

# The Meaning of *Ṣantērôt* (Zech 4:12)



## THE MEANING OF *ṢANTĒRÔT* (ZECH 4:12)

AL WOLTERS  
REDEEMER UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,  
ANCASTER, ONTARIO, CANADA

Zechariah 4 describes the fifth of the eight night visions of Zechariah. What the prophet sees is a menorah which is flanked on either side by an olive tree. Verse 12 of the chapter seems to describe a kind of double-take on the part of the prophet, calling attention—in the form of a question addressed to the angelic commentator of the night visions—to a feature of the fifth vision that had not been part of the preceding description. The question reads as follows in the MT and NRSV:

מה־שְׁתֵּי שִׁבְלֵי הַזַּיִתִּים אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד שְׁנֵי צְנִתְרוֹת הַזָּהָב הַמְרִיקִים  
מֵעֲלֵיהֶם הַזָּהָב

“What are these two branches of the olive trees, which pour out the oil through the two golden pipes?”

The branches in question are subsequently identified by the angel as “the two anointed ones (literally, “the two sons of oil”) who stand by the Lord of the whole earth” (verse 14).

This verse and its immediate context are bristling with exegetical difficulties. The vision of the menorah is itself interrupted by an oracle addressed to Zerubbabel (widely declared since Wellhausen to be a later interpolation), which interprets the vision as a divine message to this Davidide governor of the Jewish returnees. Verse 12 seems like an interruption as well, since it asks a question about something not previously mentioned in the text, and it is therefore almost universally declared by the diachronically-minded to be secondary as well. To make matters worse, the Hebrew of the verse in question is considered so desperately difficult that at least one interpreter has declared that it was made deliberately obscure, to prevent the reader from understanding the vision’s religiously subversive message.<sup>1</sup> One difficulty in verse 12 is that the two “branches” which catch the prophet’s eye are actually not branches at all in the Hebrew, but *šibbālîm*, a word which in all other con-

---

<sup>1</sup> D.L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 215 (note e), 236–237.

texts in the Hebrew Bible designates either “spikes” (of grain) or “streams.”<sup>2</sup> Most interpreters take the word here to be “spikes” as a metaphorical designation of the olive-laden branch-ends of an olive tree, although the context also allows a reference to the “streams” of oil which fuel the lamps of the menorah.<sup>3</sup> Another problem in this verse is that what is said to be poured out is actually not oil at all in the MT, but gold (Hebrew *zāhāb*)—a problem which the NRSV solves by simply replacing the offending word with a word for oil. A third difficulty (to mention no more) is the meaning of *ṣantērôt*, an enigmatic *hapax legomenon* without any known cognates.<sup>4</sup> It is this difficulty which will be the subject of the present essay.

To begin with, it will be useful to take a look at the history of interpretation of this obscure word. In an Appendix I have drawn up a list of the thirty-odd proposed interpretations that are known to me, running from the LXX to the recent English translation of Koehler-Baumgartner’s lexicon. In each case I have tried to identify the first occurrence of a given interpretation; I have not listed other scholars or versions that may have subsequently adopted it. It will be observed that a good number of the proposed translations are themselves debated as to their meaning, notably the Targum. In my judgment the other three main ancient versions (LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate) are all to be understood as referring metaphorically to lamp spouts (that is, “wick-niches”)—but that too is debated. The ancient renderings do not allow us to conclude that they are based on a *Vorlage* different from the MT.

---

<sup>2</sup> See *HAL* s.v.

<sup>3</sup> That both meanings of *šibbolet* are in play is suggested by M.G. Kline, *Glory in our Midst. A Biblical-Theological Reading of Zechariah’s Night Visions* (Overland Park, Kans.: Two Age Press, 2001), 163. The meaning “spikes” (metaphorically for branches) is favored by BDB and *HAL* s.v. (*Olivenbaumäbren*), JB, NIV, NRSV, and many others. The meaning “streams” is favored by J. Calvin, *A Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets. Vol. 5: Zechariah and Malachi* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1986), 122, Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8*, 215, 235, R.B. Chisholm Jr., *Handbook on the Prophets* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 462, M. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah* (NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 272, and A.R. Petterson, *Behold Your King: The Hope for the House of David in the Book of Zechariah* (New York/London: T & T Clark International, 2009), 77.

