledo as a novice, and devoted himself to ascetical practices excelling in rigor the harsh requirements of the monastic rule. Ere long he had won extraordinary fame as a preacher and confessor, and multitudes thronged to his confessional; but he turned away from these vibrant prospects also, and buried himself in the hermitage of the Madonna of Castannar in a hut erected with his own hands. Three years afterwards he was ordered by his superiors to the monastery of Salzeda, where he soon became guardian, and stimulated the monks by his example to strict performance of their vows.

In 1492 he was made confessor to the queen, Isabella, but with the proviso, insisted on by himself, that he should be allowed to fulfill his monastic obligations and reside in his convent. Two years later he was chosen to be provincial of his order for Castile, and after a visitation of the convents made on foot, in which he noted the lax discipline everywhere prevailing, he induced the queen to procure a brief from pope Alexander VI directing a reformation. In 1495 the archbishop of Toledo died, and Ximenes was promoted to his post, an appointment from which he vainly sought to escape by flight, and which had no effect whatever over his ascetical habits after it was accepted. He was ultimately ordered from Rome, under date of Dec. 15, 1495, to live in a style comporting with his rank; but, though he obeyed in outward appearance, he persisted in wearing the coarse gown and cord of St. Francis and in sleeping on a bench by the side of his luxurious bed. In the influential position he now held, he was able to prosecute the reformation among the monks and secular clergy more energetically, and to compel its success despite the violent opposition

raised against it. He caused Albornos, a delegate to Rome who was to accuse him to the pope, to be arrested by the Spanish ambassador at Ostia and returned as a prisoner of state. Several thousand Franciscans are said to have sought relief from his rigorous rule in other lands. The general of the order invited Castile and complained bitterly, but to no purpose, against Ximenes. After his return to Rome, he caused the appointment of a number of coadjutors to share with Ximenes in the work of reform; but the latter paid no attention to this commission, and was even able, through the influence of the queen, to evade a papal bull, dated Nov. 9, 1496, which prohibited their Catholic majesties from proceeding with the reform until its operation had been investigated by the curia.

A like spirit of unfaltering sternness was exhibited by Ximenes in connection with the conversion of the Moors. Talavera, archbishop of Granada, was distinguished for liberality of view and for zealous interest in the peaceful conversion of the Moors; but Ximenes, acting as the leader of the fanatical party, insisted upon more energetic measures. He attempted, indeed, at first to convince the Moorish scholars by way of argument and also by donations, and so successfully that he was able to baptize three thousand Saracens on a single occasion; but when he encountered opposition, his violent spirit asserted itself. He disregarded all pledges, burned all Arabic books he could seize, though he saved three hundred medical works for his University of Alcala, and irritated the Mohammedans beyond endurance and until they rebelled. Talavera and others persuaded them to lay down their arms; but the revolt was punished, nevertheless, by a revocation of all pledges previously given them, and by compelling them to choose between conversion or banishment. About fifty thousand Moslems submitted to baptism on these terms, and all the land was astonished at the ability with which Ximenes had been able to convert a hostile people to Christianity in so short a time. The character of the conversions will appear most clearly in the light of the fact that Ximenes rabidly opposed the publication of even fragmentary portions of the Scriptures or of expositions of the mass in the Moorish language. He insisted that the Scriptures should be preserved within the three languages in which, by the order of God, the inscriptions at the head of Christ's cross were written, urging that the common people despise what they understand, but venerate what is hidden from them and beyond their reach, and that wicked persons would bring the Catholic Church low whenever the Bible should be spread among the people in a form intelligible to them.

In other respects the work of Ximenes was often beneficial to the world, e.g. when he protected the poor and discharged unworthy officials, and when he remodeled the financial system of Castile, whose grand-chancellor he was, so that taxation became at once more tolerable to the subject and more remunerative to the State. He was the faithful spiritual adviser of the queen while she lived, and after her death secured to Ferdinand the government of Castile, a favor which was rewarded by the bestowal upon him of a cardinal's hat and of the post of general-inquisitor (1507). He had already begun the erection of buildings for the University of Alcalá in 1498, which were completed ten years later, and had given to it a faculty of forty-two professors, the ablest men to be found, and set apart fourteen thousand ducats for its annual support. His greatest literary undertaking was the *Compluteansian Polyglot*, begun in 1502 by the accumulation of available manuscripts. The Old-Test. portion of the materials upon which that work was based have recently been transferred to the University of Madrid (see Tregelles, *Account* [1854], p. 12-18). The *Polyglot* (in 6 vols.) was finished in 1517. **SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES.** Ximenes was also engaged in the preparation of an edition of the works of Aristotle, which was interrupted by his death, and he labored for the preservation of the Mozarabic liturgy.

Ximenes was not possessed of uncommon learning, and his instincts were rather those of a soldier than a scholar. He wished to renew the Crusades, and actually did bring about the capture of the piratical harbor of Mozarquivir and of the town of Oran, being personally present at the storming of the latter place. He has been credited with having originated the Inquisition in Castile, and charged, on the other hand, with having opposed its rule. Both statements are, however, erroneous. He came to the court twelve years after the Inquisition was introduced, and he protected Talavera, archbishop of Granada, against the charge of heresy by appealing the case from the Inquisition to the pope. As grand-inquisitor he issued instructions, to enable new converts to protect themselves against the suspicion of relapse, and even provided for their education in Christian knowledge. He also restricted the authority of subordinate inquisitors. On the other hand, he refused to allow causes before the tribunal of the Inquisition to be tried in public, and in general showed himself to be in thorough harmony with the spirit of that institution. A moderate estimate fixes the number of persons burned at the stake during the ten years of his supreme administration at above two thousand. He also erected a new

tribunal of the Inquisition and transplanted the Inquisition itself to Oran, the Canary Isles, and America. He was unable to attend the Lateran Synod held under Leo X, but counseled the pope by letter, and promulgated the decisions of the synod before its members had dispersed. He also endorsed Leo's plan for improving the Julian calendar. But he did: not, on the other hand, hesitate to condemn the sale of indulgences as involving an enervation of the discipline of the Church and a dangerous liberality. When king Ferdinand died (1516), Ximenes was made regent of Castile until Charles (V) should reach his majority, a position which he filled during twenty months with great ability. He preserved for the crown, against the opposition of the nobility, the grand-mastership of the order of Sandiago di Compostella; transferred the seat of government to Madrid; had Charles proclaimed king over the votes of the assembled council; restrained the nobles by organizing an armed militia throughout all Spain, and deprived them of a portion of the property they had acquired by violence or fraud. With this money he paid all debts incurred by Ferdinand and Isabella, strengthened the army and navy, erected fortifications and established arsenals, and supplied the mercenary greed of the court with funds. He took measures to improve the condition of the natives of America, and appointed Las Casas to be protector over the American colonies. The introduction of African slavery into the colonies, which was proposed by some, was positively forbidden by him. On the return of Charles to Spain, he found Ximenes dying. The end came Nov. 8, 1517.

The principal source for Ximenes' life is Gomez, *De Reb. Gestis a Fr. Ximenio Cisnero. Libri Octo*, in *Rerum Hisp. Scriptores Aliquot* (Frankf. 1581), vol. 2. Other Spanish works on Ximenes are given in Prescott. A French life was written by Flechier, bishop of Nismes. See also Hefele, *Der Cardinal Ximenes, etc.* (1844); Prescott, *Ferdinand and Isabella*; Saint-Hilaire, *Hist. d'Espagne depuis les Premiers Temps Historiques' jusqu'a la Mort de Ferdinand VII* (new ed. 1852, 6 vols.); Lavergne, *Le Cardinal Ximenes*, in *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, 1841, 2, 221 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop* s.v.



# Y

## Yates, Andrew, DD.D.

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Schenectady, N. Y., Jan. 10, 1772. He graduated with honor at Yale College in 1793; studied theology under Dr. John H. Livingston, and was licensed in 1796 by the Classis of New York. In 1797 he was made professor of Latin and Greek in Union College, and held this chair until 1801, when he became pastor of a Congregational Church in East Hartford, Conn., After thirteen years of efficient service (from 1801 to 1814), he again accepted a professorship in Union College (mental and moral philosophy), which he held eleven years (from 1814. to 1825), and for eleven years more was the principal of a high-school at Chittenango, N. Y. (to 1836). From that time until his death he devoted himself with untiring zeal and great usefulness to the assistance of no less than thirteen feeble churches.. During his life as a teacher, he was constantly engaged in preaching wherever he was wanted. He was the chief instrument in founding a mission among the Indians at Mackinaw, about 1823. He organized a Church at Chittenango, and was its pastor while he had charge of the high school. His death was the result of illness contracted in his missionary labors. His last effort was the establishment of a Mission Church among a poor people at Day, or Sacondaga, Schenectady Co., N.Y., of which his sister, an aged and benevolent lady, was the chief supporter. But ten days before its dedication, and on a Sabbath, Oct. 13, 1844, he died without a struggle. His epitaph is inscribed on the bell of the little church, which is only one of the many monuments of his apostolic spirit and toils. At East Hartford his pastorate was greatly blessed with revivals and constant ingatherings. There he began, and at Schenectady continued, to teach theology to young men, of whom thirty entered the ministry of Christ. Among these were president Wayland, of Brown University; Dr. Mark Tucker, of Wethersfield; and Dr. B. B. Wisner, of Boston. Dr. Yates was an accurate scholar, a thorough theologian, an effective evangelical preacher, an accomplished college professor and officer, a man of great public spirit and Christian enterprise. He was in the best sense a Christian gentleman, and “a good minister of Jesus Christ.” His publications consisted of a few occasional *Sermons* and fugitive pieces. He preferred to let his active- works speak for him, for he

was not ambitious of distinction. "I allow myself to do nothing," said he, "for the purpose of being superior to my neighbors. Ambition is a bad motive; the Bible does not appeal to it." The dew falls silently, nobody hears it, but the fields feel it. The attraction of gravitation makes no noise." So he lived and died, a happy Christian, and "a workman that needed not to be ashamed." Dr. Sprague has given an unusual space to his memory in his *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 9:126-138; see also Corwin, *Manual Of the Ref. Church*, p. 2 25, 276. (W. J. R. T.)

### Yates, John Austin, D.D.

a (Dutch) Reformed minister, son of the preceding, was born at East Hartford, Conn., May 31, 1801. He graduated at Union College in 1821, and studied theology at the Seminary of the Reformed Church' at New Brunswick, N. J., for two years, when he accepted a tutorship in his alma mater at Schenectady, N.Y. He was licensed to preach in 1824; continued as tutor until 1827, and was then made professor of Oriental literature in the same institution. To complete his preparations for this chair, he went to Europe, studied at the University of Berlin, visited Italy and other countries, and returned at the end of two years to his post (in 1829). He was never settled as a pastor, but supplied various churches in Schenectady, Albany, and elsewhere during his collegiate life of twenty years. He had, however, accepted a call to the First Reformed Church of Jersey City, and had informally begun his labors with enthusiasm and great popularity. He died very suddenly of Asiatic cholera, Aug. 26, 1849, while on a visit to Schenectady, and his funeral sermon was preached in his church in Jersey City on the evening that had been set apart for his installation. Dr. Yates was a highly accomplished man, attractive in manners, of genial spirit, and possessed of that magnetic power which is so irresistible in social and public life. He was a man of genius, literary and polished to a high degree, and an enchanting public speaker. His sermons, being prepared during his professional life, were written with great care, and often were the fruits of long previous study and repeated revision. His delivery was animated and graceful, with a subdued earnestness, and free from all stage effects or merely popular sins. He was as simple as a child, and singularly free from duplicity or suspicion. He passed through many trials, to some of which his natural temperament added new pangs and complications. His students and friends loved him unto death with the most ardent affection, while those who opposed him in some of his difficulties

were equally decided in their feelings. His sudden death found him at peace with God and ready for his change. He left no printed remains. (W. J. R.T.)

### Yates, Richard, D.D.

an English clergyman, was born at Bury St. Edmund's in 1769. He was chaplain of Chelsea Hospital from 1798, and rector of Ashen, in Essex, from 1804 until his death Aug. 24, 1834. He published, *An Illustration of the Monastic History and Antiquities of the Town and Abbey of St. Edmund's Bury* (1805): — *The Church in Danger*, etc. (1815): — and other Works. See Allibone, *Dict. Of Brit and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

### Yates, William, D.D.

a Baptist missionary, was born at Loughborough, Leicestershire, England, Dec. 15, 1792. He was educated at Bristol College, and went to Calcutta as a missionary in 1815. He settled at Serampore, where, after the death of Dr. Carey, he devoted himself entirely to translating, and to preparing textbooks. He visited England and the United States in 1827-29, and in 1845 embarked for England on account of his health, but died on the Red Sea, July 3 of that year. He translated the whole Bible into Bengalee; the New Test and most of the Old into Sanskrit, and the New Test. into Hindee and Hindostanee. Amonghis most important publications were, *A Grammar of the Sanscrit Language on a New Plan* (1820): — *Sanscrit Vocabulary (cod.)*: — *Introduction to the Hindostanee Language* (1827): — *Dictionary, Hindostanee and English* (1836): — *Biblical Apparatus*, in four parts (1837): — *Theory of the Hebrew Verb*; and *Introduction to the Bengalee Language* (posthumous; edited by J. Wenger, 1847). A *Memoir* (1847) of him has been written by Dr. James Hoby. See Allibone, *Dict. Of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

### Yeomans, John William, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born at Hinsdale, Mass., Jan. 7, 1800. He graduated at Williams College in 1824; studied theology in the seminary at Andover, and was ordained and installed pastor of the Church at North Adams in November, 1828. In 1832 he became pastor of the First Congregational Church of Pittsfield; in 1834 of the First Presbyterian Church of Trenton, N. J.; in 1841 accepted the presidency of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; and in 1845 became pastor of the Mahoning Church, Danville, where he continued to labor until his death, June 22, 1863. Dr.

Yeomans was a man of strong and original mind. His profound thought and logical power were acknowledged by all who knew him or read his writings, As a preacher, he was instructive, impressive, and often highly eloquent. Above all, he was a man of faith and prayer, of deep, intelligent, and scriptural piety. He published, an *Election Sermon* (Boston, 1834, 8vo): — *Dedication Sermon* (1840, 8vo): — *Inaugural Address* (1841, 8vo): — and was co-author of a *Hist. Of the County of Berkshire, Mass.* (Pittsfield, 1829, 12mo, 468 pp. in 2 pts.). Besides these, he was a frequent contributor to the *Biblical Repertory* and other religious periodicals, and had for several years been engaged in writing *Commentaries* on the Epistle to the Romans and the Gospel of John, both of which were left in an unfinished state. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 207; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit and Amer. Authors*, s.v. (J. L. S.)

### Young, Alexander, D.D.

a Unitarian minister, was born in Boston, Sept. 22, 1800. In 1812 he entered Boston Latin School, and in 1820 he graduated at Harvard College. In 1821 he entered the Divinity School at Cambridge, where he pursued the regular course of study for three years. He was licensed in 1824, and accepted a call to the Sixth Congregational Church, Boston, in 1825. In 1833 he went to Europe. He was a very successful preacher. He died March 16, 1846. His publications were numerous, mostly sermons. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 8:524.

### Young, Arthur; D.D. LL.D.

an English divine, chaplain to speaker Onslow, became rector of Bradfield, and in 1746 prebendary of Canterbury. He died in 1759. He published a *Historical Dissertation on Idolatrous Corruptions in Religione* etc. (1734). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

### Young, Brigham

the president and prophet of the Mormons (q.v.), or Latter-day Saints, was born in Whitingham, Vt., June 1, 1801. He was the son of a farmer, received a very limited education, and learned the trade of a painter and glazier. He joined the Baptist Church and preached occasionally with considerable acceptance. In 1832 however, he joined the Mormons at Kirtland, O., became an elder and one of the twelve apostles, and was sent

as a missionary in 1835 to make proselytes in the Eastern States, in which he was very successful. His preaching was characterized by a peculiar kind of eloquence, which made a deep impression, and enabled him to rise rapidly in the estimation of the people of his sect, and to acquire almost boundless influence. He possessed, at the same time, great energy and shrewdness and a strong personality, which further enhanced his popularity. After the death of Joseph Smith, in 1844, Young was one of the four aspirants to the presidency, and was unanimously elected' to that office by the apostles. The choice was received with the highest approval, and his principal rival, Sidney Rigdon, was excommunicated. When the Mormons were expelled from Nauvoo in 1846, Young set out to lead the host on their weary journey across the Plains, which terminated only on their reaching Great Salt Lake Valley, which he declared to be the promised land Here he founded Salt Lake City in July, 1847, in which he exercised absolute authority. In March, 1849, a convention was held in that city, a constitution framed, and a State was organized under the name of Deseret, which, in the "reformed Egyptian" language, is said to mean the "Land of the Honey-bee." Congress, however, refused to admit the new state, but Utah Territory was organized, and President Fillmore appointed Brigham Young governor for four years. The next year the United States judges were driven away; and at the termination of the four years for which Young had been appointed governor, Colonel Steptoe was appointed in his place. But on visiting Utah in 1854, he was resisted by the Mormon president, who declared that he would "be governor, and no power could hinder it until the Lord Almighty says, "Brigham, you need not be governor any longer." In 1857 President Buchanan appointed Alfred Cumming governor, and sent him out with a military force of 2500 men for the protection of the Federal officers. This brought matters to a crisis, and the Mormons became peaceable, though not without some concessions on the part of the government.

On Aug. 29, 1852, Young proclaimed the "celestial law of marriage," sanctioning polygamy, which he declared had been revealed to Joseph Smith in July, 1843. This was denounced by Smith's widow and her four sons as a forgery; and, although the Mormon apostles had repeatedly and explicitly denied the imputation of such a doctrine and practice, they now accepted it without much resistance. He took to himself a large number of wives, most of whom resided in a building known as the "Lion House," so called from a huge lion, carved in stone, which stands upon the portico. In

addition to his office of president of the Church, he was grand archee of the Order of Danites, a secret organization within the Church, which was one of the chief sources of his absolute power and by organizing and directing the trade and industry of the community for his own advantage he accumulated immense wealth. During the later years of his life and administration, the development of the mining interests of the Territory and of the commercial interests of Salt Lake City brought a great many "gentiles" (as those who are not Mormons are called by that sect) to the Territory and city, and the temporal power of Brigham Young had greatly diminished. He died at Salt Lake City, Aug. 29, 1877.

### Young, Edward (1), LL.D.

an English clergyman, father of the poet, was born in 1643. 'He was successively fellow of Winchester College, rector of Upham in Hampshire, prebendary of Salisbury (1682), chaplain to William and Mary, and dean of Salisbury. He died in 1705. He published a number of single sermons, and a collection under the title of *Sermons on Several Occasions* (Lond. 1702-3, 2 vols.). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

### Young, Edward (2)

a celebrated English poet and clergyman, was born at Upham in Hampshire, in 1684. He was educated at Winchester School and at Oxford University, where he received a law fellowship in All-Souls College in 1708. He devoted himself, however, more to poetry and religious studies than to law; but received the degree of B.C.L. in 1714, and that of D.C.L. in 1719. 'His first appearance as a poet was in 1713, in an *Epistle to George, Lord Lansdowne*, on his being created a peer. He, however, became ashamed of its fulsome flattery and suppressed it. In the same year he also published two other poems of some length, entitled respectively *The Last Day* and *The Force of Religion, or Vanquished Love*. The year following he published *A Poem on the Death of Queen Anne*. These efforts gave him some immediate reputation, and in 1719 he ventured on the more ambitious effort of a tragedy, under the title of *Busiris*, which was brought out at Drury Lane with fair success. This attracted to him the notice of the duke of Wharton, with whom he went abroad at the end of this year. At the death of the duke, Young received an annuity of £200. In 1721 his tragedy *The Revenge* was produced, but was unsuccessful at the time, though it has since had greater acceptance. Between 1725 and 1728

appeared in succession his satires entitled *The Love of Fame, the Universal Passion*, which had great success, and brought to their author both money and fame. In 1726 he issued *The Installment*, a poem addressed to Sir Robert Walpole on his being made a Knight of the Garter, for which service it is believed he obtained his pension. In 1727 he took holy orders, and was appointed one of the royal chaplains; and in 1730 he became rector of Welwyn, Hertfordshire, which post he retained, much against his will (for he was an anxious seeker for ecclesiastical preferment), until his death, April 12, 1765. In 1731 he married Lady Elizabeth Lee, daughter of the Earl of Lichfield and widow of Colonel Lee. He exhibited great grief at her death, in 1741; and it is believed that he received the suggestion of the *Night Thoughts* from the solemn meditations on that event. By this work, begun shortly afterwards and published 1742-46, almost solely is he remembered. He published numerous other works of no present importance. In 1762 he superintended an edition of his collected works in 4 vols. 12mo, from which he excluded some of his most gushing productions. The *Night Thoughts* has passed through editions innumerable both in England and America. Various other editions of his collected works have also appeared from time to time, for which see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit and Amer. Authors*, s.v. See also Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*; Hazlitt, *Lectures on the Eng. Poets*, lect. 6.