<sup>4</sup> The single exception is the Aramaic cognate *ṣntryn* found in some manuscripts of the medieval Targum Sheni to Esther (1:2), but this is clearly based on *ṣantērôt* in Zech 4:12, and thus has no independent value. See B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Sheni to the Book of Esther. A critical edition based on MS. Sassoon 282 with critical apparatus* (New York: Sepher-Hermon Press, 1994), 29. Note that Grossfeld emends *ṣntryn* to *ṣnwryyn*, “hooks” (p. 159).

One option I have not listed is that chosen by Wellhausen in 1892,<sup>5</sup> and Tigchelaar in 1996.<sup>6</sup> It is the option of *docta ignorantia*, the admission that we simply do not know what the word means, and therefore cannot translate it. This was essentially already the position of Luther, who wrote the following about his own rendering of *ṣantĕrŏt* as *schneutzen* or “snuffers”:

What the two snuffers are, however, and what form they took, I really do not know, and I am open to anyone’s advice on the matter. It is beyond my competence, nor do I find anyone who can give us certainty. I have translated it into German as follows: “the two snuffers, with which one trims [the lamps]”—but only to avoid leaving a gap in the text. And I have taken as my model Moses’ lampstand in Exodus [25:]38, which also had snuffers.<sup>7</sup>

The list of suggested interpretations shows the wide range of divergent exegetical proposals, but it obscures the fact that one of them has dominated all others in modern Hebrew lexicography, namely that *ṣantĕrŏt* means “pipes,” “conduits,” “tubes,” or the like. This is the interpretation that is found in almost all contemporary Bible versions, commentaries and lexica.<sup>8</sup> Many Hebrew refer-

<sup>5</sup> J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (4. unveränderte Auflage; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963 [orig. 1892]), 42, 182–83.

<sup>6</sup> E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End. Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic* (OTS, 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 41.

<sup>7</sup> D. Martin Luthers Werke: kritische Gesamtausgabe (120 vols.; Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–2009) 23.565: “Was aber die zwei gülden schneutzen sind und wie sie sind gestalt gewest, weis ich warlich nicht und lasse hie raten, wer da kan. Es ist uber meine kunst, finde auch niemand, der uns darynn gewis mache. Ich habs verdeuscht also: ‘zwo schneutzen, damit man abbricht’, alleine das ich nicht ein fenster muste ym text lassen und habe dem leuchter Mose nach geomet Exo. 38., der auch schneutzen hatte.” For the meaning of *schneutzen* and *abbrichen* in this passage, see the “Wörterklärungen zur Lutherbibel von 1545,” in H. Volz (ed.), *D. Martin Luther, Die gantze Heilige Schrift Deudsch 1545 / Auffz new zugericht. Anhang und Dokumente* (Munich: Rogner & Bernhard, 1972), 299\*–397\*. The English translation of this passage in H.C. Oswald (ed.), *Luther’s Works. Vol. 20: Lectures on the Minor Prophets III. Zechariah* (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1973), 230, is unreliable.

<sup>8</sup> So for example NAB (“channels”), TEV (“pipes”), NIV (“pipes”), NJPS (“tubes”), the New Living Translation (“tubes”); W. Rudolph, *Haggai—Sacharja 1–8—Sacharja 9–14—Maleachi* (KAT; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976), 103 (“Röhren”), C.L. Meyers and E.M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8* (AB, 25B; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 257 (“conduits”), R. Hanhart, *Sacharja* (BKAT, XIV/7; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990–1998), 253 (“Röhren”), I. Willi-Plein, *Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi* (ZBK, 24.4; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2007), 91 (“Goldröhren”); BDB (“pipes”), *HAL* s.v. (“Röhren”), and L. Alonso

ence works do not even acknowledge that other meanings have been suggested.<sup>9</sup> In the Hebrew spoken in Israel today it has acquired the technical meaning “catheter,” clearly based on this lexicographical consensus.<sup>10</sup> An apparent exception to the consensus is found in the English translation of Koehler-Baumgartner’s lexicon (no. 30 in the Appendix), but this exception turns out to be based on a mistranslation of the German original, which actually continues to give the meaning as *Röhren*, “pipes.”