### Young, Jacob, D.D.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Alleghesny County, Pa., March 19, 1776. His father was a member of the Church of England, and his mother was a Presbyterian, yet both were strangers to the converting power of Christ until brought to him by their own son. The stirring scenes and mighty struggles connected with the birth of our national republic at the time Mr. Young was ushered into life seem to have breathed into him the very spirit of greatness. His first years were passed amid the wildest scenes of frontier peril, which inspired him with physical and mental activity, and uncommon natural courage. Under the care of his affectionate mother, he grappled with many of those great thoughts which afterwards swelled his mature and manly heart. The simple grandeur of the New Test. impressed his mind, while the history and sufferings of his Savior won his heart and kindled his most ardent love. In early manhood he moved with his father to Kentucky; joined the Methodists; felt himself called to preach, and, without formal Church authority, preached his first sermon, saw the congregation bathed in tears, and felt in his own soul the heavenly unction.

In 1801 he was licensed to preach, and under the direction of William McKendree, afterwards bishop, was thrust out on a large frontier circuit. For fifty-five years Mr. Young was engaged in the itinerancy. He traveled extensively, everywhere attended by marvelous success. He died Sept. 16, 1859. He was a man of great intellectual power, habitually prompt, laborious, unswerving; great in his Christian character, great in his fidelity, great in his success. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1860, p. 233; Simpson, *Cyclop. of Methodism*, s.v.; and his *Autobiography*.

### Young, John Clarke, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, son of the Rev. John Young, was born at Greencastle, Pa., Aug. 12, 1803. He prosecuted his preparatory studies under John Borland, an eminent teacher of New York city; and studied three years in Columbia College, when he removed to Dickinson College, graduating in 1823. He entered Princeton Theological Seminary in 1824, where he remained two years; then in 1826 became tutor in the College of New Jersey, where he served until 1828. He was licensed in the spring of 1827 by the Presbytery of New York; and, on leaving Princeton, was settled as pastor of the McChord Presbyterian Church of Lexington, Ky. In the fall of 1830 he was chosen president of Center College, Danville, and filled the office with great credit to himself during the remainder of his life. In 1834 he assumed, in collection with the presidency of the college, the office of pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Danville, in which relation, also, he remained until his death, which occurred June 23, 1857. He published a number of single *Sermons*, *Speeches*, and *Addresses*. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, IX, 4:44.

### Young, John Kimball, D.D.

a minister of the Congregational Church, was born at Dover, N. H., March 22, 1802. His preparatory studies were pursued at Dover Academy; he entered Dartmouth College at the age of fifteen, and graduated in 1821. He was a teacher in Dover Academy, and in Charleston, S. C., from January, 1824, to July, 1827; graduated from Andover Theological Seminary in 1829, and was ordained in Boston, Sept. 24, 1829; was the agent of the American Bible Society from 1829 to 1831; installed pastor at Laconia, N. H. (then Meredith Bridge), Nov. 29, 1831, and was dismissed Feb. 12, 1867. He was acting pastor at Hopkinton from 1867 to 1874. From 1842 he was a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for



Foreign Missions; from 1846 to 1858, also from 1861 to 1873, he was a trustee of the New Hampshire Missionary Society; for a time was a trustee of the Gilmanton Academy and Theological Seminary; was corresponding secretary of the New Hampshire General Association from 1851 to 1861, was moderator of it in 1866, and from 1849 was a member of the New Hampshire Historical Society. He died at Laconia, Jan. 28, 1875. See *Cong. Quar.* 1876, p. 437; 1877, p. 576

### Young, John R., D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Marlborough, N.Y., Oct. 17, 1820. He graduated at Union College, and subsequently at Union Theological Seminary. After his ordination he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Phelps, N.Y.; and subsequently he became stated supply of Painted Post, Baldwinsville, Cortland, and Keesville, all in N. Y. A second pastorate in Plattsburg lasted five years; from Plattsburg he removed to Mamaroneck and from thence; to Newport, R. I. He was pastor at Greenbush, N. Y., for two years, and stated supply at Albany for two years following. After this he served a short time at Newark, N. Y., and at Tecumseh, Mich.; also at Clyde, where he was taken ill, and returned to Albany. He died at Norfolk, Va., July 30, 1879. See *Necrological Report of Union Theological Seminary*.

### Young, Matthew, D.D.

a distinguished Irish prelate and mathematician, was born in the County of Roscommon in 1750. He prosecuted his studies at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was admitted in 1766; became a fellow in 1775, and entered into holy orders. In 1786 he was chosen professor of natural philosophy in the same institution, and greatly enlarged his course of instruction, introducing illustrations by means of apparatus. He was one of the founders of the Royal Irish Academy, which began active work in 1782. He was appointed by lord Cornwallis bishop of Clonfert and Kilmachduagh; and died Nov. 28, 1800. He published a number of mathematical and philosophical papers and essays, and left in MS. a *Latin Commentary on the First Two Books of Newton's Principia*. See Knight, *Enay4 Cyclop. Biog.* 6:892; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

## Young, Patrick

(Lat. *Patricius Junius*), a noted English clergyman and scholar, was born at Seton, in East Lothian, Scotland, Aug. 29, 1584. He was educated at the University of St. Andrews, where he took the degree of A.M. in 1603. In 1605 he was incorporated A.M. at Oxford, took deacon's orders, and became chaplain of New College. He went to London afterwards; was granted a pension of £50 a year; and, made keeper of the library of king James. In 1617 he went on to France and other neighboring countries, where he attracted great attention on account of his learning. He was subsequently presented to the rectories of Haves and Lanrhan. In 1649 he retired to Bromfield, in Essex, where he lived, with his son-in-law, Mr. Atwood; and died Sept. 7, 1652. His great scholarship is not adequately represented by his literary remains, for he is said to have been indolent and undesirous of literary fame. He assisted Thomas Reid in translating into Latin the works of king James; made some notes on the Alexandrine MS. of the Bible (extending down to Numbers 15), which are published in Walton's Polyglot Bible, vol. 6 under the title *Patricii Junii Annotationes quas Paraverat ad MS. Alexandrinzi*, etc.: — published in 1633 an edition of the *Epistles of Clemens Romanus*, from the same MS., which may be found in vol. 1 of the *Sacrosancta Coneilia* of Labbae and Cossart: — and in 1638, published an *Exposition of Solomon's Song*, written by Gilbert Foliot, bishop of London in the time of Henry II. His *Life* has been written by Sir Thomas Smith (rabbi Smith). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Knight, *Engl. Cyclop. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit and Amer. Authors* s.v.

## Young Men's Christian Associations

This is the current designation of certain organization of modern times for religious work outside of the regular ecclesiastical limits.

**I. History.** — There were associations of young men for religious improvement in Great Britain and Ireland at a very early period. The meetings of college students participated in and largely controlled by John and Charles Wesley were of this character. Such organizations found their way into Germany and Switzerland about the same time. In 1710 there were similar societies in New England, which were addressed by Cotton Mather under the title "Young Men Associated." There were similar associations in some of the German cities during the period from 1834 to 1842. Up to that time, however, the organizations were sporadic, and left

no permanent results in the form of our present associations. A larger movement occurred in Germany in 1849, which resulted in the organization of the German associations of the present time.

The Young Men's Christian Associations of England and America originated in a meeting of a dozen clerks in the upper story of a London commercial house, for the purpose of spending an hour in religious exercises, in 1844. It was organized by George Williams, one of the clerks, and afterwards became enlarged in its scope and plan so as to meet the wants of the Christian young men of that vicinity. A convention of those who had become interested in the movement was held, and a society was formed on June 6, 1844, for "Improving the Spiritual Condition of Young Men in the Drapery and other Trades." The plan was imitated in other British cities, and found its way across the Channel. Various cities on the Continent attempted similar organizations, and among them Paris. In the French metropolis, however, the consent of the police was required in order to hold any kind of public meeting. This was at length given, and a start was made in the good work. A providential circumstance favored the popularization of the new movement. Just at this time Rernan's *Life of Jesus* had appeared, and was producing great excitement among the Parisians. The work was read by thousands. To counteract the infidel influence of this brilliant writer, Protestant lectures were given in reply to him. The lectures were crowded. Thousands became eager listeners, who had hitherto been out of the reach of the churches and other religious movements. This gained for the association the esteem of all the better classes, and gave it a standing which it has ever since maintained.

The movement of London also found its way across the Atlantic in two directions at about the same time. The association of Montreal, Canada, was organized according to the model of the London society, Dec. 9, 1851. Twenty days later, by direct suggestion from London, and without knowledge of the organization at Montreal, the association of Boston, Mass., was organized. On June 30, 1852, the association of New York was organized, and during the same year ten associations, including those of Baltimore and Washington, came into existence. Cincinnati, however, claims a permanent organization since 1848, which is earlier than that of any other American association. Such organizations have greatly multiplied in North America since the time above mentioned, and at an early period of their history united in conventions for aggressive and concerted action. At the First Annual Convention of the Young Men's

Christian Associations of the United States and British Provinces, which met at Buffalo, N. Y., June 7 and 8, 1854, a number of the societies, about half of those in existence, formed a Confederation. There were at that time in the countries mentioned 35 societies with about 8000 members.

Associations not formally connected with the Confederation were welcomed to seats in the annual meetings, but could have no part in the proceedings except by courtesy of the convention. A second convention was held at Cincinnati in September, 1855, when there were 60 associations with 9000 members. A third convention was held at Montreal in June, 1856, when the reports showed the existence of 67 societies with 10,000 members. This convention accepted and ratified, the Paris basis, adopted by the first World's Conference of the associations, held in that city in 1855. It is as follows:

“The Young Men’s Christian Associations seek to unite those young men who, regarding Jesus Christ as their God and Savior, according to the Holy Scriptures, desire to be his disciples in their doctrine and in their life, and to associate their efforts for the extension of his kingdom among young men.”

As a rule, the American associations regulated their membership on this basis. It was deemed advisable to keep their membership within the membership of the evangelical churches. While those outside who are seriously disposed are permitted to enjoy all the general advantages of the association, they are not allowed to vote or to hold office. In the English associations, as a general rule, any person is eligible to membership who gives evidence of his conversion to God. But still it is expected that when such a state exists, the young man will unite with some Church. In Holland there is no restriction as to membership; it is presumed that when a young man presents himself to the association, he is earnestly seeking the kingdom of God, and is worthy of all encouragement. From the period of its organization to the breaking-out of the civil war in 1861, the new movement had made steady and rapid progress, the membership of all the associations having reached 25,000 in April of the preceding year. The work done is in part indicated by an extract from the report of the annual convention held at New Orleans, April 11, 1860:

“Sixty-nine associations have sent in reports. Of these 64 have sustained prayer-meetings; 15 have Bible-classes; 34 conduct mission Sabbath schools; 30 have had courses of sermons, and 35

courses of lectures; 45 own libraries, and 38 keep open reading-rooms.”

But with the fall of Fort Sumter came a terrible shock to the associations. Many of them disbanded; the annual convention could not be called that spring; and the Confederation speedily fell to pieces. The work of the preceding ten years seemed to have been destroyed in a day. But a new field of activity came on with the war. Within a month after the opening of the war the association of New York appointed an Army Committee, who began work among the soldiers gathered in the numerous camps in the neighborhood of that city, and exposed to the demoralizing influences of camp and army life. Devotional meetings were held among the soldiers; a pocket edition of a *Soldier's Hymnbook* was published and circulated; the Christian men of every regiment were organized, as far as possible, for effective work, and public sentiment was aroused in behalf of the momentous interests involved.

The need of co-operation under this new phase of the movement, as under the earlier development, was soon felt, and, by the suggestion of the Army Committee of the New York association, the Central Committee was induced to call a convention to meet in New York. Only forty-two delegates were present, and these represented but fifteen associations; but in their sessions, which lasted a day and a half, a grand beginning was effected. In order to promote the temporal and spiritual welfare of the soldiers and sailors of the army and navy, the United States Christian Commission was appointed. This commission consisted of twelve Christian gentlemen from eight leading cities, and was to be the organ and executive agent of the Young Men's Christian Associations and of the Christian public. This proved to be a great boon to the soldiers in camps, on battle-fields, and in hospitals. It co-operated with the Sanitary Commission, which was a purely secular agency; but it went further than that commission could go. The Christian public heartily supported its efforts, and made it the medium by which Christian homes, churches and communities sent spiritual and material comfort the soldiers in the field and the hospital. This work belonged distinctively to the Young Men's Christian Associations only at its origin. After it was fairly organized it belonged to the whole Christian public. During the four years of the war, the commission sent out 4859 delegates to do hospital and Gospel work; expended in cash \$2,513,741.63; received and distributed stores worth \$2,839,445.20; received and distributed Bibles and- reading-matter valued

at \$299,576.26.; distributed 1,466,748 Bibles and parts of the Bible, 296,816 bound books, 1,370,953 hymnbooks, 19,621,103 papers and magazines, 8,308,052 knapsack-books in flexible covers, 39,104,243 pages of tracts — its delegates preached 58,308 sermons, and held 77,444 prayer-meetings.

Similar work was done by some of the associations in the South among the soldiers of the Confederate army, but there was no general organization for that purpose.

The distinctive work of the associations throughout the country during the war was continued on a limited scale. Two general conventions were held during this period; the first met at Chicago, June 4-7, 1863, with 30 associations represented; the second met at Boston, June 1-5, 1864, with 28 associations represented by 136 delegates. Although these meetings were full of enthusiasm, it appeared that the principal activity of the societies was absorbed in army and commission work.

After the close of the war the associations entered upon a new period of progress in their work among young men, which has continued at an increasing rate until the present, and has every appearance of a still greater development of power for good in the years to come. Among the items in which this improvement has been manifested, a few deserve mention. A number of general secretaries have been appointed, who make this work for young men the business of their lives. These secretaries hold an annual meeting for the interchange of views on their common work, and carefully prepared papers are read on topics of vital interest to those present. The greatest advantage accruing from the labors of these officers is the rapid increase of societies, as well as of workers in those already organized. There has been a rapid increase in the amount of property and the number of buildings owned by these associations. A test of membership has been adopted by the International Convention, which has secured a more substantial Christian character to the associations. In 1866, at Albany, N.Y., they reaffirmed the Paris basis adopted in 1856; in 1868, at Detroit, Mich., they adopted the "evangelical Church test" and in 1869, at Portland, Me., defined the term *evangelical*. The test, as now applied, is as follows:

*"Resolved*, That, as these organizations bear the name of Christian, and profess to be engaged directly in the Savior's service, so it is clearly their duty to maintain the control and management of all their affairs in the hands of those who profess to love and publicly

avow their faith in Jesus, the Redeemer, as Divine, and who testify their faith by becoming and remaining members of churches held to be evangelical. And we hold those churches to be evangelical, which, maintaining the Holy Scriptures to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, do believe in' the Lord Jesus Christ (the only begotten of the Father, King of kings and Lord of lords, in whom dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and who was made sin for us, though knowing no sin, bearing our sins in his own body on the tree), as the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved from everlasting punishment."

At the time this resolution was passed about one half of the associations had the same test. It was decided that all associations organized after that date must, in order to be entitled to representation in the International Convention, limit their active voting membership to members of evangelical churches. The associations have thus secured the hearty co-operation of the churches and Christian people of the land. Another important work, not to be overlooked, is the origination by these societies of stringent legislation in the United States for the suppression of obscene literature, and the continuation of those efforts by special organizations for the enforcement of such legislation.

The building of the Pacific Railroad brought together many men of vicious habits, who, in turn, contaminated those who came in contact with them. Here was a new population continually on the move, yet sadly needing the assistance of such an organization as the Young Men's Christian Association. Each new terminus of the road became, for the time being, a town, generally of tents and board shanties; but what was a town today might be a wilderness to-morrow, and another spot in the wilderness be chosen for the town. Churches 'could not keep pace with this onward march of humanity. and in July, 1868, the Young Men's Christian Association of Omaha organized a movement to meet the demands of this new field.. They sent out a company of Christian young men whose duty it was to keep pace with the march of the employs and the attendant means of drawing men into temptation. They held religious meetings wherever they could get a hearing, and organized societies for the perpetuation of these beginnings. After the movement had been fairly started by the Omaha association, and its practicability had been demonstrated, the International Convention of the Young Men's Christian Association took it up, and extended it' to other railroads as rapidly as circumstances would permit.

Efforts were made to open rooms for railroad workmen at Erie, Altoona, Baltimore, Jersey City, and other important centers, but for various reasons they met with only partial success. In time leading railroad men became interested in these philanthropic labors in behalf of their employees. Such men as Cornelius Vanderbilt, Thomas A. Scott, John W. Garrett, Robert Harris, J. H. Devereux, and others gave encouragement to the movement in various ways. Some of them contributed to the support of secretaries named by the associations, and offered rooms for the holding of meetings. In Indianapolis twelve railway companies unite in supporting the association; and in Chicago the principal railroad officials are members of association committees.

**II. Present Operations.** — There are two prominent characteristics of these associations, which deserve notice they are associations of *young men*; they embody the youthful enthusiasm and energies of the Church. What constitutes a *young man*, is a problem that has had various solutions. In America a man is considered to have passed his youth when he has reached the age of forty years. After that he ceases to be an active, and becomes a counseling member. In France marriage serves as the dividing line between the young men and those who have passed young manhood. Young women, as a rule, are not admitted. In one or two organizations women have been admitted to equal or nearly equal privileges with men. This is the case in Brooklyn, where the wisdom of the plan is apparent in the activity and efficiency of the society. In some other cities women have all the privileges of the library and reading-room, and other similar advantages. In Boston they have organized a Young Women's Christian Association. A like association was founded in New York in 1870, and incorporated in 1873. It has for its object the same ends as those to which Young Men's Christian Associations are directed. Generally, however, young women are not admitted to these organizations of young men, except as spectators to certain of the more public meetings.

The second characteristic of these associations is their undenominational character. They profess to be simply *Christian* associations. But it was found necessary to limit the voting membership to Christian young men and in time it was deemed important to find a common basis of Christian belief. This was found in the evangelical test already mentioned. There is a broad distinction to be noted in the methods and opinions of the evangelical churches and the so-called liberal Christians. The incitements to sinners to lead a new life, the degree of zeal in exhortation, and the



methods of instructing inquiring penitents are so widely different in the two systems of belief that it was considered vital to the success of the enterprise to keep them separate in this field of labor. No new creed was desired, and none was needed; a simple declaration of what was already in the symbols of all evangelical churches was sufficient to unite the Christian young men of America into one brotherhood for aggressive Christian work. There is no clashing of theological opinions, for all have united under the one banner of the Divine Christ, to reach out and save fallen humanity from impending ruin. The work of the associations consists of prayer-meetings, Bible classes, social meetings, educational classes, meetings in jails, hospitals and almshouses, open-air services, services of song, neighborhood and cottage prayer-meetings, and the sustaining of reading-rooms, lectures, gymnasiums for physical exercise, and employment bureaus. The extent of this work is indicated in the statistics given at the close of this article.

### **Picture for Young 1**

The great work and rapid growth already indicated, and still more apparent by an examination of the statistics, could not have been secured by the active efforts of individual associations. A very common experience is that of a few young men of a village, who meet and organize an association, obtain a room, meet for a few months, and then disband. Such failures result from a lack of organized superintendence. To counteract such evils, secretaries were employed, who were to give their time to the work and receive remunerative salaries. In 1870 these were 11 in number; while in 1880 there were 133 secretaries, with several assistants.

The system of organization and mutual dependence of these associations is best indicated by an extract from an article by Rev. George R. Crooks, D.D., in *Harpers Weekly* for April 3, 1880. He says, "First are the local organizations, occupying hired rooms, or in some instances their own buildings, and employing secretaries to conduct the necessary business. Then follow the state and provincial organizations, composed, of a State or Canadian province, holding an annual convention and appointing a State committee to exercise due oversight. Their relation to the local bodies, however, is purely advisory; twelve of them employ secretaries. Ascending higher, we have the American International organization, composed of the associations of the United States and Canada. Its executive agent is an International Committee of twenty-five members, having a working

quorum in New York city. The committee is a vigorous body, and has taken in hand the fostering of associations among college students, commercial travelers, Germans, colored young men, and railroad men. At the top of all is the International Central Committee, which met in Geneva, Switzerland, in June, 1879." The work accomplished by the American International organization has exerted a powerful influence upon the associations of the whole country. In 1866 a committee of five was appointed by the convention, and located in New York. This committee has since retained its headquarters, with a working quorum, in that city, but has been increased to twenty-five members, many of whom reside in other parts of the country. This is the executive agent of the International Convention. By it the convention is called to assemble each year, and by it the proceedings are afterwards published. Each year the committee brings up a report of its work, and submits a plan for the coming year. This, after due consideration and such modifications as are considered desirable, is referred back to the committee for execution. In 1868 the convention authorized the employment of a visitor in the West. The field included the states of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Kentucky, and Tennessee. There he has continued to labor with abundant success. When he began his labors there were less than 40 associations, maintained at an annual expense of \$29,000. Now there are nearly 300 associations, expending annually more than \$100,000. At that time only one general secretary was employed, and not one society owned a building. Now there are 48 general secretaries and eight buildings. The eleven states all have state organizations, and of these six employ state secretaries. The requirements of the central office had so increased in 1870 that a general secretary of the International Committee was appointed to direct the correspondence, visitation, and editorial work. He has since been retained, and, owing to the increased demands of this department, an assistant has lately been provided.

The work in the South has developed wonderfully within a period of ten years. In 1870 there were between Virginia and Texas only three associations. In that year the visitors of the committee began their labors in that section, and now there are more than 150 associations. The work among railroad men has already been referred to another movement, entirely independent of the Pacific Railroad Mission, was that begun in Cleveland, O., in 1872. In that city, where about 10,000 men are employed by railroad companies, meetings were held to which men of this class only

were invited. The idea was taken up and practiced by other railroad cities, and, finally, the International Committee undertook the general supervision of this branch. Since the beginning of 1877 a general railroad secretary has given his entire time to this work, organizing associations, locating secretaries, visiting associations, and holding conventions. There are now more than eighty railroad organizations, with a membership of about 17,153. In 1874 the first meeting of the National Bund of German-speaking Associations was held in Baltimore. A competent secretary was chosen, and the International Committee asked to sustain him. The work of this secretary is to visit German communities and organize associations. The field embraces the young men to be found among the two millions of German-speaking inhabitants in America.

The general work among colleges was begun in 1877, when a visitor was placed in the field. The work has yielded abundant fruit. There are now 302 associations in colleges, with a total membership of 18,742.

A secretary has been sent to visit the colored young men of the Southern States, to organize associations, but more especially to instruct them in right methods of Christian endeavor.

A great work has been undertaken on behalf of commercial travelers. A ticket has been issued by the International Committee, which entitles the holder to all the privileges of the associations where he may be traveling. A secretary for commercial travelers has been appointed, and the work of this department receives his attention.

So the work is ever enlarging and reaching out into new fields. In 1868 the committee expended in its entire work \$1399. Now, with the recent development of the work in all its departments, \$22,000 are required annually to meet the demands upon it.

**III. The Outlook.** — In its Statement of Work for 1880, the International Committee has announced the following as its field of labor: “60,000 college students; 100,000 commercial travelers; 500,000 German-speaking young men; 500,000 colored young men; 800,000 railroad men; the young men in the states west of Ohio; the young men at the South; the young men in Canada; the Young Men’s Christian Associations of North America.” They state that the work will call for the undivided effort of nine men; the co-operation, for brief periods, of twenty-five members and forty corresponding members of the committee in every state and province; the

visitation of more than 550 places; 130,000 miles of travel by these workers; distribution of pamphlets and documents relating to the work, with necessary correspondence. All this can be done with so much economy that \$22,000 will cover the total cost." In America the field is almost unlimited, and with its present facilities, the International Executive Committee will go, on enlarging the work and gathering power while there are any young men yet unsaved.

**IV. Statistics.** — There have been eight World's Conferences held—beginning with that at Paris in 1855, and ending with that at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1878. Twenty-three American International Conventions have been held—beginning with the one at Buffalo in 1854, and ending with the one at Baltimore in 1879. There were thirty State and Provincial conventions held during the year ending June, 1880. There is, over and above the committees already referred to, an International Central Committee, appointed by the: World's Conference at Geneva in 1878. This committee represents eight Christian countries, and has headquarters at Geneva, where the general secretary and one half of the members reside. In America there are 9 International secretaries, 13 State secretaries, 977 general secretaries, and 66 assistants and other agents.

The following table will indicate in some degree the wonderful growth of the Young Men's Christian Associations in this country. The figures, however, do not fully represent the facts. Many associations send in no reports. Their membership, property, libraries, and work must therefore be left out of the account. Much of the work, also, is of such a nature that it cannot be represented in statistical tables. The information about this work in foreign lands is meager, but enough is known to give some idea of the proportions it has assumed in several countries.

## **Picture for Young 2**

*Other Countries.* — The latest reports from the British Isles show 583 associations. In 1889 partial returns indicated an average membership of 160 in England. Many societies in Great Britain own the buildings in which they keep open reading-rooms, and employ the same general plans in their work as have already been described.

There are in France 61 associations, but the membership is very small, averaging less than 20.

In Germany the statistics are more encouraging. There are 836 associations in all, of which 173 report a membership of 8035, 113 have libraries aggregating 20,710 volumes, 170 sustain educational classes, and 173 conduct Bible classes.

The total number of associations in Holland is 406; but we have no report of membership or other items.

In Switzerland there are 383 associations, 80 of which report a membership of 1284. There are also 22 Boys' Associations. The most of these societies sustain prayer-meetings, Bible classes, song services, and Sunday-schools; several have courses of lectures and a few own libraries. The great majority of them have been organized within a few years, and more may be expected in the future than has yet been done.

Sweden has 81 associations, with 3435 members. The following additional associations in various countries are reported: Italy, 41; Spain, 8; Austria, 5; Belgium, 27; India, 15; Syria, 1 — the one at Beirut, organized in, 1870, has 60 members and a library of 160 volumes; three others were at Damascus, Jaffa, and Nazareth; South Africa, 10; Japan, 10; Madagascar, 2; Sandwich Islands, 4; Bulgaria, 9; Norway, 73. There are in the world, so far as reported, 2371 associations.

Most of the information contained in this article has been obtained from documents published by the American International Committee, especially a *Historical Sketch of the Young Men's Christian Associations of the United States*, etc., written by Richard C. Morse, secretary of the International Committee (N. Y. 1878); and the *Year-book* of the International Committee for 188990. See also *Harper's Magazine*, Oct. 1870, p. 641 sq.

# Z

## Zaan'aim

(Heb. *Tsaana'yim*, μυρῆξι; Sept. . πλεονεκτούντων v.r.

ἀναπαυομένων; Vulg. *Seniim*), the name of a “plain” (^wl αρεοβν), more accurately “the oak by (B) Zaannaim,” a tree-probably a sacred tree mentioned as marking the spot near which Heber the Kenite was encamped when Sisera took refuge in his tent (Judges 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 Zaannaim, 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 ZANANNIM.

## Za'ānan

(Heb. *Tsaanân*, זַאנָן Sept. Σενναόρ; Vulg. *in exitu*), a place named by Micah (<sup><300></sup>Micah 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 זָאָן, 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 *Commentarys*, “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.).

## Zaanan' nim

(Heb. *Tsaananim'*, זַאנָנִים Sept. Βεσενάνιμ, v.r. Σεσεννάμι; Vulg. *Saanunim*), a place mentioned only (in this form) in <sup><683></sup>Joshua 19:33, and in the Keri or margin of <sup><1041></sup>Judges 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 (זָנָן; 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 Zaanunimi*.” The Hebrew is זַאנָנִים זָבִי / *Laim* and can only signify from the oak of (or “in”) Zaananim” (see Keil, *ad loc.*; *Reland, Palaest.* p. 717; Keil and Delitzsch, *On* <sup><1041></sup>Judges 4:11; Porter, *Giant Cities of Bashan*, p. 268).

## Za'avan

(Heb. *Tsaavan'*, זַאבָּן migratory; Septs *Zovicaip* v.r. Ζωακόν; Vulg. *Zavan*), a Horite chieftain, second named of the three sons of Ezer. (<sup><1357></sup>Genesis 36:27; <sup><1342></sup>1 Chronicles 1:42, “Zavan”). B.C. post 1927.

## Za'bad

(Heb. *Zabad'*, **dbz**; 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 (1 Chronicles 2, 36, 37; 11:41). B.C. 1046.
2. An Ephraimite, son of Tahath and father of Shuthelah 2 (<sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 7:21). B.C. post 1875. 3. The regicide, son of an Ammonitess named Shimeath, who, in conjunction with Jehozabad, the son of a Moabite, slew king Joash, to whom they were both household officers, in his bed (<sup><1272></sup>2 Kings 12:21; <sup><1425></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><2145></sup>2 Kings 14:5, 6; <sup><1425></sup>2 Chronicles 25:3, 4). Joash had become unpopular from his idolatries (24, 18), his oppression (ver. 22), and, above all, his calamities (ver. 23, 25). The assassins were both put to death by Amaziah, but their children were spared in obedience to the law of Moses (<sup><1504></sup>Deuteronomy 10:14, 16). The coincidence between the names *Zechariah and Jozachar* is remarkable.
- 4, 5, 6. Three Israelites, "sons" respectively of Zattu (<sup><1507></sup>Ezra 10:27), Hashum (<sup><1503></sup>Ezra 10:33), and Nebo (10, 43), who divorced their Gentile wives, married after the return from Babylon. B.C.458.

## Zabadae'an

(**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 (1 Macc. 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.

### Zabadai'as

(Ζαβαδαΐας), the Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:35) of the Heb. name (<sup>450B</sup>Ezra 10:43) ZABAD *SEE ZABAD* (q.v.).

### Zab'bai

(Heb. *Zabbay'*, yBzi [prob. an error for yKzi *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 (<sup>450B</sup>Ezra 10:28). B.C. 458.

## Zab'bud

(Heb. *Zabbud'*, *דַּבְּבֻד*[prob. an error for *דַּבְּכֻד*, *Zakkuir*, as in the marg.]; Sept. Ζαβούδ), a “son” of Bigvai who returned from Babylon with Ezra (<sup><15184></sup>Ezra 8:14). B.C. 459. *SEE ZACCUR*.

## Zabadai'as

(Ζαβδαῖος), the Greek form (I Esdr. 9:21) of the Heb. name (<sup><15100></sup>Ezra 10:20) ZEBADIAH *SEE ZEBADIAH* (q.v.).

Zab'bai (Heb. *Zabdi'*, *דַּבְּבֵי* *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 (<sup><16100></sup>Joshua 7:1, 17, 18). B.C. ante 1618.
2. Third named of the nine sons of Shimhi (Shimei) the Benjamite (<sup><13889></sup>1 Chronicles 8:19). B.C. cir. 1612.
3. A Shiphmite (i.e. inhabitant of Shepham), David's commissary of vineyards and wine-cellar (<sup><13777></sup>1 Chronicles 27:27). B.C. 1043.
4. An Asaphite, father of Micha and grandfather of Mattaniah (<sup><16117></sup>Nehemiah 11:17); elsewhere called ZACCUR (12, 35) and ZICHRI (<sup><13995></sup>1 Chronicles 9:15). B.C. ante 446.

## Zab'diel

(Heb. *Zabdiel'*, *דַּבְּבֵי* *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 (<sup><13770></sup>1 Chronicles 27:2). B.C. ante 1046.
2. (Sept. Ζοχριήλ v.r. Βαδιήλ) Son of Haggadolim (“one of the great men”) and overseer of 128 of the captives returned from Babylon (<sup><16114></sup>Nehemiah 11:14). B.C. 459.
3. (Sept. Ζαβδιήλ; Josephus, Ζάβηλος; Vulg. *Zabdiel*.) An: Arabian chieftain who put Alexander Balas to death (1 Macc. 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).

## 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 1800. 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.)

## Za’bud

(Heb. *Zabud*’, *dWbz*; *given*; Sept. Ζαβούθ v.r. Ζαββούθ), son of Nathan the prophet (<sup><1045></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><1057></sup>2 Samuel 15:37; 16:16; 1 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 (<sup><1067></sup>2 Samuel 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).

### Zab’ulon

(Ζαβουλών)’ the Greek form (<sup><4013></sup>Matthew 4:13,15; <sup><4078></sup>Revelation 7:8) of the Heb. name ZEBULUN *SEE ZEBULUN* (q.v.).

### Zac’cai

(Heb. *Zakkay’*, *yKzi* pure; Sept. Ζακχαΐ v.r. Ζακχού), the ancestor of 760 of the Israelites who returned from Babylon (Ezra 2, 9; <sup><4374></sup>Nehemiah 7:14). B.C. ante 536. *SEE ZABBAI*; *SEE ZACCHAEUS*.

### Zacchae’us

(Ζακχαΐος, 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 (2 Macc. 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 Ἀβραάμ). 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, publicanus*) to collect the imposts levied on the Jews by the Romans, and who in the execution of that trust employed subalterns (the ordinary *τελώναι*), 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 τι νόσ τι ἔσυκοφάντησα*) 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 (*μείναι*, ver.5, and *καταλύσαι*, ver. 7, 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 Zacchaeus who lived at Jericho at this same period, well known on 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 (<sup><1319></sup>Ezra 2:9) and Nehemiah (<sup><1074></sup>Nehemiah 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 Sycamore Zacchaei* (Lips. 1694); Crossman, *Hist. of Zacchaeus* (Lond. 1854); and the literature referred to by Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* col. 1031, 1032. *SEE JESUS CHRIST.*

### Zac'chur or Zao'cur

(Heb. *Zakkun'*, רזקזי *mind full*; Sept. Ζακχούρ v.r. Ζακούρ Or Ζακχόρ), the name of several Hebrews. *SEE ZABBUD.*

1. A Simeonite, son of Hamuel and father of i.e. Shimei whose posterity became numerous [<sup><1305></sup>1 Chronicles 4:26, A. V. "Zacchur"). B.C. considerably ante 1612.
2. The father of Shimea, which latter was the Reubenite "spy" sent out to explore Canaan the second time (<sup><0434></sup>Numbers 13:4). B.C. ante 1618.
3. A Levite, third named of the four "sons of Merari by Jaaziah" (<sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 24:27). B.C. 1043.
4. First named of the four sons of Asaph as Levitical musicians in the arrangement of David (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 25:2,10; <sup><1625></sup>Nehemiah 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 (<sup><1633></sup>Nehemiah 13:13). B.C. ante 410.

7. A Levite who signed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (<sup><1602></sup>Nehemiah 10:12). B.C. 410.

### Zachariä, Gotthilf Traugott

a German theologian, was born at Tauchardt, in Thuringia, in 1729, and studied at Königsberg 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 Theologie, oder Untersuchung des Grundes der vornehmsten biblischen Lehren* (1771-75, 4 pts. 3 sections, with Suppl. by Volborth [1786]). 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. Zachariä 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, *Gelehrten-gesch. der Universität 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.

### Zachari'ah

(a, <sup><1243></sup>2 Kings 14:29; 15:8, 11; b, <sup><1282></sup>2 Kings 18:2). *SEE ZECHARIAH.*

## Zachari'as

(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. (1 Esdr. 1, 8), the lesser prophet (6, 1; 7:3) the adviser of Ezra (8:44; comp. <sup><15816></sup>Ezra 8:16), the "son" of Pharosh (1 Esdr. 8:30; comp. <sup><15803></sup>Ezra 8:3), the "son" of Bebai. (1 Esdr. 8:37; comp. <sup><15811></sup>Ezra 8:11), a "son" of Elam (1 Esdr. 9:27; comp. <sup><15026></sup>Ezra 10:26), and one (1 Esdr. 1, 15) who is properly called *Heman* (<sup><14515></sup>2 Chronicles 35:15), and another (*Eapaianc*, 1 Esdr. 5, 8) properly called *Azariah*, or *Seraiah* (<sup><15102></sup>Ezra 2:2; <sup><16107></sup>Nehemiah 7:7).

**1.** Son of Barachias, who, our Lord says, was slain by the Jews between the altar and the Temple (<sup><1235></sup>Matthew 23:35; <sup><2151></sup>Luke 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 <sup><982></sup>1 Samuel 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 (<sup><1421></sup>2 Chronicles 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 Maccabean war (1 Macc. 5, 18, 56-62).

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

## Zacharias

popé 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 Carolingian 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, 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.)

## Zach'ary

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

## Za'cher

(Heb. *Ze'ke*; רכז, in pause *Za'ker*, רכז; *memorial*; Sept. Ζαχούρ v.r. Ζαρχούρ), last named of the eight sons of Jehiel the founder of Gibeon, by his wife Maachah (<1388>1 Chronicles 8:31); elsewhere (<1387>1 Chronicles 9:37) called *Zechariah* (q.v.).

## Za'dok

(Heb. *Tsadok'*, q/dx; *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 <408>Matthew 3:8; Renan, *Vie de Jesus*, p. 216.) A "Sadoc" (Σαδώκ) finally occurs in our Savior's genealogy (<4014>Matthew 1:14). It is, moreover, worth noticing that the New-Test. name *Justus* (<4023>Acts 1:23; 18:7; <5011>Colossians 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 (<1398>1 Chronicles 24:3). The first mention of him is in <1328>1 Chronicles 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, ver. 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 (<5057>2 Samuel 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 (<sup><1027></sup>1 Kings 2:27, 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 (<sup><1004></sup>1 Kings 4:4; <sup><1332></sup>1 Chronicles 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 <sup><1057></sup>2 Samuel 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 know 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 (<sup><0937></sup>1 Samuel 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” (<sup><121P></sup>2 Samuel 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 (<sup><1277></sup>1 Chronicles 27:17). In later times we usually find two priests, the ihigh-priest anti the second priest (<sup><1258></sup>2 Kings 25:18), and there does not seem to have been any great difference in their dignity. So, too, <sup><101P></sup>Luke 3:2. Zadok and Abiathar were of nearly equal dignity (<sup><1055></sup>2 Samuel 15:35,36; 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 (<sup><131G></sup>1 Chronicles 16:39); Abiathar had the care of the ark at Jerusalem; not, however, exclusively, as appears from <sup><1315></sup>1 Chronicles 15:11; <sup><1052></sup>2 Samuel 15:24, 25, 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 (<sup><104P></sup>1 Kings 4:2), strictly speaking his son’s son, if we observe <sup><1388></sup>1 Chronicles 6:8, 9, and <sup><1057></sup>2 Samuel 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 (<sup><1310></sup>2 Chronicles 31:10). The language in <sup><3916></sup>Ezekiel 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 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 (<sup><1253></sup>2 Kings 15:33; <sup><1270></sup>2 Chronicles 27:1). B.C. 755.

**3.** According to the genealogy of the high priests in <sup><1312></sup>1 Chronicles 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; <sup><4611></sup>Nehemiah 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* (Ὠδέας) 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 (<sup><4604></sup>Nehemiah 3:4). B.C. 446. He is probably the same as is in the list of those that sealed the covenant in <sup><4602></sup>Nehemiah 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 (<sup><4629></sup>2 Samuel 23:29), i.e. of Netophah, a city of Judah. The men of Tekoah, another city of Judah, worked next to Zadok. Meshullam of the house of Meshezabeel, who preceded him in both lists (<sup><4604></sup>Nehemiah 3:4 and 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 (<sup><4609></sup>Nehemiah 3:29). B.C. 446. He belonged to the 16th course (<sup><4604></sup>1 Chronicles 24:14), which was one of those that returned from Babylon (<sup><4627></sup>Ezra 2:37).

**6.** A scribe, one of the three principal treasurers appointed by Nehemiah (<sup><4613></sup>Nehemiah 13:13). B.C. 410. He was perhaps identical with No. 4 or 5 above.

## Za'ham

(Heb. id., *μῆζι* in pause *μῆζ*; *rancidity* or *fatness*; Sept. Ζάαμ v.r. Ζάλάμ and <sup><4604></sup>Ροολάμ; Vulg. *Zoom*), last named of the three sons of Rehoboam by one of his wives (<sup><4612></sup>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.

## Za'ir

(Heb. *Tsair'*, *ry[æ]* *small*, as often; Sept. Σιόρ; Vulg. *SeirCa*), a place named in <sup><4602></sup>2 Kings 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 **bybšh** to refer to the neighboring parts of the country of Edom (see Rashi, *On* <sup><120></sup>2 *Chronicles* 21:9). The parallel account in *Chronicles* (<sup><120></sup>2 *Chronicles* 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, **hrylæ** and **wyrçmīæ** 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* <sup><120></sup>2 *Kings* 8:21). Others, again, as Movers (*Chronik*, p. 218) and Ewald (*Gesch.* 3, 524), suggest that Zair is identical with *Zoar* (**r[x** or **r[w**x). 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* (**ry[ç**), 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 known to the author of the book of Kings,

### Za’laph

(Heb. *Tsalaph’*, **āl x**; *wound*; Sept. **Σελέφ** v.r. **Σελέ** and **Ἐλέφ**; 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.

### Zai’mon

(Heb. *Tsalmon’*, **˘/ml xj** *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 (<sup><120></sup>2 Samuel 23:28), called in the parallel passage (<sup><120></sup>1 *Chronicles* 11:29) **ILAI** *SEE ILAI* (q.v.), which Kennicott prefers (*Dissert.* p. 187). *SEE DAVID*.

2. A mountain (רֹחַ) 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 (<sup>1098</sup>Judges 9:48). The reading of the Sept. here (Ἐρμών) 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 of Abimelech. 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 been supposed 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 <sup>1084</sup>Psalm 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 *Handwörterbuch*, differs from himself (גַּל יָרֵחַ and הַמַּלְאָכִים). 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 הַמַּלְאָכִים יַבְלֵגֶנְךָ is “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 albet” (Virgil, *-En. 12:36*) and “humanis ossibus 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.”

### Zalmo'nah

(Heb. *Tsalmonah*, **hnm̄b̄kj̄** *shady*; Sept. **Σελμωνά**; 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 (<sup>-0634E</sup>Numbers 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.**



## Zalmun'na

(Heb. *Tsalmunna*’, [Nm] **כי** apparently from **ל** **ש**, *shadow*, and [nim; *to withhold; i.e. deprived of protection*; Sept and Josephus, **Σαλμαννά**,) 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 (<sup><0085></sup>Judges 8:5-21 <sup><0891></sup>Psalm 83:11). B.C. 1361. **SEE ZEB**A. The distinction between the “kings” (**μυκῆται**] *melakim*) and the “princes” (**μυραῖ**, *sarnl*) of the Midianites on this occasion is carefully maintained throughout the narrative (Judges 8. 5, 12, 26). “Kings” of Midian are also mentioned in <sup><0618></sup>Numbers 31:8; but when the same transaction is referred to in <sup><0632></sup>Joshua 13:21, they are designated by a different title (**μυραῖ** ~~nesim~~; A.V. “princes”). Elsewhere (<sup><0224></sup>Numbers 22:4, 7) the term *elders* (**μυραῖ**] *zekenin*) 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 (<sup><1350></sup>1 Chronicles 5:10, 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**.