Widespread though it may be, this interpretation of *ṣantērôt* is far from assured, because it appears to go back to a sixteenth-century guess, and is based on a highly dubious etymological connection with the word *ṣinnôr*, also understood to mean “pipe.” As far as I have been able to discover, the earliest example of the “pipe” interpretation is found in the Hebrew-Aramaic *Vocabularium* by Alfonso de Zamora that was included in the Complutensian Polyglot (no. 11 in the Appendix). It is there found under the entry for *ṣinnôr*, and both words are given the meaning *canalis*.<sup>11</sup> This unprecedented semantic guess, as well as the assumed connection with *ṣinnôr*, have been repeated in dictionaries ever since.

Yet it is a hypothesis built on sand. For one thing, the meaning of *ṣinnôr* (which occurs only twice in the MT) is itself almost as debated as that of *ṣantērôt*.<sup>12</sup> For another, the suggested etymological connection between the two words assumes that *ṣantērôt* contains an infix *tan* after the second radical of the assumed triliteral root—something that otherwise never happens in Hebrew.<sup>13</sup> As Friedrich Delitzsch put it in 1886, *ṣantērôt* construed as a derivative of a root צנר constitutes a “monstrous nominal form.”<sup>14</sup> In short, the traditional appeal to *ṣinnôr* to justify translating *ṣantērôt* as “pipes” has very little to commend it.

Schökel, *Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español* (Madrid: Editorial Trotta, 1994) s.v. (“tubos”).

<sup>9</sup> So for example BDB, *HAL*, and Alonso Schökel, *Diccionario*.

<sup>10</sup> See R. Alcalay, *The Complete Hebrew-English Dictionary* (4 vols.; Tel-Aviv: Massadah, 1963) s.v.

<sup>11</sup> See *Vocabularium hebraicum atque chaldaicum totius veteris testamenti* in Volume 6 of *Biblia polyglotta complutensia* (1514–1517; repr., Rome: Typographia Polyglotta Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana, 1983–1984) s.v. (folio cxxxvii, recto).

<sup>12</sup> See *HAL* s.v. and T. Kleven, “The Use of *ṢNR* in Ugaritic and 2 Samuel V 8: Hebrew Usage and Comparative Philology,” *VT* 44 (1994), 195–204. Some of the proposed meanings of *ṣinnôr* surveyed by Kleven are “throat,” “penis,” “joint,” and “hook.”

<sup>13</sup> See Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 26, note 42. The infix letters which are occasionally found in Hebrew do not include *tan*; see GKC §85n. An infix *tan* does occur in Akkadian nouns, but never after the second radical; see *GAG* §56n.

<sup>14</sup> F. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuchs zum Alten Testament* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886), 115, note 1 (“monströse Nominalform”).

My own alternative proposal is based on two assumptions. The first is that the phrase *bēyad*, which comes immediately before *ṣantērōt*, should be taken in its usual sense, and therefore most likely introduces personal agents. The second is that *ṣantērōt* has to do with the processing of olives to produce oil. Once these two points are admitted, I would submit that the suggestion that *ṣantērōt* means “oil-pressers” is a plausible one. Let me elaborate briefly on each of these two assumptions.

Although *bēyad* is a common Hebrew phrase, meaning literally “in the hand of,” and then generally “by” or “through,” it has been given some strained alternative interpretation in this verse, presumably because of the difficulty of the immediately following noun *ṣantērōt*. The most common of these interpretations of *bēyad* is that it means “beside,” a view which is first found in Jerome’s Vulgate (*inxta*),<sup>15</sup> and which has been adopted by a host of subsequent interpreters, from Rashi to contemporary lexica.<sup>16</sup> However, it has often been pointed out that it is difficult to find *bēyad* used in this sense elsewhere,<sup>17</sup> and Jerome himself abandoned the Vulgate rendering in his commentary on Zechariah, substituting *super* for *inxta*.<sup>18</sup> Ironically, the opinion that *bēyad* must here mean “beside” is so entrenched that Kahana suggested emending it to *bēṣad*, which does have the required meaning.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Here Jerome was perhaps influenced by Symmachus’ more literal rendering *ἀνὰ χεῖρα*, “close by”; see J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae* (Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum, XIII; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943), 299.