## Zam’bri

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

## Zam’bris

(Ζαμβρίς v.r. Ζαμβρί), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:34) of the Heb. name (<sup><1502></sup>Ezra 10:42) AMARIAH *SEE AMARIAH* (q.v.).

## Za’moth

(Ζαμόθ v.r. Ζαμόθ, Vulg. *Zathoim*), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esdr. 9:28) of the Heb. name (<sup><1507></sup>Ezra 10:27) ZATTU *SEE ZATTU* (q.v.).

## Zamzum’ mim

(Heb. *Zamzummim*, מזמזימי Sept. Ζομζομμίμ v.r. Ζοχομμίμ, 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.) (<sup><1521></sup>Deuteronomy 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* <sup><1145></sup>*Genesis* 14:5). Ewald further supports this by identifying Ham (q.v.), the capital city of the Zuzim (<sup><1145></sup>Genesis 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 **μῆζ**;(Luther), or as “noisy,” from **μζῆζ**(Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 419), or as onomatopoeic, 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 novimus fas sit etymologium aequè ignorare.” See *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1852, p. 366.

## Zano’ah

(Heb. *Zano’ach*, **זָנוּחַ**;<sup>[**זָנוּחַ**]</sup> Nehemiah 11:30, **זָנוּחַ**], prob. *marsh*), the name of two towns in the tribe of Judah.

- (Sept. **Ζανώ**) v.r. **Τανώ**, Vulg. *Zano*.) A place in the lowland (Shephelah), named in connection with Zoreah and Jarmuth (<sup>[**זָנוּחַ**]</sup> Joshua 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 (<sup>[**זָנוּחַ**]</sup> Joshua 11:30), and of those which assisted in repairing the wall of Jerusalem (<sup>[**זָנוּחַ**]</sup> Joshua 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).
- (Sept. [in Joshua, taking in the following name] **Ζανωακείμ** v. **Ζακωναείμ**, Vulg. *Zanoel*; in Chronicles **Ζαμόν**, Vulg. *Zanoa*.) A town in the highland district, the mountain proper (<sup>[**זָנוּחַ**]</sup> Joshua 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*= *a*), 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’nfith) 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* (j nž) the sins of Israel.”

### Zaph’nath-Paäne’äh

(Heb. *Tsaphenath’ Paane’äch*, j n[Pi tnpχ; Sept. *Ψονθομφανήχ*, Vulg. *Salvator mundi*), a name given by Pharaoh to Joseph (<sup>445</sup>Genesis 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 Nominum 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 *prima facie* 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 εὐρετήν**, *Ant.* 2, 6, 1), and Theodoret also follows it (**τῶν ἀπορήτων ἔρμηνευτήν** 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 Pharaon Zaphanath Phaaneah appellavit, quod Hebraice absconditorum repertorem sonat... tamen quia hoc nomen ab AEgyptio ponitur, ipsius linglume.debet habere rationem. Interpretatur ergo Zaphanath Phaaneah 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:

#### Picture for Zaphnath 1

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 *ψονθομφαναηχ*, omitting the vowels as unessential, i.e. *p-s-n-t-m-p-n’-n-ch*, would be in hieroglyphics thus:

#### Picture for Zaphnath 2

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.).

### Za’phon

(Heb. *Tsaphon*’, *ֶ/רָפָן*; *north*, as often; Sept. *Ἰαφών* v.r. *Ἰαφάν*; 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 (<sup><0637></sup>Joshua 13:27). It is one of the places in “the valley” (i.e. of the Jordan), which appear to have constituted the “remainder (*rty*) of the kingdom of Sihon” apparently referring to the portion of the same kingdom previously allotted to Reuben (ver. 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 <sup><0720></sup>Judges 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. (*Κεφεινῶ*) and a host of other MSS.,

and it has consistency on its side, since the Ephraimites were marching eastward rather than northward. *SEE JEPHTHAH.*

### Za'ra

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

### Zara

*SEE TALMUD.*

### Zar'aces

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

### Za'rah

(<sup><0380></sup>Genesis 38:30; 46, 12). *SEE ZERAH.*

### Zarai'as

(Ζαράϊας), the Greek form of ZERHIAAHA (*a*, 1 Esdr. 8:2; comp. <sup><0300></sup>Ezra 7:1; *b*, 1 Esdr. 8:31; comp. <sup><0304></sup>Ezra 8:4) or (corruptly) ZEBADIAH (1 Esdr. 8:34; comp. <sup><0308></sup>Ezra 8:8).

### Za'reah

(<sup><0129></sup>Nehemiah 11:29). *SEE ZORAH.*

### Za'reathite

(1 Chronicles 2, 53). *SEE ZORATHITE.*

### Za'red

(Numbers 21,12). *SEE ZERED.*

## Zar'ephath

### Picture for Zarephath

(Heb. *Tsarephath*’, **træx**, *smelting* place; Sept and New Test. **Σαρεπτά** [in Obad. **τὰ Σαρεπτά**; v.r. in 1 Kings, **Σεφθά**]; Josephus, **Σαρεφθά**; “Sarepta,” <sup><4045></sup>Luke 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 (<sup><4170></sup>1 Kings 17:9, 10). Beyond stating that it was near to, or dependent on, Zidon (**/dyxæ**), the Bible gives no clew to its position. It is mentioned by Obadiah (ver. 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





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 <sup><1076></sup>1 Kings 7:46 points to a “*Tell Sarem*, a very conspicuuils 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.”

### Za’ reth-sha’ har

(Heb. *Tse’ reth hash-Sha’ char*, רֶחַב הַיְצֵר *plendor of the dawn*; Sept. Σάρθ 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 (<sup><1339></sup>Joshua 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.

### Zar’hite

(Heb. *Zarchi’*, זַרְחִי Sept. Ζαράϊ v.r. Σαράϊ, A. V. “Zarhites”), the patronymic of the family of Zerah son of Judah (<sup><1081></sup>Numbers 26:20; <sup><1077></sup>Joshua 7:177 <sup><1371></sup>1 Chronicles 27:11, 13), and also of that descended from Zerah son of Simeon (<sup><1083></sup>Numbers 26:13).

### Zar’tanah

[some *Zarta’ nah*] (<sup><1042></sup>1 Kings 4:12). *SEE ZARETAN.*

### Zar’tan

(<sup><1076></sup>1 Kings 7:46). *SEE ZARETAN.*

## Zath'oi

(Sept. **Ζαρθοή**‘; Vulg. *Zachues*), a Greek form (1 Esdr. 8:32) of the Heb. name ZATTU *SEE ZATTU* (which is apparently omitted in <sup><1508></sup>Ezra 8:5).

## Zathu'i

(Sept. **Ζαθουί** v.r. **Ζατού**‘; Vulg. *Demu*), a Greek form (1 Esdr. 5, 12) of the Heb. name (<sup><1508></sup>Ezra 2:8) ZATTU *SEE ZATTU* (q.v.).

## Zat'thu

(<sup><1604></sup>Nehemiah 10:14). *SEE ZATTU*.

## Zat'tu

(Heb. *Zattu*‘, **אֲתַזִּי** *pleasant*; Sept. **Ζαθουιά** v.r. **Ζαθθουά**, **Ζαθουά**, etc.; Vulg. *Zethua*, *Zethu*), an Israelite whose “sons” to the number of 945 (or 845) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 8; <sup><1673></sup>Nehemiah 7:13); and another company of them returned with Ezra, although his name has accidentally dropped out of the text in <sup><1505></sup>Ezra 8:5, as we learn from the Sept and the Apocryphal parallel (1 Esdr. 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 (<sup><1507></sup>Ezra 10:27).

## Za'van

(1 Chronicles 1, 42). *SEE ZAAVAN*.

## Zayit

*SEE OLIVE*.

## Za'za

(Heb. *Zaza*‘, **אֲזַז**; perhaps *projection*; Sept. **Ζαζάη** v.r. **Ὠζαζά**, **Ὠζάμ**, 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.

## Zebachim

*SEE TALMUD*.

## Zebadi'ah

(Heb. *Zebaayah*, **hyḏḏbʾz**) [thrice in the prolonged form *Zebadya'hu*, **Yhyḏḏbʾzæ** <sup><1381D></sup>1 Chronicles 26:2; <sup><1470B></sup>2 Chronicles 17:8; 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 (<sup><1381D></sup>1 Chronicles 8:15). B.C. cir. 1618.
- 2.** A Benjamite of the “sons” of Elpaal (<sup><1381D></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1327D></sup>1 Chronicles 12:7). B.C. 1054.
- 4.** A Levite, third son of Meshelemiah the Korhite (<sup><1324D></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1327D></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1470B></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1491D></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1308B></sup>Ezra 8:8). B.C. 459.
- 9.** A priest of the “sons” of Immer, who divorced his Gentile wife married after the Exile (<sup><1501D></sup>Ezra 10:20). B.C. 458.

## Ze'bah

(Heb. *Ze'bach*, *hbz* sacrifice, as often; Sept. Ζεβεέ; Josephus, Ζεβή; Vulg. *Zeebe*), 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 <sup><0085></sup>Judges 8:5-21; <sup><0811></sup>Psalms 83:11). *SEE ZALMUNNA*. It is a remarkable instance of the unconscious artlessness of the narrative contained in <sup><0063></sup>Judges 6:33-8, 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 (<sup><0088></sup>Judges 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.).

<sup><0812></sup>Psalms 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 luxuriant growth of the great plain — “Seize these godly 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.*

### Zeba'im

(Heb. with the art. *hats-Tsebaïm'* **יבאֲחִי** *the gazelles*, as often; Sept. **υἱὸν Ἀσεβωείμ** v.r. **Ἀσεβωείν**; Vulg. *Asebainn*; in Nehemiah *hats-Tsebaïm'*, **יבאֲחִי**; Sept. **υἱὸν 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 (<sup><157></sup>Ezra 2:57; <sup><175></sup>Nehemiah 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.* <sup><157></sup>Ezra 2:57), designating doubtless an individual *SEE POCHEREETH.*

### Zeb'edee, or rather Zebedae'us

(**Ζεβεδάιος**, the Greek form apparently of *Zabdi* or *Zebediah*), a fisherman of Galilee, the father of the apostles James the Great and John

(<sup><402></sup>Matthew 4:21), and the husband of Salome (<sup><475></sup>Matthew 27:56; <sup><4150></sup>Mark 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 (<sup><3815></sup>John 18:15), that the family of Zebedee were in easy circumstances (comp; 19:27), although not above manual labor (<sup><402></sup>Matthew 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 <sup><402></sup>Matthew 4:21, 22; <sup><4019></sup>Mark 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 (<sup><475></sup>Matthew 27:55, 56; <sup><4150></sup>Mark 15:40; 16:1; comp. <sup><4151></sup>Matthew 25:20; <sup><4183></sup>Luke 8:3). It is reasonable to infer that Zebedee was dead before this time. *SEE JOHN (the Apostle)*.

### Zebi’na

(Heb. *Zebina*’, *anybzē* 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 (<sup><4503></sup>Ezra 10:43). B.C. 458.

### Zebin

*SEE ALEXANDER.*

### Zeboi’im

(<sup><0142></sup>Genesis 14:2,8). *SEE ZEBOIM.*

### Zebo’im

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

1. (Heb. *Tseboini*’, *myabx*] gazelles, as often, <sup><2808></sup>Hosea 11:8; or shorter, *Tseboim*’, *mybax*] [marg. *mybx*], <sup><0109></sup>Genesis 10:19; or *mybax*] [marg.

μυζοχρ 14:2, 8 [A.V. “Zeboïm”]; <sup><623></sup>Deuteronomy 29:23; Sept. Σεβοείμ v.r. Σεβοείμ; Vulg. *Zeboïm*), one of the five cities destroyed by divine visitation in the vale of Siddim (<sup><2108></sup>Hosea 11:8), mentioned immediately after Admah (<sup><0109></sup>Genesis 10:19; <sup><623></sup>Deuteronomy 29:23), and ruled over by a separate king, Shemeber (<sup><0142></sup>Genesis 14:2, 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*’, μυζοχρ the hyenas; Sept. Ζαμαείν v.r. Σαβίμ, Σεβοείμ, etc.; Vulg. *Seboïmn*), the name of a valley (γρ, i.e. a ravine or gorge, apparently east of Michmash, mentioned in <sup><0138></sup>1 Samuel 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 <sup><0134></sup>Nehemiah 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

*SEE FLY.*



## Zebu'dah

(Heb. *Zebidah*', **hdybzꜥ** marg. *Zebudath*', **hdWzj**] *bestowed*; Sept. **Ἰελδάφ** v.r. **Ἐιελδάθ, Ἰελλα**, etc.; Vulg. *Zebida*), the daughter of Pedaiah of Rumah, wife of Josiah and mother of king Jehoiakim (<sup><1236></sup>2 Kings 23:36). B.C. 633.

## Ze'bul

(Heb. *Zebul*', **l bzj**] *habitation*; Sept. **Ζεβούλ**; Josephus, **Ζέβουλος**), the chief man (**rꜥj** A. V. "ruler") of the city of Shechem at the time of the contest between Abimelech and the native Canaanites (<sup><07028></sup>Judges 9:28, 30, 36, 38,41). B.C. 1319. He governed the town as the "officer" (**dyqꜥꜥ**; Sept. **ἐπίσκοπος**; Josephus, **ζένοϛ** *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.**

## Zeb'ulonite

(Heb. *Zebuloni*', **ynꜥWbzj**] Sept. **Ζαβουλωνίτης** v.r. **Ζαβουνίτης**), the patronymic designation of a member of the tribe of Zebulun (<sup><04327></sup>Numbers 26:27, "Zebulunite;" <sup><07211></sup>Judges 12:11, 12).

## Zeb'ulun

(Hee. *Zebulun*', once [Judges 1, 30] fully **^Wl Wbzj**] usually **^l Wbzj**] or [<sup><0330></sup>Genesis 30:20; 35:23; 46, 14; <sup><00406></sup>Judges 4:6; 5, 18; 6:35; 1 Chronicles 2, 1; 6:63, 77; 12:33, 40; <sup><14300></sup>2 Chronicles 30:10, 11, 18; <sup><08827></sup>Psalms 68:27; <sup><23011></sup>Isaiah 9:1] **^Wl bzj**] *habitation*; Sept., New Test., and Josephus, **Ζαβουλών**; Vulg. *Zabulon*; A.V. "Zabulon," <sup><00413></sup>Matthew 4:13, 15; <sup><0608></sup>Revelation 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 (<sup><03523></sup>Genesis 35:23; 46, 14; 1 Chronicles 2, 1). His birth is recorded in <sup><01319></sup>Genesis 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 49, 13 is **Κοιῶν** with no relation to the name Zebulun. The Sept. puts a different point on the exclamation of Leah: “My husband will choose me” (**ἀίρειτέῖ 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 (<sup><0638></sup>Deuteronomy 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 (<sup><0444></sup>Genesis 46:14) — who became the founders of the three great families into which the tribe was divided (<sup><0636></sup>Numbers 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 (ver. 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 (<sup><0474></sup>Numbers 7:24); at Shiloh, Elizaphan son of Parnach (<sup><0625></sup>Numbers 34:25). Its representative among the spies was Gaddiel son of Sodi (<sup><0430></sup>Numbers 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 (<sup><15713></sup>Deuteronomy 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 (*ā/j* , *choph*, a cove, the modern *Haifa*) of seas; and he shall be for a shore of ships; and his side will be to Zidon" (Genesis 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" (<sup><15318></sup>Deuteronomy 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 (<sup><16910></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><15319></sup>Deuteronomy 33:19), and it and Rimmon were allotted to the Merarite Levites (<sup><13167></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (*Ērḡ 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 (<sup><0003></sup>Judges 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 (<sup><0053></sup>Matthew 26:73); and even their religion lost much of its original purity (<sup><0000></sup>2 Chronicles 30:10, 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 (<sup><0000></sup>Isaiah 9:1; <sup><0045></sup>Matthew 4:15; 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 (<sup><0006></sup>Judges 4:6, 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” (<sup><0058></sup>Judges 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 “(ver. 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 (<sup><0021></sup>Judges 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" (<sup><3123></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (ver. 40). The head of the tribe at this time was Ishmaiah ben-Obadiah (27, 19). The "way of the sea" (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 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 (<sup><4300></sup>2 Chronicles 30:10,11,18).

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 (<sup><2718></sup>2 Kings 17:18, 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; <sup><4045></sup>Matthew 4:15, 16). In the visions of Ezekiel (<sup><3636></sup>Ezekiel 48:26-33) and of John (<sup><6108></sup>Revelation 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:

Bethlehem	Town	<i>Beit-Lahm</i>
Cana	Do	<i>Kanah el-Jelil?</i>
Dabbasheth	Do	Jebata.
Dimnah	Do	See RIMMON.
Gath-hepher, or Gittah-hepher	Do	<i>El-Meshad.</i>
Hannathon	Do	[ <i>El-Mugheir</i> ]?
Idalah	Do	<i>Jeda?</i>
Japhia	Do	<i>Yafa</i>
Kartah, or Kattah	Do	<i>El-Harti?</i>
Kirjathaim	Do	See KARTAH.
Kitron	Do	See KARTAH.
Madon	Do	<i>Kefr Menda?</i>
Nahalal, Nahallal, or Nahalol	Do	<i>Malul?</i>
Neah	Town	[ <i>Nimrin</i> ]?
Rimmon (Remmon-methoar)	Do	<i>Rumaneh</i>
Rumah	Do	<i>Tell Rumah?</i>
Sarid	Do	[Ruins. N.W. of el-Mezraah]?
Shimron	Do	<i>Semunieh?</i>

## Picture for Zebulun

2. A place on the eastern border of the tribe of Asher, between Beth-dagon and the valley of Jiphthah-el (<sup>(4027)</sup>Joshua 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.**

## Zeb’ulunite

(<sup>(4027)</sup>Numbers 26:27). **SEE ZEBULONTTE.**

## Zechari'ah

(Heb. *Zekaryah'*, **זְכַרְיָהּ**] *remembered of Jehovah*; occasionally [<sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 5:7; 15:18, 24; 24:25; 26:2, 1, 14; 27:21; <sup><1304></sup>2 Chronicles 20:14; 21:2; 26:5; 29:13; 35:8] in the prolonged form *Zekarya'hu*, **זְכַרְיָהּ**] 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. **Ζακχούρ**.) Ninth named of the ten sons of Jehiel, the father or founder of Gibeon (<sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 9:37). B.C. cir. 1618. In <sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 9:21) in the arrangement of the porters in the reign of David. B.C. 1043. In <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 26:2, 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” (<sup><1350></sup>1 Chronicles 15:20; comp. 16:5). He was of the second order of Levites (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 (<sup><1352></sup>1 Chronicles 15:24). B.C. 1043.
5. Son of Isshihi or Jesiah, a Kohathite Levite descended from Uzziel (<sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 24:25). B.C. 1043. 6. Fourth son of Hosah of the children of Merari (<sup><1361></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1304></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1407></sup>2 Chronicles 17:7). B.C. 910.

**10.** Fourth named of the seven sons of king Jehoshaphat (<sup>(420)</sup>2 Chronicles 21:2). B.C. 887.

**11.** (Sept. **Αζαρίας**.) Son of the high-priest Jehoiada, in the reign of Joash, king of Judah (<sup>(420)</sup>2 Chronicles 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" (<sup>(470)</sup>Acts 7:60), but, "The Lord look upon it, and require it" (<sup>(420)</sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup>(425)</sup>Matthew 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 (<sup>(280)</sup>Isaiah 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 (<sup>(425)</sup>2 Chronicles 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. <sup>(2017)</sup>Daniel 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 **taryb**, "in the fear of," for **twarb**, 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 (<sup><490></sup>2 Chronicles 29:1); mentioned also in <sup><128></sup>2 Kings 18:2 (Sept. Ζαχαρίας, 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 (<sup><493></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><238></sup>Isaiah 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 (<sup><493></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1241></sup>2 Kings 14:1, 2). He was succeeded by Uzziah or Azariah in the 27th year of Jeroboam II, the successor of Joash (<sup><1215></sup>2 Kings 15:1), and Uzziah reigned 52 years. On the other hand, Joash king of Israel reigned 16 years (<sup><1230></sup>2 Kings 13:10), was succeeded by Jeroboam, who reigned 41 years (<sup><1243></sup>2 Kings 14:23), and he by Zechariah, who came to the throne in the 38th year of Uzziah king of Judah (<sup><1215></sup>2 Kings 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 2 Kings 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 14:17 and 15:1. We are reduced to understand the number 27 in 15:1 as referring to the years of Jeroboam's *vicereignty* on the occasion of his father's war with Syria (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 (<sup>3071</sup>Amos 7:13). *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF*.

In the English version of <sup>1250</sup>2 Kings 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., "percutsitque eum *palam* et interfecit." But in the Sept we find **Κεβλαόμ** instead of *before the people*, i.e. Shallum and Keblaam killed Zechariah. The common editions read **ἐν Κεβλαόμ** 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*, **Κεβλαόμ**, *palam*, are [;| **בq**; Ewald (*Geschichte*, 3, 598) maintains that | **בq**; never occurs in prose [Is not the objection rather that the word is Chaldee? It occurs repeatedly in Daniel (<sup>2121</sup>Daniel 2:31; 3:3; 5:1, 5, 10), and also in the Chaldee portions of Ezra (<sup>1346</sup>Ezra 4:16; 6:13)], and that **μ[**; would be =**μ[ h**; if the Latin and English translations were correct. He also observes that in <sup>1254</sup>2 Kings 15:14, 25, 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 **Κεβλαόμ** 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 <sup><3818></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><4818></sup>2 Chronicles 34:12). B.C. 628.

**19.** Second named of the three rulers of the Temple in the reign of Josiah (<sup><4818></sup>2 Chronicles 35:8). B.C. 628. He was probably, as Bertheau conjectures, “the second priest” (comp. <sup><12518></sup>2 Kings 25:18).

**20.** Son of Shiloni and father of Joiarib among the descendants of Perez (<sup><6105></sup>Nehemiah 11:5). B.C. long ante 536.

**21.** A priest, son of Pashur and father of Amzi (<sup><6112></sup>Nehemiah 11:12). B.C. long ante 536.

**22.** Son of Amariah and father of Uziah, of the family of Perez (<sup><6104></sup>Nehemiah 11:4). B.C. ante 536.

**23.** The representative of the priestly family of Iddo in the days of Joiakim the son of Jeshua (<sup><6216></sup>Nehemiah 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 <sup><3000></sup>*Zechariah* 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

Ἄδδω. Gesenius (*Lex. s.v. ἄδδω*) and Rosenmüller (On *Zechariah I*, 1) take רבי in the passages in Ezra to mean: “grandson,” as in <sup><1296></sup>Genesis 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 <sup><238D></sup>Isaiah 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 (<sup><238D></sup>Isaiah 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 <sup><1624></sup>Nehemiah 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 (ver. 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 (ר [ni] Zechariah 2, 4; comp. <sup><2406></sup>Jeremiah 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”

(<sup><3013></sup>Haggai 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 (<sup><3016></sup>Haggai 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 (<sup><3516></sup>Ezra 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" (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., <sup><BDOT></sup>Psalm 137:145-148; 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 Chaldea 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 <sup>23119</sup>Isaiah 41:19; 55:13, and in <sup>1485</sup>Nehemiah 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 (<sup><1588B></sup>Ezra 8:3). B.C. 459.

**26.** The leader of the twenty-eight "sons" of Bebai, who came up from Babylon with Ezra (<sup><1581B></sup>Ezra 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 (<sup><1581B></sup>Ezra 8:16). B.C. 459. He stood at Ezra's left hand when he expounded the law to the people (<sup><1608B></sup>Nehemiah 8:4).

**28.** (Sept. Ζαχαρία.) One of the family of Elam, who had married a foreign wife after the Captivity (<sup><1508B></sup>Ezra 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 (<sup><1625B></sup>Nehemiah 12:35, 41). B.C. 446.

### **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 <sup><300B></sup>Zechariah 1:1, 7, and <sup><300B></sup>Zechariah 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 (~~300E~~Zechariah 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 cooperate 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 (~~300E~~Zechariah 1:7-6, 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”] (~~300E~~Zechariah 1:9); at another, “the angel of Jehovah” (ver. 11.12; 3, 1-6).

**(1.)** In the first vision (~~300E~~Zechariah 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 ~~300D~~Haggai 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 ~~300E~~Job 1:7, etc.

**(2.)** The second vision (~~300E~~Zechariah 2:1-17, A.V. 1:18-2:13) 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 the 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, <sup><1251></sup>Exodus 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 (<sup><3011></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 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.), <sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><231C></sup>Isaiah 34:13); the land of Babylon (Shinar, <sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 5:11), from which Israel had been redeemed.

(7.) The night is now waning fast, and the morning is about to dawn (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 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 <sup><381B></sup>Psalms 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 (~~308~~ Zechariah 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" (ver. 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 (ver. 9-15).

**(8.)** Immediately on these visions there follows a symbolical act (~~308~~ Zechariah 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 (~~308~~ Zechariah 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 (ver. 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 (~~288B~~ Isaiah 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 (~~300B~~ Zechariah 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 (~~300B~~ Zechariah 8:1-15). Again, he declares that "truth and peace" (ver. 16,19) 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 (ver. 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. ~~300B~~ Zechariah 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" (~~381B~~Zechariah 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 (~~381B~~Zechariah 12:1-13, 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 ~~3137~~ Zechariah 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 *ἀνόνομον*." 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 prophetic book ... I conclude from internal marks in <sup><3900></sup>Zechariah 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 <sup><3900></sup>Zechariah 9:1 11:14 (but that this argument is inconclusive, see <sup><3921></sup>Malachi 2:11); Ephraim 9:10, 13: 10:7; and Assyria <sup><3800></sup>Zechariah 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 <sup><3822></sup>Zechariah 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 Flügel, 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 (<sup><3906></sup>Zechariah 9:16; 10:2, 3; <sup><3808></sup>Zechariah 11:3,4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 17; 13:7, 8). From the allusion to the earthquake (<sup><3845></sup>Zechariah 14:5; comp. <sup><3000></sup>Amos 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 <sup><23RD></sup>Isaiah 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 <sup><23RD></sup>Zechariah 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 <sup><23RD></sup>Isaiah 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 (<sup><23RD></sup>Jeremiah 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 between 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. (~~3007~~ Zechariah 1:7; 4:8; 6,9; 9:7; 14:8; 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” (~~3018~~ Zechariah 1:18; 2, 1; 5, 1; 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 <sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:1; 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 1:1, 7; 7:1). He mentions his own name in these passages, and also in <sup><300></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:8, 9). He blows the trumpet, marches against his enemies, makes his people his bow, and shoots his arrows (ver. 13, 14); or he rides on Judah as his war-horse, and goes forth thereon to victory (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 10:3, 5). Again, he speaks of the people as a flock, and the leaders of the people as their shepherds (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:16; 10:2, 3; 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:3, 4, 13-17; 10:3, 5, 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 10:10), but a still further desolation threatened it (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 11:1-3). The first may have been the invasion of Pul (<sup><100></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><301></sup>Zechariah 9:11; 10:6, 8, 10, etc.).
- (4.) The struggle between Judah and Israel is supposed to be already begun (<sup><304></sup>Zechariah 11:14). At the same time, Damascus is threatened (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><309></sup>Zechariah 10:9, 10, 11). The only other prophets to whom these two nations appear as formidable, at the same time, are Hosea (<sup><2071></sup>Hosea 7:11; 12:1; 14:3) and his contemporary Isaiah (<sup><2071></sup>Isaiah 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:1-9), as they did afterwards (<sup><200></sup>Isaiah 20:1), and that the kingdom of Israel would suffer chiefly in consequence (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:9-12), and Judah in a smaller degree (ver. 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 (<sup><1258></sup>2 Kings 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 (<sup><1259></sup>2 Kings 15:29) and second (<sup><1270></sup>2 Kings 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:3; 10:6; 11:14; comp. 10:7); he directs his prophecy to the Trans-jordanic territory, and announces the discharge of his office in Israel (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:1-7), and Greeks (ver., 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:7, 10). But for Judah he has no cause of fear. Jehovah will protect her (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 9:8), and bring back those of her sons who in earlier times had gone into captivity (ver. 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 (<sup><300></sup>Zechariah 13:6); he sees the enemy laying siege to Jerusalem, taking

and plundering it, and carrying half of her people captive (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 12:3; 14:2, 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: *hyhwæ* "And it shall come to pass" (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 12:9, 13:2,3, 4,8; 14:6 8, 13, 16); *aWhhiµ/YBi* "in that day" (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 12:3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11; 13:1, 2, 4; 14:8, 9-13, 20, 21); *h/hhy]µan]* saith Jehovah" (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 12:1, 4; 13:2, 7,8). In the section 9-11 the first does not occur at all, the second but once (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 9:16), the third only twice (<sup><381B></sup>Zechariah 10:12; 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 <sup><381B></sup>Isaiah 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 <sup><381B></sup>Ezekiel 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 <sup><3004></sup>Zechariah 1:4-6; 7:414; 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 (<sup><3001></sup>Zechariah 1:1,7; 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 <sup><3090></sup>Zechariah 9:10 and in 12-13, 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 11, and in <sup><3037></sup>Zechariah 13:7-14, 2. The same peculiar forms of expression occur in the two divisions of the prophecy. Thus, for instance, we find **bVmler bé[ me** not only in <sup><3074></sup>Zechariah 7:14, but also in 9,8; **ryb[eh**, in the sense of “to remove,” in 3, 4, and in 13:2—elsewhere it occurs in this unusual sense only in later writings (<sup><1263></sup>2 Kings 16:3; <sup><4453></sup>2 Chronicles 15:8)—“the eye of God,” as betokening the divine providence, in <sup><3090></sup>Zechariah 3:9; 4:10; and in <sup><3001></sup>Zechariah 9:1,8.

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 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 <sup><3092></sup>Zechariah 9:12, etc. Both in <sup><3020></sup>Zechariah 2:10 and in 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 2, 14, **ab ynnh yk ^wyx tb j mçw ynr**, and in 9:9, **hnh µl çwry tb y[yrh ^wyx tb dam yl yg ! awby kl m**

Again, similar forms of expression occur in <sup><3099></sup>Zechariah 2:9, 11, and 11; 111; the description of the increase in Jerusalem, <sup><3040></sup>Zechariah 14:10, may be compared with 2, 4; and the prediction in 8:20-23 with that in <sup><3046></sup>Zechariah 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 **abx**; (<sup>3808</sup>Zechariah 9:8), **hmar**; (<sup>3840</sup>Zechariah 14:10), **l hb** (which occurs besides only in <sup>3811</sup>Proverbs 20:11), and the phrase **tvq, aLmae** (<sup>3813</sup>Zechariah 9:13), instead of **tvqErd**; 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 quae 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 <sup>3802</sup>Zechariah 9:2 an allusion to <sup>3838</sup>Ezekiel 28:3: in ver. 3 to <sup>4112</sup>1 Kings 10:27; in ver. 5 to <sup>3814</sup>Zephaniah 2:4; in ver. 11 to Isaiah 51, 14; in ver. 12 to <sup>3840</sup>Isaiah 49:9 and Isaiah 61, 7; in 10; 3 to <sup>3847</sup>Ezekiel 34:17. Zechariah 11 is derived from Ezekiel 34 (comp. esp. ver. 4 with <sup>3840</sup>Ezekiel 34:4), and <sup>3818</sup>Zechariah 11:3 from <sup>3816</sup>Jeremiah 12:5. <sup>3811</sup>Zechariah 12:1 alludes to <sup>3813</sup>Isaiah 51:13; 13:8,9, to Ezekiel 5, 12; 14,8 to <sup>3871</sup>Ezekiel 47:1-12; ver. 10, 11, to <sup>3838</sup>Jeremiah 31:38-40; ver. 16-19 to <sup>3863</sup>Isaiah 66:23 and 60:12; ver. 20, 21, to <sup>3862</sup>Ezekiel 43:12 and 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 <sup>3802</sup>Zechariah 9:12; 11:3; 12:1; 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 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 <sup><2168></sup>Jeremiah 16:18, and has an almost verbal accordance with <sup><2607></sup>Isaiah 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 <sup><300></sup>Zechariah 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 not 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 (<sup><301></sup>Ezekiel 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 9:11, 12, and hence ver. 10 can only be regarded as a reminiscence of <sup><310></sup>Micah 5:10; and even if 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 Nehemiah 5 and 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” ((μϒΒαῖ)) in 13:1-5 may be the same as the “Teraphim” of 10:2, where they are mentioned in connection with “the diviners” ((μϒμαῖQh)). Malachi (<sup><315></sup>Malachi 3:5) speaks of “sorcerers” ((μϒρᾶῖm)), and that such superstition long held its ground among the Jews is evident from Josephus (*Ant.* 8:2, 5). Nor does <sup><312></sup>Zechariah 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 ver. 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 (~~יזעמי~~ A.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 ~~נחמיה~~ Nehemiah 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 ~~זכריה~~ Zechariah 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. 3:6, 7). If, however, we are to understand 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 the 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 Psalm 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 <sup><300></sup> Zechariah 9:1-10, 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 (<sup><470></sup>Matthew 27:9, 10; comp. <sup><3812></sup>Zechariah 11:12, 13) there seems no good reason for setting aside the received reading. Jerome observes (*Comment. in Evang. Matth.* 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 omnium, 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, ΖΠΙΟΥ may have been written, and that copyists may have taken this for ΙΠΙΟΥ. 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 Ἱερεμίου 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 Ἰερεμίου καὶ τοῦ Προφήτου-ἡγουν 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 <sup>4205</sup>Matthew 21:5; <sup>6125</sup>John 12:15) 12:10 (in <sup>6857</sup>John 19:37; <sup>6007</sup>Revelation 1:7); 13:7 (in <sup>4151</sup>Matthew 26:31; <sup>4147</sup>Mark 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, *Meletemata 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 *Horne'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 **ta** and **dywā**, and employs **tj ai'** (<sup><3807></sup>Zechariah 5:7) in its later use as the indefinite article, and **twoTj'ai** with the fem. termination (<sup><3812></sup>Zechariah 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); Varenus, *Explicatio* [includ. Haggai Ind Mal.] (Rost. 1662, 4to); De Base, *Analysis* (Brem. 1689, 4to); Biermann, *Erklärung* (Utrecht, 1699; in Germ. 1706, 4to); Gerbade, *Opelooften* (Leyd. 1702,



4to); Muilman, *Illustratio* (Franek. 1703, 4to); Meiss, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1706, 8vo); Bohle, *Analysis*, ed. Grape (Rost. 1711, 8vo); Nemethus, *Explicatio* (Ultraj. 1714, 4to); Boekholt, *Erklärung* (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, *Erklärung* (Rost. 1764, 8vo); Trinius, *Amerk.* (Quedlinb. 1780, 8vo); \*Flügge, *Erläuterung* (Hamb. 1784, 8vo); \*Venema, *Sermones* (Leov. 1789, 4to); Blayney, *Notes* (Oxf. 1797, 4to); Thube, *Erklärung* (Schwerin, 1802, 8vo); Salomon, *μυρταβαε* (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, *Erklärung* (Brem. 1831, 8vo, pt. 1); Park, *Explication* (Loud. 1832, 8vo); Burger, *Etudes* (Strasb. 1841, 4to); Baumgarten, *Nachtgesichte* (Brunswick, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); Neumann, *Erklärung* (Stuttg. 1860); Wardlaw, *Lectures* (Lond. 1862, 12mo); \*Kliefoth, *Erläuterung* (Schwerin, eod. 8vo); Kohler, *Erklärung* (Erlang. 1862-63, 8vo); Robinson, *Homilies* (Lond. 1865, 8vo); \*Moore, *Commentary* [iucclud. Hagg and Mal.] (N.Y. 1866, 8vo); Pressel, *Commentar* [ibid.] (Gotha, 1870, 8vo); \*Wright, *Commentary* (Lond. 1879, 8vo). **SEE PROPHEETS, MINOR.**

## Ze'dad

(Heb. *Tsedasd'*, **דדאס** with **h** directive, *Tseda'dah*, **הדדא**] *slope*; Sept. **Σαδαδάκ** v.r. **Σαραδάκ**, etc.), one of the landmarks on the north border of the land of Israel, as promised by Moses (<sup>4018</sup>Numbers 34:8) and as restored by Ezekiel (<sup>3575</sup>Ezekiel 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).

## Zedechi'as

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

## Zedeki'ah

(Heb. *Tsidkiyah'*, ~~hYqdkāh~~ but in this simple form only in <sup><121></sup>1 Kings 22:11; <sup><100></sup>Nehemiah 10:1; <sup><272></sup>Jeremiah 27:12; 28:1; 29,3; elsewhere in the prolonged form *Tsidkiya'hu*, ~~WhYqdkāh~~ *my righteousness is Jah*, or, *righteousness of Jehovah*; Sept and Josephus, 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. <sup><2439></sup>Jeremiah 13:19), the horns of the *irem*, or buffalo, which was the recognized emblem of the tribe of Ephraim (<sup><1537></sup>Deuteronomy 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 (<sup><283D></sup>Jeremiah 28:2; comp. 29:21, 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 (d/[ ]) 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. <sup><1189></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><283D></sup>Jeremiah 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 was 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 (<sup><4630></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><4233></sup>2 Kings 23:31; 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. Zedekiah was 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 (<sup><2485></sup>Jeremiah 38:5). His history is contained in the short sketch of the events of his reign given in <sup><1247></sup>2 Kings 24:17-25, 7, and, with some trifling variations, in <sup><3401></sup>Jeremiah 39:1-7; 52, 1-11, together with the still shorter summary in <sup><4630></sup>2 Chronicles 36:10, etc.; and also in <sup><2410></sup>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 <sup><3161></sup>Ezekiel 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 ver. 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 (<sup>25159</sup>Jeremiah 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 (<sup>31713</sup>Ezekiel 17:13; <sup>44613</sup>2 Chronicles 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 <sup><262b></sup>Jeremiah 34:21; 37:5-11, and <sup><267b></sup>Ezekiel 17:15-20; but Josephus (<sup><260b></sup>Ezekiel 10:7, 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 <sup><242b></sup>Jeremiah 2:18, 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 (<sup><264b></sup>Jeremiah 34:7). In 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 (ver. 18), recalling in its form that in which the original covenant of the nation had been made with Abram (<sup><015b></sup>Genesis 15:9, etc.), was performed in the Temple (<sup><244b></sup>Jeremiah 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 (<sup><269b></sup>Jeremiah 34:20). This encounter was quickly followed by Jeremiah's capture and imprisonment which, but for the interference of the king (<sup><267b></sup>Jeremiah 37:17, 21), would have rapidly put an end to his life (ver. 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 (<sup><261b></sup>Jeremiah 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 (<sup><268b></sup>Jeremiah 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 (ver. 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 (ver. 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 (<sup>-2830-</sup>Jeremiah 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 (Bar. 2, 3; <sup>-2910-</sup>Lamentations 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 (ver. 5, 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 (<sup>-2807-</sup>Jeremiah 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 Zedekiah, 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 Chaldeans. 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 (<sup><del>2430</del></sup>Jeremiah 32:4) states that Zedekiah shall "speak with the king of Babylon mouth to mouth, and his eyes shall behold his eyes;" the latter (<sup><del>2423</del></sup>Ezekiel 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 (<sup><del>2400</del></sup>Ezekiel 1:1-3; 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 (<sup><del>1316</del></sup>1 Chronicles 3:16). B.C. 598 or later. As nothing further is recorded of him, and he is not mentioned subsequently among the royal lineage (ver. 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 (<sup><del>2421</del></sup>Jeremiah 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 <sup><del>1423</del></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><del>1600</del></sup>Nehemiah 10:1 A. V. "Zikijah"). B.C. 410.

**Zeeb**

*SEE WOLF.*

## Ze'eb

(Heb. *Zeeb*, **baʔj** *wolf*, as often; Sept. **ὁ Ζήβ**, Vulg. *Zeb*), one of the two “princes” (**μυραῖ**) of Midian in the great invasion of Israel—inferior to the “kings” Zebah and Zalmunna. He is always named with Oreb (<sup><10075></sup>Judges 7:25; 8:3; <sup><10811></sup>Psalms 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” (**baʔj āqy**; Sept. **Ἰακεφζήφ** v.r. **Ἰακεφζήβ**, 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.

## Zekukith

*SEE CRYSTAL*.

## Ze'lah

(Heb. *Tsela'*, [**l** **ḫ**ḫin pause, [**l** **ḫ**ḫin Samuel], *a rib*; Sept. in Joshua **Σηλά**, in Samuel **Πλευρά**), a city in the tribe of Benjamin (<sup><16838></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><12114></sup>2 Samuel 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. ver. 13). The ancient geographers seem ignorant of the locality (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 1058); but 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.**

### Ze'lek

(Heb. *Tse'lek*, **q| x**, *fissure*; Sept. **Σελλήκ** and **Σβλεγί** v.r. **Ἐλέ** and **Σελή**), an Ammonite, one of David's thirty heroes (<sup><10237></sup>2 Samuel 23:37; <sup><3113></sup>1 Chronicles 11:39). B.C. 1046. **SEE DAVID.**

### Zeloph'ehad

(Heb. *Tselophchad'*, **dj p| x]** of uncertain etymology; Sept. **Σαλπαάδ** v.r. **Σαλφαάδ**, etc.), son of Hopher, 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, Hopher (<sup><13715></sup>1 Chronicles 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 **γῆραι** 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 (<sup><04455></sup>Numbers 14:35; 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 (26:33; 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.**

### Zelo'tes

(**Ζηλωτής**), an epithet of the apostle Simon (<sup><0165></sup>Luke 6:15; <sup><4013></sup>Acts 1:13) to distinguish him from Simon Peter. 'In the parallel lists of <sup><0004></sup>Matthew 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  $\hat{\text{זֵּל}}$  *zeal*, of which the Greek title is a translation. The word denotes a *zealot* in’ general (<sup>4142</sup>1 Corinthians 14:12; Titus 2, 14; 1 Peter 3, 13), especially in behalf of Jewish law and institutions (<sup>4213</sup>Acts 21:20; 22:3; Galatians 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*.