<sup>16</sup> For Rashi, see A.J. Rosenberg, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets. A New English Translation of the Text, Rashi and a Commentary Digest* (2 vols.; New York: The Judaica Press, 1988), 336. Similarly BDB s.v. *בַּיַד*, 5d, Alonso Schökel, *Diccionario s.v. yād*, 1b., E. Jenni, *Die hebräischen Präpositionen. Band I: Die Präposition Beth* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992), 224. Among recent English Bible versions the NEB, NIV, and TEV have “beside.”

<sup>17</sup> See E.W. Hengstenberg, *Christology of the Old Testament and a Commentary on Messianic Predictions* (1847; repr., Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1970), 283, note 2, E.B. Pusey, *The Minor Prophets with a Commentary Explanatory and Practical and Introductions to the Several Books* (2 vols.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1885), 2.363, note 11, E. Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch übersetzt und erklärt* (Zweite und dritte umgearbeitete Auflage; 2 vols.; Leipzig: Scholl, 1929–1930), 510, O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. Eine neue Deutung der Majestätsschilderungen in Jes 6, Ez 1 und 10 und Sach 4* (SBS, 84/85; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977), 309, D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (OBO, 50/3; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 955.

<sup>18</sup> See *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera. Pars I: Opera Exegetica 6: Commentarii in Prophetas Minores* (CCSL; Turnholt: Brepols, 1970), 783 (line 225), 784 (line 243).

<sup>19</sup> A. Kahana, “Haggai, Zechariah” in *The Book of the Twelve* (Tel Aviv:

Another common interpretation is that *bēyad* means “through,” which is indeed a well-attested meaning of the phrase, but which here runs into a grammatical difficulty. Interpreters who adopt the meaning “through” generally construe the participle *hammēriqîm* (with the article) as the predicate of the clause, yielding a translation like that of the NRSV: “which pour out the oil *through* the two golden pipes.”<sup>20</sup> The problem with this construal is that the article is incompatible with such a predicate use of the participle.<sup>21</sup> The many commentators and translators who read the clause in this way appear to have overlooked this grammatical difficulty.<sup>22</sup> We can save this construal only by deleting the offending article, as is done by Sellin and Rudolph.<sup>23</sup> Other attempts to make sense of *bēyad* here are those of the NKJV, which translates “into the receptacles of,” and Keel, who takes it to mean “in the power of.”<sup>24</sup> However,

Mekorot, 1930), 150 [Hebrew].

<sup>20</sup> Another construal is that of W.H. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel. Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period* (JSOTSup, 304; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 184, who translates: “What are the two tops of the olive trees which [are] through the golden pipes which empty the gold from them.” This is grammatically possible, but evokes the improbable image of pipes emptying golden oil from treetops that are inserted lengthwise inside them.

<sup>21</sup> On the absence of the article with participles used predicatively, see C.L. Seow, *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1987), 49: “When the participle is used as a predicative adjective, it comes after the noun and agrees with the noun in gender and number, but it never takes the definite article.” Cf. GKC §116*q*, B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, Ind., 1990), §37.5b, P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (2 vols.; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), §137*l*, and B.T. Arnold and J.H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 79.

<sup>22</sup> Some recent examples are Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8*, 215, 236, Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8* (AB, 25B; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 228, 257, T. Pola, *Das Priestertum bei Sacharja* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 63, and Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 272. In English versions this construal goes back to the Geneva Bible, and is found also in the KJV, RSV, JB, NAB, NJPSV, and the New Living Translation. Among the few commentaries to point out the grammatical difficulty is that of the Cambridge Hebraist W.H. Lowe, *The Hebrew Student’s Commentary on Zechariah* (London: MacMillan and Co., 1892), 47.

<sup>23</sup> See Sellin, *Zwölfprophetenbuch*, 510 and Rudolph, *Haggai...Maleachi*, 104. The difficulty was also felt by P. Haupt, who proposed reading the article as the interrogative particle instead, and then deleting the first letter of מעליהם; see his “The Visions of Zechariah,” *JBL* 32 (1913), 107–122, here 117 n. 43. A further unnoticed difficulty of the NRSV construal is that in strict grammar one would expect the participle to have the feminine form מריקות, to agree with the feminine noun שבלים, “spikes.”