### Zel’zah

(Heb. *Tseltsach’*,  $\text{j xl } \text{ךְ}$  *shadow* from the *sun*, or, by reduplication from  $\text{hl } \text{כְּ}$ ; *to send*; Sept.  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha$ , 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*” (<sup>9102</sup>1 Samuel 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  $\text{l xl } \text{x}$ , 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 ( $\text{l x}$ ) 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*.

## Zemara'im

(Heb. *Tsemara'yim*, מַצְאִיחַ] *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 (Josh; 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 (רְחִי) or eminence mentioned in <sup>4E34</sup>2 Chronicles 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 (ver. 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).

## Zem'arite

(Heb. with the art. *hats-Tsemari'*, צְמָרִי] evidently a patronymic or rather patril 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 (ver. 18) and 1 Chronicles 1 (ver. 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.

### Zemi'ra

(Heb. *Zemirah'*, ἤρμζ music, as in Isaiah 24? 16, etc.; Sept. Ζεμυρά v.r. Ζαμυρίας 'and Ἀμαρίας; Vulg. *Zamira*), first named of the nine sons of Becher son of Benjamin (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 7:8). B.C. post 1874.

### Ze'nan

(Heb. *Tsenan'*, ἤνζ 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 (<sup><657></sup>Joshua 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 Mejdal 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* <sup><657></sup>Joshua 15:37). Knobel supposes this last to be identical with: the ruin of es*Senat*, 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 in 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-Senn2berek*. 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.

## Ze’nas

(*Ζηνᾶς*, a contraction from *Ζηνόδωρος*, as *Ἄρτεμᾶς* from *Ἀρτεμίδωρος*, *Νυμφᾶς* *Νυμφόδωρος* and probably *Ἑρμᾶς* from *Ἑρμόδωρος*), a believer, and, as may be inferred from the context, a preacher of the Gospel, who is mentioned in <sup><4013></sup>Titus 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 *ἄονλχρο* leads rather to the other inference. Tradition has been somewhat busy with the name of Zenas. The *Synopsis de Vita et Morte Prophetarum, Apostolorum, et Discipulorum 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.

## 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 the Stoic

*SEE STOICS*.

## Zephani'ah

(Heb. *Tsephanyah'*, **הַצְפַּנְיָהוּ**) [in the prolonged form *Tsephanya'hu*, **וְהַצְפַּנְיָהוּ** <sup><1258></sup>2 Kings 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 (<sup><3166></sup>1 Chronicles 6:36 [Heb. 21]); the same elsewhere (ver. 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 (<sup><3001></sup>Zephaniah 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 (<sup><2101></sup>Jeremiah 21:1) and *sagan*, or second priest, in the reign of Zedekiah. He succeeded Jehoiada (<sup><2102></sup>Jeremiah 21:29, 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 (<sup><2102></sup>Jeremiah 21:29). Twice was he sent from Zedekiah to inquire of Jeremiah the issue of the siege of the city by the Chaldaeans (<sup><2101></sup>Jeremiah 21:1), and to implore him to intercede for the people (<sup><2303></sup>Jeremiah 37:3). On the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuzaradan, he was taken with Seraiah the high-priest and others, and slain at Riblah. (<sup><2422></sup>Jeremiah 52:24, 27; <sup><1258></sup>2 Kings 25:18,21). B.C. 588.

**4.** Father of Josiah 2 (<sup><3160></sup>Zechariah 6:10), and of Hen, according to the reading of the received text of <sup><3064></sup>Zechariah 6:14 as given in the A. V. B.C. ante 519. *SEE JOSIAH*.



## 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 **Ἀνάληψις** 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 **ἠρᾶ**; *he watched*, or **ἠπῆ**; *he hid*, with the common affix **hy**; 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 **ἠπῆ**, 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 (*Onomast. V. 7.*) gives the true signification, one sanctioned by Gesenius— “abscondidit, i.e. custodivit Jehovah,” *Jehovah hath guarded*, the verb **ἠπῆ** being used of divine protection in <sup><1075></sup>Psalm 27:5 and <sup><1030></sup>Psalm 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, *Præf. 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 <sup>2101</sup>Proverbs 25:1 and <sup>2309</sup>Isaiah 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 (*P7rovium 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 (ver. 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 of 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 (ver. 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 (ver. 10-18). Ch. 2 is a call to repentance (ver. 1-3), with prediction of the ruin of the cities of the Philistines, and the restoration of the house of Judah after the visitation (ver. 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 (ver. 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 (ver. 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 (ver. 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 are 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 clad themselves in strange apparel, and those who in some superstitious mummery leaped upon the threshold (Bochart, *Hieroz.* c. 36). Not a few verses occur in the course of the prophecy which, in tone and dignity, are not unworthy to be associated with the more distinguished efforts of the Hebrew bards. A few paronomasiae occur (<sup>3015</sup>Zephaniah 1:15 and <sup>3016</sup>Zephaniah 2:1-4), and occasionally there is a peculiar repetition of a leading word in the formation of a climax (<sup>3025</sup>Zephaniah 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 <sup>3341</sup>Isaiah 34:11 to <sup>3024</sup>Zephaniah 2:14, or Isaiah 47, 8 to <sup>3025</sup>Zephaniah 2:15, or <sup>3301</sup>Isaiah 18:1 to <sup>3030</sup>Zephaniah 3:10, or <sup>3306</sup>Isaiah 16:6 to <sup>3028</sup>Zephaniah 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 <sup>3005</sup>Zephaniah 1:5 and <sup>3402</sup>Jeremiah 8:2 we can perceive little similarity of language, though the same superstitious custom is referred to, and a

comparison of <sup><3012></sup>Zephaniah 1:12 with <sup><3481></sup>Jeremiah 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 (<sup><3019></sup>Zephaniah 3:9; <sup><61516></sup>Romans 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 prophetic 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, *Commentarius* [on ch. 1] (Fr. ad O. 1719-24, 4to); Gebhardi, *Erklärung* (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, *Erklärung* (Erlang. 1827, 8vo); Strauss, *Commentarius* (Berol. 1843, 8vo); Robinson, *Homilies* (Lond. 1865, 8vo); Reinke, *Erläuterung* (Leips. 1868). **SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.**

Ze'phath

### Picture for Zeohath 1

(Heb. *Tsephath*', תִּפְחָ] *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.

## Picture for Zephath 2

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*.

## Zeph'athah

(Heb. *Tsepha'thah*, [htpxj](#) watchtower; Sept. [κατὰ βορᾶν](#); Josephus, [Σαφθά](#), *Ant.* 8:12,1; Vulg. *Sephata*), the name of a valley ([γαδ](#)) where Asa joined battle with Zerah the Ethiopian ([2 Chronicles 14:10](#)). It was "at," or rather "belonging to," Mareshah ([hvrml j](#)) Josephus, [οὐκ ἄποθεν](#)). 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 that of *Zepihath* (q.v.), with **h** directive, and render it “the valley towards Zephath.”

## Zepheth

SEE PITCH.

## Ze'phi

(<sup><13035></sup>1 Chronicles 1:36). SEE ZEPHO.

## Zepho

(Heb. *Tsephoo*, /**פְּצָוּ** watch-tower; Sept. **Σωφάρ**; Vulg. *Sephu*), third named of the five sons of Eliphaz the son of Esau (<sup><0331></sup>Genesis 36:11), and one of the Idumeans “dukes” (ver. 15), B.C. considerably post 1927. In the parallel passage (<sup><13035></sup>1 Chronicles 1:36) the name is written *Zephi* (Heb. *Tsephi*', **פְּצִי** Sept. **Σωφάρ**; Vulg. *Sephi*).

## Ze'phon

(Heb. *Tsephon*', **פְּצוֹן** watch; Sept. **Σαφών**; Vulg. *Sephon*), first named of the -seven sons of Gad (<sup><0415></sup>Numbers 26:15) and progenitor of the family of the *Zephonites* (Heb. with the art. *hats-Tsephoni*', **צְפוֹנִי** Sept. **ὁ Σαφωνί**; Vulg. *Sephonifte*). In Genesis 46, 16 his name is written *Ziphion* (Heb. *Tsiphyon*', **פְּצִיֹן** Sept. **Σαφών** .Vulg. *Sephon*). B.C. 1874.

## 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 Entstehung d. altkatholischen Kirche* (2nd ed.). See also, Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* s.v.

## Ze'rah

(Heb. *Ze'rach*, **j rĕ**, [in pause *Za'rach*, **hrĕ**; <sup><13104></sup>1 Chronicles 2:4; "Zarah," <sup><0330></sup>Genesis 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 (<sup><0363></sup>Genesis 36:13; 1 Chronicles 1, 37), and one of the "dukes" or phylarchs of the Edomites (<sup><0367></sup>Genesis 36:17). B.C. considerably post 1927. . Jobab of Bozrah, one of, the early kings of Edom, perhaps belonged to his family (ver. 33; <sup><0044></sup>1 Chronicles 1:44).
2. Twin son with his elder brother Pharez of Judah and Tamar (<sup><0330></sup>Genesis 38:30; 1 Chronicles 2, 6; "Zara," Matthew 1, 3). B.C. cir. 1895. His descendants were called Zarhites, Ezrahites, and Izrahites (<sup><0250></sup>Numbers 26:20; <sup><1065></sup>1 Kings 4:31; <sup><13708></sup>1 Chronicles 27:8, 11), and continued at least down to the time of Zerubbabel (9, 6; <sup><6124></sup>Nehemiah 11:24). Nothing is related of Zerah individually beyond the peculiar circumstances of his birth (<sup><0327></sup>Genesis 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 (1 Chronicles 4,24), and founder of the family of Zarhites (<sup><0263></sup>Numbers 26:13). B.C. 1874. In Genesis 46, 10 he is called ZOHAR.

**4.** A Gershonite Levite, son of Iddo (or Adaiah) and father of Jeaterai (<sup><1372></sup>1 Chronicles 6:21, 41 [Heb. 6:26]). B.C. ante 1043.

**5.** The Ethiopian or Cushite (yvwksh) king who invaded Judah, and was defeated by Asa (<sup><1449></sup>2 Chronicles 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, a/s even 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 (<sup><1441></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1441></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (11:8), and were no doubt captured and probably dismantled by that king (comp. 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" (<sup><312></sup>1 Chronicles 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 full 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. O 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 (<sup><434></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><972></sup>1 Samuel 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" (<sup><449></sup>2 Chronicles 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” (<sup><445B></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><443B></sup>2 Chronicles 13:19), and he held cities in Mount Ephraim (<sup><445B></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><446B></sup>2 Chronicles 16:1-9). The after-years of Asa were troubled with wars (ver. 9); but they were with Baasha (<sup><11516></sup>1 Kings 15:16, 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 both 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 (<sup><4168></sup>2 Chronicles 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.*

## Zerahi'ah

(Heb. *Zerachyah'*, *hyj řž*] *Jehovah has risen*; Sept. *Ζαράια* v.r. *Ζαράια*), the name of two Hebrews.

**1.** A priest, son of Uzzi and father of Meraioth, in the ancestry of the later Jewish pontiffs (<sup><B06></sup>1 Chronicles 6:6, 51 [Heb. 5:32; 6:30]), and of Ezra (<sup><B06></sup>Ezra 7:4). B.C. cir. 1350. *SEE HIGH-PRIEST.*



2. Father of Elihoenai “of the sons of Pahath-moab” (<sup><אֶלְיָהוּ</sup>Ezra 8:4). B.C. ante 459.

## Zeraim

SEE TALMUD.

## Ze'red

(Heb. *id.* **drz**, [in pause *Za'red*, **drz**; Deuteronomy 2<sup>o</sup>13; “Zared,”<sup><זָרַד</sup>Numbers 21:12], *osier-brook*; Sept. **Ζαρέδ** v.r. **Ζαρέτ** and **Ζαρέ**), the name of a brook or valley (l j ñ) on the border between Moab and Edom (<sup><אֶרְבֵּי</sup>Deuteronomy 2:13), where the Israelites encamped before crossing the Arnon (<sup><זָרַד</sup>Numbers 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 <sup><אֶרְבֵּי</sup>Deuteronomy 2:3. “The camping station in the catalogue of Numbers 23, which corresponds to the “pitching in the valley of Zered” of 21:12, is probably Dibon-gad, as it stands next to Ije-abarim (comp. 33:44, 45 with 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 (<sup><זָרַד</sup>Isaiah 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.*

### Zer'eda

(Heb. with the art. *hats-Tseredah'*, **hḏrꜝḥi** *the fortress* [Fürst] or *the cool* [Gesén.] Sept. ἡ Σαριδά v.r. Σαριρά; Vulg. *Sareda*), a town in Mount Ephraim, the birthplace of Jeroboam the son of Nebat (<sup><1112></sup>1 Kings 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) identifies it with *Surdah*, a village little more than a mile south of Jufna (Tristram, *Bible Places*, p. 110).

### Zered'athah

(Heb. *Tsereda'thah*, **hḏrꜝ'** 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 (<sup><1407></sup>2 Chronicles 4:17), in place of the ZARTIAN *SEE ZARTIAN* (q.v.) of the parallel passage (<sup><1074></sup>1 Kings 7:46).

### Zer'erath

[some *Zere'rath*], or rather .ZER'ERA (Heb. *Tsererah'*, **hrrꜝ**) with h local added, *Tserera'thah*, **htrrꜝ**, *to Zererah*, perh. an interchange for *Zeredah*, as some MSS and versions read; Sept. Ταγαραγαθά v.r. καὶ συνηγμένη; Vulg. omits), a place mentioned (<sup><1072></sup>Judges 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.).

## Ze'resh

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

## Zereth

**SEE SPAN**.

## Ze'reth

(Heb. *Tse'reth*, **trx**, prob. *splendor*; Sept. **Σερέθ** v.r. **Σαρέθ** and **Ἀρέθ**; Vulg. *Sereth*), first named of the three sons of Ashur (the Judahite and founder of Tekoa) by one of his wives, Helah (<sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 4:7). B.C. cir. 1612.

## Ze'ri

(Heb. *Tseri'*, **yræj** Sept. **Σουρί**; Vulg. *Sori*), second named of the six sons and assistants of Jeduthun in the Levitical music (<sup><1328></sup>1 Chronicles 25:3); probably the same elsewhere (ver. 11) called by the equivalent name of IZRI **SEE IZRI** (q.v.).

## Ze'ror

(Heb. *Tseror'*, **r/rxæa** *bunch*, as often; Sept. **Σαράρ** v.r. **Ἀρέδ** and **Ἰαρέδ**; Vulg. *Seror*), a Benjamite, son of Bechorath and father of Abiel in the ancestry of king Saul (<sup><1001></sup>1 Samuel 9:1). B.C. cir. 1230.

## Zeru'ah

(Heb. *Tseruah'*. **h[Wræ]** *smitten* with leprosy [Gesén.] *or full-breasted* [Fürst]; Sept. **Σαρουά** Vulg. *Sarua*), the widowed mother of Jeroboam the son of Nebat (<sup><1126></sup>1 Kings 11:26). B.C. 973. In the additional narrative of the Sept. inserted after <sup><1123></sup>1 Kings 12:24, she is called *Sarira* (a corruption of Zereda, Jeroboam's native place), and is said to have been a harlot.

## Zerub'babel

(*Heb.* Zerubbabel', [bBrz] 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 (<sup><1802></sup>Ezra 3:2, 8; 5, 2, etc.; <sup><3001></sup>Haggai 1:1, 12, 14, etc.), and appearing as such in the genealogies ("Zorobabel," <sup><4012></sup>Matthew 1:12; <sup><4187></sup>Luke 3:27), whereas in <sup><1819></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (arcæ of Judah in the Captivity, what in later times was called, htWl Ghivyræ "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 (hj P) 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 kept the Feast of Tabernacles, as it is said they did in <sup><1804></sup>Ezra 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 (~~504~~Ezra 6:4), he had collected the materials, including cedar-trees brought from Lebanon to Joppa, according to the precedent in the time of Solomon (~~426~~2 Chronicles 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 (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 Cuthians 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, <sup>^</sup>Ps; in <sup><3004></sup>Haggai 1:4, and <sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 7:3, 7). They had, in fact, ceased to care for the, desolation of the Temple (<sup><3002></sup>Haggai 1:2-4), and had not noticed that God was rebuking their lukewarmness by withholding his blessing from their labors (ver. 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 (<sup><3013></sup>Haggai 1:13, 14; 2:4-9, 21-23; <sup><3016></sup>Zechariah 4:6-10; 8:38; 9:18-23). 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 (<sup><15168></sup>Ezra 6:18; <sup><16127></sup>Nehemiah 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 Esdr. 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 Esdr. 5, 8, whereas Zorobabel, Eneuius and Mardocheaus correspond to Zorobabel, Ananias, and Mardocheaus of Josephus. Moreover, the letter or decree of Darius as given by Josephus is as manifestly copied from the decree of Darius in <sup><1306></sup>Ezra 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 <sup><1309></sup>1 Chronicles 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: [ver. 19] The issue of Pedaiah were *Zerubbabel* (by his brother Salathiel’s widow), Shimei (to whom may be added Zerubbabel’s children, Meshullam, *Hananiah*, and a daughter Shelomith), [ver. 20] Hashubah, Ohel, Berechiah, and Hasadiah (called also Jushab-hesed), making in all



five sons (besides Zerubbabel, who was reckoned as Salathiel's heir [~~STR~~ Ezra 3:2]). [Ver. 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*. [Ver. 22] The family of this last consisted of six descendants, namely, his son *Shemaiah*, and grandchildren Hattush, Igeal, *Bariah*, *Neariah*, and Shaphat. [Ver. 23] *Neariah* had three sons, *Elioenai*, Hezekiah, and *Azrikam*; [ver. 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, but 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).**

Generation	1 Chron. 3	Matt. 1;12-17	1 Chron.3	Luke 3;27-33	Born B.C.
1	Zerubbabel	Zorobabel	Zerubbabel	Zorobabel	c. 530
2	Hananiah		Hananiah		? 530
3	Rephaiah		Rephaiah	Rhesa	? 505
4	Arnan		Arnan	Joanna	? 475
5	Obadiah	Abiud	Obadiah	Juda	? 445
6	Shechanbiah	Eliakim?	Shechaniah	Joseph?	? 415
7	Shemaiah		Shemaiah	Semi	? 385
				Mattathias	
				Maath	
8	Neariah		Neariah	Nagge	? 355
9	Azikam	Azor	Elioenai	Esli	? 325
10			Johanann	Naum	? 295
11				Amos	? 265
12		Sadoc		Mattathias	? 235
13		Achim		Joseph	? 205
14		Elliud		Janna	? 175
15		Eleazar		Melchi	? 145
16		Matthan		Levi	? 105

17		Jacob		Matthat	? 85
18		Joseph		Heli	? 55
19				Mary	c 25
20		Jesus		Jesus	6

## Zerui'ah

(Heb. *Tseruyah'*, **הַיְרֻחַ** [<sup><0940></sup>1 Samuel 14:1 **הַיְרֻחַ**] *wounded* [Gesén.] or *balsam* [Fürst]; Sept and Josephus, **Σαρουΐα**; 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 (<sup><0246></sup>1 Samuel 26:6; 2 Samuel 2, 18; 1 Kings 1, 7, etc.). B.C. ante 1046. She and Abigail are specified in the genealogy of David's family in <sup><1213></sup>1 Chronicles 2:13-17 as "sisters of the sons of Jesse" (ver. 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 <sup><1075></sup>2 Samuel 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.

## Ze'tham

(Heb. *Zetham'*, **μτζ**] prob. 1. q. *Zethan* [q.v.]; Sept. **Ζεθόμ** v.r. **Ζοθομ**, **Ζηθάβ**, etc.; Vulg. *Zetham*, *Zatham*), a grandson of Laadan, a Gershonite Levite (<sup><1378></sup>1 Chronicles 23:8), associated with his father, Jehiel or Jehieli, and his brother Joel, in charge of the Temple treasury (<sup><1352></sup>1 Chronicles 26:22). B.C. 1043.

## Ze'than

(Heb. *Zeythan'*, <sup>ⲧ</sup>tyzεolive [Gesen.] or *shining* [Fürst]; Sept. Ζαιθάν v.r. <sup>Ⲡ</sup>Θάϛ; Vulg. *Zethan*), fifth named of the seven sons of Bilhan, a Benjamite (<sup><1370></sup>1 Chronicles 7:10). B.C. prob. 1014.

## Ze'thar

(Heb. *Zethar'*, rtz, prob. Persian, either *star* [Gesen.] or *sacrifice* [Fürst]; Sept. Ἀβατοξάϛ; Vulg. *Zethar*), sixth named of the seven eunuchs of Ahtasuerus who attended upon the king, and were commanded to bring Vashti into his presence (<sup><1000></sup>Esther 1:10). B.C. 483.

## Zi'a

(Heb. id. [yza] <sup>ⲓ</sup>zæmotion [Gesen.] or *terrified* [Fürst]; Sept. Ζιά v.r. Ζουέ; Vulg. *Zie*), sixth named of the seven Gadite chiefs resident in Bashan (<sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 5:13). B.C. prob. 1014.

## Zi'ba

(Heb. *Tsiba'*, abyxæ briefly abxæ <sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 16:4], *plantation* [Fürst], or *statue*. [Gesen.]; Sept. Σιβά v.r. Σιββά; Josephus, Σιβάϛ; Vulg. *Siba*), a person who plays a prominent part, though with doubtful credit to himself, in one of the episodes of David's history (<sup><1002></sup>2 Samuel 9:2-12; 16:1-4; 19:17, 29). He had been a slave (db[ ] 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 (<sup><1002></sup>2 Samuel 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 (<sup><1061></sup>2 Samuel 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 (<sup><1062></sup>2 Samuel 19:24 sq.). B.C. 1023. *SEE MEPHIBOSHETH.*

### Zib'eon

(Heb. *Tsibon'*, <sup>~</sup>/[ bʔ , *dyed* [Gesen.] or *robber* [Fürst]; Sept. <sup>'</sup> Σεβεγών; Vulg. *Sebeon*), the father of Anah, whose daughter Aholibamah was Esau's wife (<sup><1032></sup>Genesis 36:2). B.C. ante 1963. Although called a Hivite, he is probably the same as Zibeon the son of Seir the Horite (ver. 20, 24, 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 <sup>y</sup>yljebi (the Hivite) is a mis-transcription for <sup>y</sup>yrjebi (the Horite). *SEE ESAU.*

Another difficulty connected with this Zibeon is that Anah in <sup><1032></sup>Genesis 36:2 is called his daughter, and in ver. 24 his son; but this difficulty appears to be easily explained by supposing that <sup>t</sup>tb refers to Aholibamah, and not to the name next preceding it. The Samaritan, it should be observed, has <sup>~</sup>b. 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" (ver. 24). The word rendered "mules" (q.v.) in the A.V. is the Heb. <sup>μ</sup>ymæ *yemim*, perhaps the Emim, or giants, as in the reading of the Samuel <sup>μ</sup>ymæb; 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 (ver. 29). For the identification with Beeri, father of Judith the Hittite (26, 34), *SEE BEERI*, and also *SEE ANATH.*

## Zib'ia

(Heb. *Tsibya'*, ~~aybka~~Sept. Σεβιά v.r. Ίεβιά; Vulg. *Sebia*), a Benjamite, second named of the seven sons of Shaharaim (q.v.) by one of his two wives, Hodesh (~~1389~~1 Chronicles 8:9). B.C. post 1612.

## Zib'iah

(Heb. *Tsibyah'*, ~~hybka~~Sept. Σαβιά v.r. Αβιά; Vulg. *Sebi(l)*), a native of Beer-sheba, mother of king Jehoash of Judah (~~1211~~2 Kings 12:1; ~~1401~~2 Chronicles 24:1), and consequently wife (or concubine) of his father, Ahaziah. B.C. 876.

## Zich'ri

(Heb. *Zikr* ~~yrkpa~~*my memorial or memzorable*; Sept. Ζεχρί v.r. Ζαχρό, Ζοχοί, Ζαρί, and even sometimes Ζαχαρίας, Ἐζεχρί; 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 (~~1062~~Exodus 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 (~~1389~~1 Chronicles 8:19). B.C. cir. 1612.
3. Fifth named of the eleven sons of Shashak of the tribe of Benjamin (~~1383~~1 Chronicles 8:23). B.C. cir. 1612.
4. Last named of the six sons of Jeroham of the, tribe of Benjamin (~~1387~~1 Chronicles 8:27). B.C. cir. 1612. 5. A "son" of Asaph and father of Micah (~~1395~~1 Chronicles 9:15); elsewhere called *Zabdi* (~~1617~~Nehemiah 11:17) and *Zaccur* (12, 35).
6. A descendant of Eliezer the son of Moses, being son of Joram and father of the treasurer Shelomith (~~1325~~1 Chronicles 26:25). B.C. ante 1043.
7. The father of Eliezer, which latter was chief of the Reubenites in David's reign (~~1376~~1 Chronicles 27:16). B.C. ante 1043.
8. A Judahite whose son Amasiah volunteered at the head of 200,000 men in Jehoshaphat's army (~~1476~~2 Chronicles 17:16). B.C. 909.

**9.** Father of Elishaphat, which latter was one of the conspirators with Jehoiada to restore Joash (<sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. ante 876.

**10.** An Ephraimitish chief in the invading army of Pekah the son of Remaliah (<sup><1430></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><2006></sup>Isaiah 7:6). *SEE TABAEL*.

**11.** Father of Joel, which latter was superintendent of the Benjamites after the return from Babylon (<sup><1610></sup>Nehemiah 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 (<sup><1627></sup>Nehemiah 12:17). B.C. cir. 480.

### Zid'dim

(Heb. with the art. *hats-Tsiddim'*, ~~צידים~~, *the declivities*; Sept. τῶν Τυρίων [apparently reading *d* for *d*]; *Vittig, Assedim*), the first named of the fortified towns of the tribe of Naphtali (<sup><1628></sup>Joshua 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*, which Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 182) with much probability takes to be the present *Hattin*, at the northern foot of the well-known Kurn Hactin, 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).

### Zidki'jah

(<sup><1600></sup>Nehemiah 10:1). *SEE ZEDKKIAH*.

## Zi'don

## Picture for Zidon 1

(Heb. *Tsidon'*, <sup>~</sup>דִּיזֹן or briefer <sup>~</sup>רִיזֹן, <sup><0105></sup>Genesis 10:15, 19; 49, 13], *fishery* [Gesens.] or *fortress* [Fürst]; Sept. [usually], New Test., and classical writers generally, Σιδών; A.V. "Sidon" in ver. 15, 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 (<sup><0105></sup>Genesis 10:15; <sup><0103></sup>1 Chronicles 1:13). B.C. considerably post 2514. *SEE ETHNOGRAPHY.*
2. One of the most ancient cities of Phoenicia (<sup><0109></sup>Genesis 10:19; 49:13; <sup><0108></sup>Joshua 11:8; 19:28; <sup><0103></sup>Judges 1:31; 10:6; 18:28; <sup><0106></sup>2 Samuel 24:6; <sup><0117></sup>1 Kings 17:9; <sup><0110></sup>Isaiah 23:2, 4, 12; <sup><0152></sup>Jeremiah 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; <sup><0178></sup>Ezekiel 27:8; 28:21, 22; <sup><0104></sup>Joel 2:4 [Heb. 4:4]; <sup><0102></sup>Zechariah 9:2; <sup><0121></sup>Matthew 11:21, 22; 15:21; <sup><0108></sup>Mark 3:8; 7:24, 31; <sup><0103></sup>Luke 4:26; 6:17; 10; 13, 14; <sup><0121></sup>Acts 12:20, 27:3), which still retains its ancient appellation (Phoen. <sup>~</sup>dx) 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 of 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 πεδῖον 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*, 8th 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 (<sup><00E3></sup>Judges 1:31); on the contrary, it was sometimes a formidable enemy (<sup><0702></sup>Judges 10:12). Even in Joshua's time it was called Tsidon-rabba, or Great Zidon (<sup><6108></sup>Joshua 11:8; 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  $\text{yb}\check{\text{c}}\text{w}\text{y}$  of Zidon") as  $\mu\text{y}\text{n}\text{w}\text{d}\text{x}$ , "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, <sup><0493></sup>Genesis 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 Tamyris 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," <sup><0782></sup>Judges 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  $\mu\text{nd}\text{x}\ \mu\text{a}$ , 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 Zidonians in arts and manufactures, 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" (<sup><231E></sup>Isaiah 23:2; <sup><3278></sup>Ezekiel 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 (<sup>453B7</sup>Ezra 3:7; <sup>43224</sup>1 Chronicles 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; 27; 28:1-19; Isaiah 23), have no parallel in the shorter and vaguer utterances against Zidon (<sup>43321</sup>Ezekiel 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 (<sup><0105></sup>Genesis 10:15), and is implied in the name of “Great Zidon,” or “the, metropolis Zidon,” which is twice given to it in Joshua (<sup><0108></sup>Genesis 11:8- 19:28). It is confirmed, likewise, by Zidonians being used as the generic name of the Phoenicians, or Canaanites, (<sup><0136></sup>Genesis 13:6; <sup><0780></sup>Judges 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 (ver. 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, *II.* 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 (*II.* 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 splendor 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 Zidonians 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 Zidonians (<sup><1086></sup>1 Kings 5:6); and, possibly, when Ethbaal, the father of Jezebel, is called their king (<sup><1165></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><1116></sup>1 Kings 11:5, 33; <sup><1233></sup>2 Kings 23:13); or when women of the Zidonians are mentioned in reference to Solomon (<sup><1101></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><2312></sup>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 (<sup><2104></sup>Joel 3:4) and Jeremiah (<sup><2473></sup>Jeremiah 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 (<sup><2572></sup>Jeremiah 25:22); that., previous to the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, it had furnished mariners to Tyre (<sup><2378></sup>Ezekiel 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 mouths 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 Artaxerxes 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 seditious 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.

## Picture for Zidon 2

Zidon is mentioned several times in the New Test. Jesus went once to the coasts of Tyre and Zidon (<sup><4157></sup>Matthew 15:21); Sarepta, a city of Sidon, is referred to (<sup><4045></sup>Luke 4:26); and Paul touched at Zidon on his voyage from Caesarea to Rome (<sup><4273></sup>Acts 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.”

## Picture for Zidon 3

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 (<sup><4273></sup>Acts 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 Phœnicia*, p. 117). Saida, however, possesses another most vital interest, apart from its faded historical memories. It is the only spot in Phœnicia where Phœnician monuments with Phœnician 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 Phœnician 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 Phœnicia in imitation of’ similar works of art in Egypt. The inscriptions themselves are the longest Phœnician 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 (~~<1161>~~ 1 Kings 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:

ykl ml r [ braw rs[ tñçb l b j ryb 1 µndx l m rz[nmça l m  
 rz[nmça l m rbd µndx l m tñbt l m ^b 2 tl zgn rmal µndx l m  
 tm l a ^b µty µr za µmy sm ^b yt[ l b 3 z rbpbw z tl j b ða  
 bkçw da l kw tkl mm l k taymñq tñb ç a µrmb w z bkçm tya  
 j tpy l a açy l aw µnm ^b µç ya k µnm ^b çqny l a m[y l aw  
 ybkçm tl j tya 5 mda µa ãa ynç bkçm tl [ z bkçmb ^s w  
 tkl mm l k k µndb [mçt l a ðrbdy açy ç a µa z bkçm tl [ j  
 tpy ç a µda l k mb ^sm[y ç a µa ybkçm tl j tya rbqy l aw  
 µapr ta bkçm µl ^ky l a z bkç [ rzw ^b µl ^ky l aw rbqb  
 rda l m µta µçdqh µnl ah µnrqsyw µntj t ql µnb l çm ç a  
 tl [ j tpy ç a ah µda µa tkl mm tya µntx tya açy ç a µa z  
 bkçm tmhm µda µa ah t k l mm [ rz tyaw z tl j w fml çrç  
 µl ^ky l a çmçh tj t µyj b yatw l [ ml rp

(1.) In the month of Bul, in the year 14. (XIV) of my reigning, [I,] king Ashmanezer, king of the Zidonians, (2) son” of king Tabnith, king of the Zidolionias spake king Ashmanezer, king of the Zidonians, saying, I have been stolen away (3), before my time — a son of the flood [?] of days. The whilom Great is dumb—the Son of God is dead. And I rest in this grave, even in this tomb, (4) in the place which I have built My adjuration, to all the ruling-powers and all men. Let no one open this resting place, and (5) not search with us for treasure, for there is no treasure with us; and *let him not bear away the couch of my rest*, and not trouble (6) us on this resting-place by disturbing the couch of my slumbers. Even if people should persuade thee, do not listen to their speech. For all the ruling powers and (7) all men who should open the tomb of this my rest, or any man who should *carry away the couch of my rest*, or any man who troubles me or (8) this my couch, unto them there shall be no rest with the departed; they shall not be buried in a grave, and there shall be to them neither son nor seed (9) in their stead, and the holy gods will send over them a mighty king

who will rule over them, and (10) cut them off with their dynasty. If any human being should open this resting place, and any man should carry away (11) this tomb be he of royal seed or a man of the people there shall be unto them neither root below nor (12) fruit above, nor honor among the living under the sun. The shorter inscription round the king's neck contains seven lines, as follows:

ndx r[brawrs[tnçbl bj ryb 1 yaj tpyl a  
 zammysmnbty[I btl zgnrma 2 [mçtl a  
 mmyakmnmnbçqbyl awzbkçm rbqb I [j tpyçamdal kwk k  
 l mml kkmndb fnl ahmnrsgsywmntj t[rzwnbml nkyl a tyaacy  
 tmhmdamaahtkl mm[rztyawztm knatm [nmçaknak

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 de vogue. The inscription reads as follows.

tçb m j ryb l mtrtç[dbl my trtç[db^bkpndx  
 ranrçtyapundgl m trtç[l yl

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

## Zidon'ian

(Heb. sing. *Tsidoni'*, ~~ϣנצ~~<sup><3520></sup> Ezekiel 32:30; plur. *Tsidonim*, ~~ϣנצ~~<sup><3520></sup> ~~ϣנצ~~<sup><3520></sup> the full form], or ~~ϣנצ~~<sup><3520></sup> Ezra 3:7, they of Zidon], and [<sup><11105></sup> 1 Kings 11:5, 33] *Tsidongs* ~~ϣנצ~~<sup><3520></sup> Sept. ~~Σιδώνιοι~~<sup><3520></sup> Ezekiel 32:30, (~~στρατηγὶ Ἀσσοὺρ~~); Vulg. *Sidonmi* [except ver. 30, *venatores*]; A.V. "Sidonians," <sup><1248></sup> 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 (<sup><1008></sup> Judges 3:3), and colonies of them appear to have spread up into the hill country from Lebanon to Misrephoth-maim, (<sup><6134></sup> Joshua 13:4, 6), whence in later times they hewed cedar-trees for David and Solomon (<sup><1224></sup> 1 Chronicles 22:4). They oppressed the Israelites on their first entrance into the country (<sup><1012></sup> Judges 10:12), and appear to have lived a luxurious, reckless life (<sup><10157></sup> Judges 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 (<sup><07116></sup>Judges 11:5, 33; <sup><12313></sup>2 Kings 23:13), as well as the sun-god Baal, from whom their king was named (<sup><11631></sup>1 Kings 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'*, ת/ינאך Sept. Σύραι, Vulg. *Sidoniae*) were in Solomon's harem (11, 1), **SEE ZIDON**.

### 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 Protomartyris* (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. Généralé*, s.v.

### Zif

(Heb. Ziv, wz] bloom; Sept. Ζιού v.r. Νεισώ, Vulg. *Zio*), the early name (<sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 6:1, 37) of the second Hebrew month IYAR **SEE IYAR** (q.v.), corresponding to April or May. **SEE CALENDAR**.

## Zi'ha

(Heb. *Tsicha'*. *aj yxæ* *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 (<sup><1013></sup>Ezra 2:43; <sup><1016></sup>Nehemiah 7:46). B.C. ante 53.
2. First named of the two chief Nethinim resident in Ophel after the Captivity (<sup><1012></sup>Nehemiah 11:21). B.C. 536.

## Ziim

SEE TSIYIM.

## Zik'lag

(Heb. *Tsiklag* *gl ḡkæ* on pause *gl qæ* *fully Tsikelag'*; *gl ḡpææ* Chronicles 12?, 20), *winding* [Fürst]; Sept. *Σεκελά* or *Σικελάγ* v.r. *Σικελά* etc.; Josephus, *Σικελλά*, *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 (ver 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 (19, 5). We next encounter it in the possession of the Philistines (<sup><0276></sup>1 Samuel 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 (ver. 7; 31; 14, 26; <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 12:1, 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 (<sup><1000></sup>2 Samuel 1:1; in, 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 (<sup><1012></sup>Nehemiah 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 (~~1271~~-1 Samuel 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 ver. 9,10, 21) that it was north of the brook Besor. The word employed in ~~1275~~-1 Samuel 27:5, 7,11, 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 (gl qx gl ç [ ]). — 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.**

## Zil’lah

(Heb. *Tsillah*’, hLxashade; Sept. Σελλά; Vulg. *Sella*), last named of the two wives of Lamech the Cainite, to whom he addressed his song (~~1049~~-Genesis 4:19, 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*.

### Zil’pah

(Heb. *Tsilpah*’, **hP| zə** *a trickling*; Sept. **Ζελφά** v.r. **Ζελφάν**; Josephus, **Ζελφά**, *Ant.* 1, 19,7; Vulg. *Zelpha*), a female servant of Laban, whom he gave to Leah on her marriage with Jacob (<sup><0294></sup>Genesis 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 (<sup><0309></sup>Genesis 30:9-13; 35:26; 37:2; 46, 18). B.C. 1919.

### Zil’thai

(Heb. *Tsiltay*’, **yTI kə** *shady 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 (<sup><1380></sup>1 Chronicles 8:20). B.C. post 1612.
2. Last named of the seven Manassite captains who joined David at Zik-lag (<sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 12:20). B.C. 1054.

### Zim’mah

(Heb. *Zimma*’, **hMzə** *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 (<sup><1360></sup>1 Chronicles 6:20); probably the same with the “son” of Shimei and father of Jahath (ver. 42). B.C. post 1874.



2. Father or ancestor of Joah, which latter was a Gershonite in the reign of Hezekiah (<sup><4912></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><3161></sup>1 Chronicles 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 <sup><4912></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12 with the same in 1 Chronicles 6. 35; “Joel the son of Azariah” in <sup><4912></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12 ‘and <sup><3161></sup>1 Chronicles 6:36; and “Kish the son of Abdi” in <sup><4912></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12 with “Kishi the son of Abdi” in <sup><3164></sup>1 Chronicles 6:44).

## Zim’ran

(Heb. *Zimran*’, זִמְרָן *celebrated*; Sept. Σουβρᾶν v.r. Ζεμβράμ, Σεβραν, etc.; Vulg. *Zama* and *Zacimr-imr*), first named of the nine sons of Abraham by Keturah (<sup><1212></sup>Genesis 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 <sup><3225></sup>Jeremiah 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 Cinaedocolpitaie, 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.**

## Zim’ri

(Heb. *Zimni*’, זִמְנִי *any song or celebrated*; Sept. Ζαμβρί; Josephus, Ζαμόρης, *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 (<sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 2:6). B.C. post 1874.
  2. The son of Salu, a Simeonitish chieftain slain by Phinehas with the Midianitish princess Cozbi (<sup><0254></sup>Numbers 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 <sup><0258></sup>Numbers 25:8. It was not the *ohel* or ordinary tent of the encampment, but the *hq; 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 (<sup><1308></sup>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. <sup><1108></sup>1 Kings 16:8, 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 (ver. 9-20). Ewald's inference from Jezebel's speech to Jehu (<sup><1188></sup>2 Kings 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 <sup>~/mraï</sup> 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 <sup>µrā</sup>; "to be high" (Gesenius); and in other passages, especially <sup><1089></sup>Proverbs 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 (<sup><2016></sup>Jeremiah 20:5, 25) in probable connection with Dedan, Tema, Buz, Arabia (<sup>br{}</sup>) the mingled people "ereb" (<sup>br{h}</sup>) 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

(Heb. *Tsin* <sup>ˆxæ</sup> with. <sup>h</sup> directive, *Tsinah*, <sup>hnæ</sup> <sup><0644></sup>Numbers 34:4; or *Tsintnah*, <sup>hnæ</sup> Joshua 10:, 3 ], *a flat* [plain or palm-tree]; Sept. <sup>Σίν</sup> v.r. <sup>Σινά</sup> 'etc.; Vulg. *Sin*), a wilderness (<sup>rBdæ</sup>) or open, uncultivated region on the south of Palestine and westward from Idumaea, in which was situated the city of Kadesh-barnea (<sup><0432></sup>Numbers 13:22; 20:1; 27; 14; 33:36; 34:3; <sup><6351></sup>Deuteronomy 32:51; Joshua: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" (Σίβ) 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 (<sup><del>1330</del></sup>Numbers 20:1; see *Seetzen, Reisen*, 3, *Hebron to Madara*; Wilton, *Negeb*, p. 127, 134). **SEE KADESH.**

### Zi'na

(Heb. *Zina'*, <sup><del>1330</del></sup>perhaps *abundance*; Sept. Ζιζά, *Vulg.* *Ziza*), second named of the four sons' of Shimei the Gershonite (<sup><del>1330</del></sup>1 Chronicles 23:10). B.C. 1043. In ver. 11. he is called ZIZAH **SEE ZIZAH** (q.v.), and some MSS. here have *Ziza* (<sup><del>1330</del></sup>*azyz*), like the Sept. *aid* *Vulg.*

### 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.)

## Zi'on

(Heb. *Tsion'*, *צִיּוֹן* *sunny* [Gesén.] or *fort* [Fürst]; Sept. [usually] and New. Test. *Σιών*, *Vulg. Sion*; A. V. "Sion" in New. Test.), a prominent hill (*yh*) 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* (<sup><442></sup>2 Chronicles 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* (<sup><4016></sup>Psalm 2:6). By the Hebrew prophets the name is often put for Jerusalem itself (<sup><21818></sup>Isaiah 8:18; 10:24; 30:19; 33:14; <sup><4982></sup>Psalm 48:2, 11, 12; comp. <sup><4933></sup>Romans 9:33; 11:26; 1 Peter 2, 6; <sup><6401></sup>Revelation 14:1); also for its inhabitants, sometimes called *sons* or *daughters of Zion* (<sup><2107></sup>Isaiah 1:27; 12:6; 40, 9; 49, 14; 52, 1; <sup><4914></sup>Psalm 9:14; 97:8; <sup><3817></sup>Zechariah 2:7,10; 9:9, 13; <sup><4184></sup>Zephaniah 3:14, 16; Joel 2, 23; <sup><4216></sup>Matthew 21:5; <sup><4215></sup>John 12:15); and for the spiritual Sion,

the church or city of the living. God (<sup><8022></sup>Hebrews 12:22, 28; <sup><8025></sup>Galatians 4:26; <sup><4482></sup>Revelation 3:12; 21:2,10).