<sup>24</sup> Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen*, 309. He is followed by Barthélemy, *Critique*

all of these more or less far-fetched interpretations are unnecessary if we understand the following noun *ṣantĕrōt* to refer, not to physical objects, but to personal agents. As Pusey pointed out long ago in his comments on this passage, *bĕyad* in the Hebrew Bible is almost always used of personal agents. He calculated that, out of the 277 places where the phrase occurs, only three are an exception to this general rule.<sup>25</sup> The text here is therefore most naturally translated “in the hands of the two *ṣantĕrōt*,” with the suggestion that the latter are personal beings. Note that the phrase *bĕyad* was already translated this way in the LXX (ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ), and that an interpretation of the *ṣantĕrōt* as personal beings has been previously proposed by Zer-Kavod.<sup>26</sup>

The second assumption undergirding my proposal is that the two *ṣantĕrōt* have to do with the processing of olives so produce oil. This is a reasonable assumption given the context of the fifth vision. It is clear that the two olive trees are related to the menorah as the suppliers of olive oil to its lamps, but there is no mention of how the olive oil is produced. We can of course imagine that the transfer of oil from the trees to the lamps occurs of its own accord, without any personal agency by which oil is extracted from olives, but that is not the most plausible scenario. It is telling that three of the four medieval Jewish interpretations of *ṣantĕrōt* (nos. 7, 8 and 19 in the Appendix), followed by the early modern exegetes Oecolampadius and Coccejus (nos. 12 and 17), assumed that it had to do with the equipment that was normally used to press out olive oil.

Our proposal is therefore as follows. If the *ṣantĕrōt* were personal beings, and if they were involved in the production of olive oil, then they are most likely “oil-pressers,” especially since the presumably olive-bearing spikes of the olive trees are “in the hands” of these individuals.<sup>27</sup>

Admittedly, at this stage of our argument this proposal can be no more than a reasonable conjecture. However, if we adopt it as a

*textuelle* 3, 955 and J. Voss, *Die Menorah. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem* (OBO, 128; Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 45.

<sup>25</sup> Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, 363–64. Pusey takes the three exceptions (Job 8:4; Prov 18:21; Isa 64:6) to refer to personifications. Oddly enough, he does not draw the conclusion that the *ṣantĕrōt* are therefore personal.

<sup>26</sup> M. Zer-Kavod, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1968), 83 [Hebrew]; cf. Appendix, no. 26. Similarly Haupt, “Visions,” 122, who inserts *šĕdīm*, “genii,” after *bĕyad šĕnĕ*. Note that the distributive singular of the Hebrew is appropriately translated “in the hands” (plural) in English, as it is in the LXX.

<sup>27</sup> The apparently feminine ending may seem to count against this conclusion, but we need to remember, given the numeral *šĕnĕ* which precedes it, that *ṣantĕrōt* is grammatically masculine, and that many masculine nouns have plurals in *-ōt* (for example *’ābōt*, “fathers,” and *paḥōt*, “governors”).



working hypothesis we discover that a number of other features of this enigmatic text fall into place. I have in mind in particular three illuminating effects which this hypothesis produces: (1) the first *zāhāb*, “gold,” now functions as an objective genitive, (2) the clause after *ṣantērôt* now functions as an explanatory gloss defining its meaning, and (3) this verse now turns out to contain an intertextual echo of the cupbearer’s dream in Genesis 40. Let me say a few words about each.

It has been universally assumed by exegetes that the *zāhāb* of the construct chain *ṣantērôt hazzāhāb* refers to the material from which the *ṣantērôt* are made, typically yielding the translation “the two *golden* pipes,” as in the NRSV. Yet its second occurrence in this verse (at least in the unemended MT) seems to use *zāhāb* as a bold metaphor for oil; what is poured forth from the olive branches is said to be *gold*. However, this would mean that the same word *zāhāb* is being used in two quite different senses in the same verse, first referring literally to a precious metal, and then metaphorically as an agricultural product.<sup>28</sup> This apparent incongruity has led many scholars, including the translators of the NRSV, to emend the second instance of *zāhāb* to a Hebrew word for “oil.”<sup>29</sup>

However, if *ṣantērôt* means “oil-pressers,” then *ṣantērôt hazzāhāb* means “pressers of ‘gold,’” with *zāhāb* functioning grammatically as an objective genitive, referring to the metaphorical “gold” which oil-pressers squeeze out of olives. In that case both occurrences of *zāhāb* in this verse are a metaphor for olive oil (just as we today speak of another kind of oil as “black gold”<sup>30</sup>), and there is no need for emendation.

Secondly, if *ṣantērôt* means “oil-pressers,” it turns out that the participial construction which follows it is an explanatory gloss telling us what it means. The Hebrew text is הַמְרִיקִים מֵעֲלֵיהֶם הַזֶּהָב (literally “the ones who empty out the ‘gold’ from on them” (i.e. from the olives on the spikes)).<sup>31</sup> For readers who might have difficulty understanding the phrase “the two *ṣantērôt* of gold,” with its

<sup>28</sup> See A.S. van der Woude, “Die beiden Söhne des Öls (Sach. 4:14): Messianische Gestalten?,” M.S.H.G. Heerma van Voss *et al.* (eds.), *Travels in the World of the Old Testament. Studies Presented to Professor M. A. Beek* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974), 262–268, here 266.

<sup>29</sup> Usually יצהר, sometimes שמן. See D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle* 3, 954. The proposal to read יצהר goes back at least to Archbishop Thomas Secker in the eighteenth century; see W. Newcome, *An Attempt Towards an Improved Version, A Metrical Arrangement, and An Explanation of the Twelve Minor Prophets* (2nd ed.; London: Pontefract, 1809), 286.

<sup>30</sup> See *Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary. Tenth Edition* (Markham, Ont.: Thomas Allen & Son, 1999), s.v. “black gold.”

<sup>31</sup> The pronominal suffix הֶם here functions as a third-person *common* pronoun (cf. GKC §135*o*) referring to the feminine noun שבלים (as it does in Gen 41:23). The same suffix refers to feminine nouns also in Zech 5:9 and 11:5.

objective genitive and its bold metaphor, the three following words (to be understood grammatically as standing in apposition to the phrase in question) make it unmistakably clear what the meaning is: the *ṣantĕrôt* are the ones who empty out the golden oil from (מִן) the olives on (עַל) the spikes.<sup>32</sup> The explanatory nature of these words becomes even clearer if we vocalize the participle as הַמְרִיקִים (*hammōriqîm*) rather than הַמְרִיקִים (*hammēriqîm*), thus understanding it as the Hiphil of יִרַק, “spit out,” not of רִיק, “be empty.”<sup>33</sup> In that case the mysterious workers are said to *express*—squeeze out—the golden oil (literally: cause it to be spit out<sup>34</sup>) from the olives. But even if we retain the vocalization of the MT, the meaning is essentially the same

For our third point, we need to visualize the action depicted in our verse if *ṣantĕrôt* does mean “oil-pressers.” We see two previously unnoticed workers, the *ṣantĕrôt*, each holding in his hand one of the olive-laden branch-ends of the olive trees, who “express the gold [i.e. the oil] from [the olives] on them.” This is certainly an unusual way of producing oil, but it has a striking parallel in the grape-pressing of the cupbearer’s dream in the Joseph story. The cupbearer describes his dream as follows:

<sup>9</sup> In my dream there was a vine before me, <sup>10</sup> and on the vine there were three branches. As soon as it budded, its blossoms came out and the clusters ripened into grapes.

<sup>11</sup> Pharaoh’s cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes and pressed them into Pharaoh’s cup, and placed the cup in Pharaoh’s hand (Gen 40:9–11, NRSV).

In both the vision of Zechariah 4 and the dream of Genesis 40 the berries (olives in the vision, grapes in the dream) are taken in hand as they grow on the branches, and are manually pressed on the spot to deliver the liquid product (oil in the vision, wine in the

---

<sup>32</sup> The force of the compound preposition in מֵעֵלֵיהֶם is not captured in most versions, which generally take it to mean simply “from” (so the NASB) or “out of” (so the KJV), or omit the phrase altogether (so the NRSV). On the usage of מֵעַל see GKC §119*b, d*, BDB s.v. עַל, IV,2, HAL s.v. עַל, 8.