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.**

## Picture for Zion 1

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 Tyropoeoi, 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” (<sup><2488></sup>Jeremiah 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.

## Picture for Zion 2

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 (<sup><0433></sup>Numbers 13:29; <sup><0156></sup>Joshua 15:63; <sup><0121></sup>Jude 1:21 2am 2av.). Upon it that monarch built his palace, and there for more than a thousand years the kings and princes of Israel lived and ruled (ver. 9 etc.). In Zion, too, was David buried, and fourteen of his successors on the throne were laid near him in the royal tomb (<sup><1120></sup>1 Kings

2:10; 11:43; 14:8, 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. <sup><0148></sup>Genesis 14:18 Ninth <sup><0712></sup>Psalms 76:2); then it became *Jebus* under the Jebusites, so called from a son of Canaan (<sup><0106></sup>Genesis 10:16; <sup><3104></sup>1 Chronicles 11:4, 5); then the “city of David” and *Jerusalem* (<sup><0107></sup>2 Samuel 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.*

## Zi'or

(Heb. *Tsior'*, ר[~~צ~~ צsmallness; Sept. Σιώρ v.r. Σωραίθ; Vulg. *Sior*), a town in the highland district of Judah (<sup><0654></sup>Joshua 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

(Heb. *idn.* ~~āyza~~ *āyza* *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 (<sup><3046></sup>1 Chronicles 4:16). B.C. post 1618.
2. A town apparently in the south or Simeonitish part of Judah (<sup><0654></sup>Joshua 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.*



## Picture for Ziph

**3.** A town in the mountain district of Judah (<sup><1655></sup>Joshua 15:55), where it is mentioned between Carmel and Juttah, 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 (<sup><9234></sup>1 Samuel 23:14,15,2.4; 26:2). It had been built by Meshah the son of Caleb (<sup><1392></sup>1 Chronicles 2:42), and was eventually fortified by Rehoboam (<sup><4108></sup>2 Chronicles 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* (<sup><1392></sup>1 Samuel 23:15) and a *wood* (<sup><1392></sup>1 Samuel 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*.

### Zi’phah

(Heb. *Ziphah*’, <sup><1392></sup>הַפְּזָה fem. of *Ziph* [*lent*, Fiirst]; Sept; <sup><1392></sup>Ζεφά v.r. <sup><1392></sup>Ζαφά or <sup><1392></sup>Ζαίφά; Vulg. *Zipha*), second named of the four “sons” of Jehaleleel of the tribe of Judah (<sup><1392></sup>1 Chronicles 4:16). B.C. post 1618.

### Ziph’im

(Psalm 54, title). *SEE ZIPHITE*.

### Ziph’ion

(Genesis 46, 16). *SEE ZEPHON*.



## Ziph'ite

(Heb. with the art. [except <sup><0239></sup>1 Samuel 23:19] *haz-Ziphi*, *γρῆβι* [always in the plur., but abbreviated *μυρβῖν* ver. 19; 26:1]; Sept. *Ζειφᾶῖοι*; Vulg. *Ziphcei*; A. V. "Ziphites," but "Ziphims" in Psalm 54 title), the partial designation of the inhabitants of the town of ZIPH *SEE ZIPH* (q.v.).

## Zi'phron

[some *Ziph'ron*] (Heb. *Ziphron'*, *רְפְרֹן* *fragrance* [Gesén.] or beautiful *top* [Fürst]; Sept. *Ζεφρωνά* v.r. *Δεφρωνά*; Vulg. *Zephrona*, both from the directive *h* of the Heb.), a place on the northern boundary of the Promised Land, and consequently also of Naphtali (<sup><0349></sup>Numbers 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 (<sup><3476></sup>Ezekiel 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*.

## Zip'por

(Heb. *Tsippor'*, *רְפְּסָה* briefly *רְפָּסָה* <sup><0210></sup>Numbers 22:10; 23:18], *sparrow* [comp. *Zipporah*]; Sept. *Σεπόρος*; Vulg. *Sephor*), *father* of Balak, king of Moab, who is always designated by this patronymic title (22, 2, 4, 10, 16; 23:18; <sup><0349></sup>Joshua 24:9 <sup><07125></sup>Judges 11:25). B.C. ante 1618. He is possibly the king referred to in <sup><02136></sup>Numbers 21:26. *SEE BALAK*; *SEE MOAB*.

## Zippo'rah

(Heb. *Tsipporah'*, *רְפְּסָה* *sem. of Zippor*; Sept. *Σεπόρορα*; Josephus, *Σαπώρορα* *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; 4:25; 18:2; comp. ver. 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: (<sup><0180E></sup>Genesis 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 (<sup><0420E></sup>Numbers 12:1, etc.). A slight confirmation for this appears to be that in a passage of Habakkuk (<sup><380E></sup>Habakkuk 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.*

## Ziz

### Picture for Ziz

(Heb. with the art. *hats-Tsits*, *יֶצֶת* the projection; Sept. *Ἀσᾶέ* v.r. *Ἀσσεῖς*; Vulg. *Sis*), the name of a cliff (*הַלְיָמִי* 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 (<sup><4016></sup>2 Chronicles 20:16; comp. ver. 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).

## Zi'za

Heb. *Ziza'*, ~~azya~~ *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 (<sup><4413></sup>2 Chronicles 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" (<sup><1336></sup>1 Chronicles 4:37). B.C. cir. 725.

## Zi'zah

(Heb. *Zizah'*, ~~hzyza~~ *e. Ziza*; Sept. Ζιζά; Vulg. *Ziza*), a Gershonite Levite, second son of Shimei (<sup><1331></sup>1 Chronicles 23:11); elsewhere (ver. 10) called ZINA *SEE ZINA* ; (q.v.).

## Zizanion

*SEE TAKE*.

## 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

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

[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

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.

## Zo'an

(Heb. *Tso'an*,  $\hat{[k]}$ ; Sept.  $\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ; 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. ( $\langle 04122 \rangle$  Numbers 13:22;  $\langle 07812 \rangle$  Psalm 78:12, 43  $\langle 23911 \rangle$  Isaiah 19:11, 13; 30:4;  $\langle 05014 \rangle$  Ezekiel 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  $\hat{[k]}$ ; "he moved tents" ( $\langle 23310 \rangle$  Isaiah 33:20), cognate with  $\hat{[f]}$ ; "he loaded a beast of burden;" and thus signifies "a place of departure" (like Zaananim,  $\langle 06933 \rangle$  Joshua 19:33, or Zaanaim,  $\langle 07011 \rangle$  Judges 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*,  $\text{Αουαρίς}$ ) 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 to Aahmes. 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. (<sup><0432></sup>Numbers 13:22; comp. <sup><0121></sup>Genesis 22:2). It seems also to have been one of the principal capitals, or royal abodes, of the Pharaohs (<sup><2391></sup>Isaiah 19:11, 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 (<sup><4982></sup>Psalms 78:12, 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” (<sup><2304></sup>Isaiah 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 saying, in “the burden of Egypt,” “The princes of Zoan are become fools; the princes of Noph are deceived” (<sup><2391></sup>Isaiah 19:13). The doom of Tanis is foretold by Ezekiel: “I will set fire in Zoan” (<sup><2304></sup>Ezekiel 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 Ἐλη, Ἐλεαρχία), 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 Pelusiatic, 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 Egyptian 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.

Zo'ar

### Picture for Zoar

(Heb. ר[ֶ]חַ, [fully ר[ֶ]חַח, Genesis 19, 22, 23, 30], *smallness*; Sept. Σηγόρ, Ζογορ, or Ζόγορα'; Josephus' Ζώρ, 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 (13, 10). Its original name was BELA, and it was still so called at the time of Abram's first residence in Canaan (14, 2, 8). It

was then in intimate connection with the cities of the “plain of Jordan” — Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboiim (see also 13:10; but not 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* (ר [xm]). 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” (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 ver. 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 <sup><154B></sup>Deuteronomy 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, (<sup><216B></sup>Isaiah 15:5). Jeremiah is the only other sacred writer who mentions it, and his words are less definite than those of Isaiah (<sup><248B></sup>Jeremiah 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 ἄλυκή**). 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 <sup><215></sup>Isaiah 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 **hj yrb** (A.V. “his fugitives,” marg. “borders;” Gesen. *Fluchtlinge*). The *terra Philisthim*, 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. <sup><150></sup>Genesis 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 appellata. (comp. also his. comment on <sup><215></sup>Isaiah 15:5). But this is probably grounded merely on an interpretation of *shalishiyeh* in <sup><215></sup>Isaiah 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 (leuca) 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 eyes 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 *Peregriatio* (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-Bahretzghor (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’ah* 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

corruption of Zoar. The ruins have likewise been described by De Saulcy (*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 *Siaghah*; 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

**SEE SEPARATISTS OF ZOAR.**

## Zo'ba

(Heb. *Tsoba'*, **ab/x**, <sup>40016</sup>2 Samuel 10:6, 8) or Zo'bah (Heb. *Tsobah'*, **hb/x** [briefly **hbxo** <sup>40236</sup>2 Samuel 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

lying chiefly eastward of Coele-Syria, and extending thence northeast and east towards, if not even to the Euphrates (see <sup><1388></sup>1 Chronicles 18:3-9; 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 *Comment. 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 (<sup><1448></sup>2 Chronicles 8:3). Among the cities of Zobah were also a place called Tibhath or Betah (<sup><1088></sup>2 Samuel 8:8; <sup><1388></sup>1 Chronicles 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 BEROETHAH.** 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 time 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 (<sup><0944></sup>1 Samuel 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 (<sup><1080></sup>2 Samuel 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 (ver. 16; comp. title to Psalm 9). David, having resolved to take full possession of the tract of territory originally promised to the posterity of Abraham (<sup><1088></sup>2 Samuel 8:3; comp. <sup><0158></sup>Genesis 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, <sup><1380></sup>1 Chronicles 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" (<sup><408E></sup>2 Samuel 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, Bethlah (Tibhath) and Berothai, yielded him "exceeding much brass" (vier.8). It is not clear whether the Syrians of Zobah 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 (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" (<sup><439I6></sup>1 Chronicles 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" (<sup><411I2></sup>1 Kings 11:23-25). Solomon also was (it would seem) engaged in a war with Zobah itself. The Hamath-zobah against which he "went up" (<sup><448E></sup>2 Chronicles 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.

### Zobe'bah

(Heb. with the article, *hats-Tsobebah'*, **הבבֶּבַח** *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 (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 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).

### Zo'har

(Heb. *Tso'char*, **רַחֵק** *light*; Sept.. **Σάαρ**), the name of two or three men.

**1.** The father of Ephron the Hittite, from which latter Abraham purchased the cave of Machpelah (<sup><1308></sup>Genesis 23:8; 25:9). B.C. ante 2026.

**2.** Last named but one of the six sons of Simeon (Genesis 46, 10; <sup><1305></sup>Exodus 6:15); elsewhere (<sup><1304></sup>1 Chronicles 4:24) called ZERAIT *SEE ZERAIT* (q.v.).

**3.** A marginal reading in <sup><1307></sup>1 Chronicles 4:7 for JEZOAR (Heb. rather *Yitschar'*, **רַחֵק** *xy*, which [as usual] takes the pointing of the Keri **רַחֵק** *and 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.

### Zo'heleth

(Heb. with the *art.* *haz-Zocheleth* **תִּלְיָזִי** a fem. participial form; Sept. **Ζωελέθ** v.r. **Ζωελεθί**; Vulg. *Zoheleth*), the name of a stone (**בָּא**) which was “by” (**לְ** *beside*) Enrogel, and “by” (**מִ** *along with*) which Adonijah offered his coronation sacrifices (<sup><1309></sup>1 Kings 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 **l j z**, “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” (**hl yj zm**, *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.” If 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 (<sup><0122></sup>Genesis 28:22; 35:14; see Bochart, *Canaan*, p. 785, 786); and he did it again when parting from Laban (Gen. 31:45). Joshua set up stones in Jordan and Gilgal, at the command of God (<sup><0101></sup>Joshua 4:9-20), and again in Shechem (<sup><0125></sup>Joshua 24:26). Near Bethshemesh there was the *Eben-gedolh* (“great stone,” <sup><0164></sup>1 Samuel 6:14), called also *Abel-gedolah* (“the great weeping,” ver. 18). There was the *Eben-Bohdn*, south of Jericho, in the plains of Jordan (<sup><0115></sup>Joshua 15:6; 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” (<sup><0111></sup>1 Samuel 7:11, 12). There was the *Great Stone* on which Samuel slew the sacrifices, after the great battle of Saul with the Philistines (<sup><0143></sup>1 Samuel 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 Zohemoth. 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 Idololatr.* 6:38; Scaliger, *On Eusebius*, p. 198; Heraldus, *On Arnobius*, bk. 7; and Elmenhorstius, *On Arnobius*; 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 Silwan. (*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.**

### Zo'heth

(Heb. Zocheth', תְּצֵה, sag [Fürst]; Sept. Ζωχάθ v.r. Ζωάβ; Vulg. *Zoheth*), first named of the two "sons, of Ishi" of the tribe of Judah (<sup><100></sup>1 Chronicles 4:20), the other being called Ben-zoheth (q.v.). B.C. post 1618.

### 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):— *Andachtsübungen u. Gentet*, etc. (New ed. 1804, 4 pts.). He also prepared a hymn book, *Sammlung geistl. Lieder u. Gesänge* (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* (Ernest’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 Encyclop.* s.v.

## Zo’phah

(Heb. *Tsophach*’, **j p/x** [in pause. **j p/x**], a cruse [Gesen.]; Sept. **Ζωφά** v.r. **Ζωφάρ** and **Ζωχάρθ**; *Vulg. Supha*), an Asherite, first named of the four sons Hof Heiam or Hotham (<sup><1375></sup>1 Chronicles 7:35 comp; ver. 32), and fathers of many sons (ver. 36). B.C. cir. 1618.

## Zo’phai

(Heb; *Tsophay*’, **yp/x** ‘, patronymic; from *Zuph* [Fürst]; Sept. **Ζουφί**; *Vulg. Sophat*), a Kohathite Levite, son of Elkanah and father of Nahath (<sup><1365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:26 [Heb. 11]); elsewhere (ver. 35) called simply ZUPH *SEE ZUPH* (q.v.).

## Zophar

(Heb. *Tsohar* צִפְרָח, *sparrow*, [Gesén.] or *shaggy* [Fuirst]; Sept. Ζωφρα; Vulg. *Sophar*), the last named of Job's three friends and opponents in argument (<sup><K211></sup>Job 2:11; 11:1; 20:1; 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 <sup><R154></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><K115></sup>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.**

## Zo'phim

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

**1.** (Sept σκοπιών; Vlg. *sublimis*.) The designation of a field (hdc) or spot on or near the top of Pisgah, from which Balaam, had his second view of the encampment of Israel (Numbers '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 field of Zophim 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 name, 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 Terre 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 (1 Samuel 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 signify not an Ephraimite by birth, but by abode. We find that the Kohathites, to whom Samuel belonged, had their lot in Mount Ephraim (<sup>OLD</sup> Joshua 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 Ephraim, 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 Ἀρμαθαῖμ Σωφίμ, Cod. A, or Cod. B, Ἀρμαθῖμ 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" (Ruth 1:2). *SEE RAMATHAIM; SEE ZUPH*.

## Zorah

(Heb. *Tsorah*', ḥ[ṣ]; *hornet*; Sept. Σαραά v.r. Σοράθ, Σαράλ, Σαρά, etc.; Josephus, Σαρασά, *Ant.* 5, 8, 12; Vulg. *Saraa*; A. V. "Zareah," Nehemiah 11:29; "Zoreah," Joshua 15:33), one of the towns near the border of the tribe of Dan (Joshua 19:41), but really within the limits of Judah, being in the north-western corner of the "valley district" (Joshua 15:33). It is almost always mentioned in connection with Eshtaol (see also Judges 13:25; 16:31; 18:2, 8, 11; and comp. 1 Chronicles 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" (Judges 13:25; 11:31). In the genealogical records of 1 Chronicles (1 Chronicles 2:53; 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 (2 Chronicles 11:10) and it was re-inhabited by the men of Judah after the return from the Captivity (Nehemiah 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.18-183). 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.

### Zo'rathite

(Heb. *Tsorathi'*, *ytærk*; patronymic from *Zorah*; Sept. *Σαραθί* v.r. *Ἀραθί*; Vulg. *Sorathi*; A.V. “Zorathites”), a designation of the inhabitants of *Zorah* (q.v.), mentioned in <sup><134E></sup>1 Chronicles 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*.

### Zo'reah

(<sup><165B></sup>Joshua 15:33). *SEE ZORAH*.

### Zo'rite

(Heb. *Tsori'*, *y[ærk*; a patronymic; Sept. *Σαραί* v.r. *Ἡσαρί*; Vulg. *Sarai*; A.V. “Zorites”), the designation apparently of the inhabitants of *Zorah* (q.v.), mentioned in <sup><105A></sup>1 Chronicles 2:54 as descended from *Salma* the

brother of Shobal, and hence classed with the descendants of the latter the “Zareathites and the Eshtaulites” (ver. 53).

## Zosimus

pope in A.D. 417-418, 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 Zosimus 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 the Africans obtained a *sacrum rescriptum* against the Pelagians from the emperor Hoorius, he gave way, and, for his part 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 Numidia and 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.

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 *of, The Crucifixion* (Canterbury, 1765), a Seaton prize poem: — *An inquiry into the Prophetic Character of the Romans as Described in* <sup><2083></sup>*Daniel 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.

## Zu'ar

(Heb. *Tsuar'*, ר [זא], *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 (<sup><0408></sup>Numbers 1:8; 2:5; 7:18, 23; 10:15). B.C. ante 1658.

## 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.)

## Zuph

(Heb. *Tsoph*, אֲזוּפָה, *honey-comb* [Gesén.] or *moist* [Fürst]; Sept. Σούφ v.r. Σώφ and Σούπ; but in <sup><0005></sup>1 Samuel 9:5 Σίφ, apparently reading אֲזוּפָה [xæ *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 (<sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1; <sup><0365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:35 [Heb. 20]). B.C. cir. 1310. In the parallel passage (<sup><0365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:26) he is called ZOPHAI.

**2.** A district (רָא, *land*) at which Saul and his servant arrived after passing through those of Shalisha, of Shalim, and of the Benjamites (<sup><0005></sup>1 Samuel 9:5). It evidently contained the city in which they encountered Samuel (ver. 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 (<sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 1:1; <sup><0365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:35) or Zophai (ver. 26), and his native place was called Ramathaim-zophim (<sup><0001></sup>1 Samuel 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 <sup><0906></sup>1 Samuel 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 *hpx*; *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 Ephraim to the vicinity of Bethlehem. *SEE RAMAH.*

## Zur

(Heb. *Tsur*, *רצ*, a rock, being substantially the same as the Heb. name of Tyre [q.v.]; Sept. *Σούρ* v.r. *Ἰσοούρ*; 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 (<sup><0608></sup>Numbers 31:8). B.C. 1618. His daughter Cozbi was killed by Phinehas, together with: her paramour Zimri, the Simeonitish chieftain (<sup><0255></sup>Numbers 25:15).. He appears to have been in some way subject to Sihon king of the Amorites (<sup><0632></sup>Joshua 13:21).
2. Second named of the eight sons of Jehiel (the founder of Gibeon) by his wife Maachah (<sup><3380></sup>1 Chronicles 8:30; 9:36). B.C. post 1612.

## Zu’riel

(Heb. *Tsuriel*’, *צור*, *my rock is God*; Sept. *Ζουριήλ*; Vulg. *Suriel*), the son of Abihail and chief of the Merarite Levites at the time of the Exode (<sup><0435></sup>Numbers 3:35). B.C. 1658.

## Zurishad’dai

(Heb. *Tsurishadday*’, *צור*, *my 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 (<sup><0406></sup>Numbers 1:6; 2:12; 7:36, 41; 10:19). B.C. ante 1658.

## Zu'zim

(Heb. Only in the plur and with the art. *haz-Zuzim'*, *μυζζη*; 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 (<sup>-0146</sup>Genesis 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 *μυζζ[ ]*) 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 *zWz*) 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, *μh* is *μ[ ]* 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

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 Thurgovia, 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.

## 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 Einsiedeln. 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 crisis 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 mounted 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 upturned 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 was 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. A Ecolampadius 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 the 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 AÆcolampadius; 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 its 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.

**THE END.**