<sup>33</sup> This vocalization is attested in the history of the text; Abravanel quotes the participle in the *plene* spelling הַמְרִיקִים. See *Nakb: Mikra’ot Gedolot “Orim Gedolim”* (8 vols.; Jerusalem: Even Israel Institute, 1993), 8.638 [Hebrew]. Tigchelaar has also suggested this vocalization (*Prophets of Old*, 41), but takes it to be a form of the other root יִרַק, “be green, yellow.” The fact that the Hiphil of this root in the sense “spit out” is not attested is probably mere coincidence.

<sup>34</sup> On this construction (a causative Hiphil with a single non-personal object), see Waltke-O’Connor, *Hebrew Syntax*, §27.3(c); cf. M. Ben-Asher, “Causative *Hiṣṣil* Verbs with Double Objects in Biblical Hebrew,” *HAR* 2 (1978), 11–19, esp. 15–16, and T.O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1971) 211 (§157a).

dream) directly to its intended recipient (menorah in the vision, cup in the dream), thus bypassing the laborious procedure by which the juice of these fruits was normally processed for human use. These remarkable parallels between the vision on Zechariah and the dream in Genesis come into focus only if *ṣantērôt* refers to the workers who press out the oil from the olives.

I take it that these three exegetical clarifications have the effect of further supporting my working hypothesis. In the light of this, it is significant that there may be previously unsuspected support for our proposed translation in a bit of evidence recorded in the Syro-Hexapla, the Syriac translation of the LXX done by Paul of Tella *circa* 617 CE. This literal Syriac translation often has marginal notes recording alternative renderings from the so-called Minor Greek versions (Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus). On Zech 4:12 there is a note to the effect that “Theodotion” has an alternative to the LXX rendering of *ṣantērôt*.<sup>35</sup> The note does not tell us what Theodotion’s Greek was, but gives its Syriac equivalent, namely *d’imt’*, that is, “of the thighs” (see no. 4 of the Appendix). This reading has been duly retroverted into Greek in the apparatus of Ziegler’s Göttingen edition of the Minor Prophets as *μηρῶν*.<sup>36</sup> However, it makes little sense in the context. What could it mean that the olive branches are in the hands of the two *thighs* of gold?

I would suggest that the *d’imt’* of the Syro-Hexapla can be plausibly interpreted in another way. The root *ʿim* may be a variant of the root *ʿm*, which is well-attested in Hebrew as referring to the pressing of olives.<sup>37</sup> It is possible that this root also exists in Syriac, since it occurs in at least one other branch of Aramaic.<sup>38</sup> In that case, the Syriac rendering of Theodotion’s interpretation of *ṣantērôt* might well mean “oil-pressers” (perhaps reflecting Greek *ἐλαιουργῶν*), and removes the difficulty of the anomalous “thighs.” If this interpretation of the Syro-Hexapla is correct, then we have

<sup>35</sup> See A.M. Ceriani, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photographice editus* (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1874), *ad locum* (folio 110, verso).

<sup>36</sup> Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, 299. The retroversion *μηρῶν* is found also in F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta. Tomus II: Jobus-Malachias, Auctarium et Indices* (1875; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1964), 1020.

<sup>37</sup> See HAL s.vv. **טע** and **טע**, and M. Moreshet, *A Lexicon of the New Verbs in Tannaitic Hebrew* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1980), 260 [Hebrew]. See also F. Goldmann, *Der Ölbau in Palästina zur Zeit der Mišnâh* (Pressburg: Adolf Alkalay & Sohn, 1907), 34, note 6: “In übertragenem Sinne steht **טע** auch für den ganzen Prozess des Pressens. T. Scheb. 4,19 (67) (parallel zu **דדד** von Trauben).” See also E.A. Knauf, “Zum Text von Hi 21, 23–26,” *BN* 7 (1978), 22–24, who argues that the **טע** of Job 21:24 means “olive.”

<sup>38</sup> See the entry **טעמ**, “olive vat,” in M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1990).

explicit support from one of the ancient versions for the meaning I am proposing.

I turn now to a final proposal. Since it can be made plausible on other grounds that *ṣantĕrōt* means “oil-pressers,” it is significant that the Hiphil of the verb *ṣāhar* is generally understood to mean “to press out oil,” a denominative verb from the noun *yīṣhār*, “fresh oil.”<sup>39</sup> It is widely agreed that this use of the verb is found in Job 24:11, where it stands in parallelism to the verb *dārak*, and where it also seems to refer, as here, to the pressing of olives “on the spot,” i.e. in the immediate proximity of the olive trees themselves. Given the analogy with agent nouns like *dārōkōt*, “wine-pressers” (a class of nouns which is well-attested in Mishnaic Hebrew<sup>40</sup>), it is an attractive hypothesis to suppose that the intractable *צַנְהוֹרוֹת* of our verse was originally *צַהוֹרוֹת*\* (*ṣāhōrōt*), which would have precisely the meaning we have been proposing, namely “oil-pressers.” This form would exemplify the Hebrew nominal pattern *qātōl*, which yields such agent nouns as *bāḥōn*, “assayer,” *ḥāmōš*, “oppressor,” and *‘āšōq*, “oppressor.”<sup>41</sup> Although the plural of these nouns is not attested elsewhere in the MT,<sup>42</sup> we know from post-biblical Hebrew that, though masculine, they regularly form their plural in *-ōt*.<sup>43</sup> Since *ṣantĕrōt* is also a masculine noun with a plural in *-ōt*, and since our argument above has established that it is likely an agent noun having to do with oil-pressing, which in Hebrew is very likely designated by the root *ṢHR*, it may well be that *ṣantĕrōt* is the corruption of an original \**ṣāhōrōt*. There may even be a trace of this postulated form in the transliteration of our word which Jerome gives, namely *sinthoroth* (note the second vowel).<sup>44</sup>

If this hypothesis is correct, then two further points follow. In the first place, *ṣantĕrōt* turns out to be a *vox nihili* or “ghost-word,”

<sup>39</sup> See BDB, *HAL* and Alonso Shökel, *Diccionario*, s.v.

<sup>40</sup> On *dārōkōt* and the nominal pattern it illustrates, see M.H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927), 106 (§235). Segal takes this form to be based on the nominal pattern *qātōl*.

<sup>41</sup> See GKC §84<sup>k</sup>. Since the initial vowel is not reduced in the plural, it may be based on Aramaic actant nouns of the pattern *qātōl*; see J. Fox, *Semitic Noun Patterns* (HSS, 52; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 184 and 242.

<sup>42</sup> Note that *yāqūš*, “fowler,” plural *yēqūšīm* (Jer 5:26), represents another nominal pattern; see GKC §84<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>43</sup> See Segal, *Mishnaic Hebrew*, 106 (§235) and 130–31 (§288), A. Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* (2 vols.; Tel Aviv: Devir, 1967), 2.445 [Hebrew], and A. Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (trans. J. Elwolde; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 187. The pattern is still common in Modern Hebrew; see L. Glinert, *The Grammar of Modern Hebrew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 454.

<sup>44</sup> Jerome, *In Prophetas Minores*, 784 (line 244).

a lexeme which never actually existed in the Hebrew language. It would be the result of reading the letters נה instead of הו.<sup>45</sup> Although this particular confusion has not been noticed elsewhere, we know that scribal mistakes of this sort are not uncommon in the history of the biblical text.<sup>46</sup> In the second place, the postulated form \**ṣāhōrōt* would now find an echo in verse 14, where we read that the two olive-bearing spikes in the hands of these \**ṣāhōrōt* are identified as “the two sons of *yīṣhār*.” The connection established by this repetition of the root צהר would embed verse 12 more firmly in its context, and further support the view that the “sons of oil” are not “anointed ones” which the spikes symbolize (so the NRSV), but are simply an idiomatic way of referring to the oil-rich spikes themselves.<sup>47</sup> What is in the hands of the oil-pressers is these physical branch-ends of the olive trees, not anointed persons.

There is much more that could be said about Zech 4:12, especially its intricate and largely unnoticed wordplay.<sup>48</sup> But enough has been said to make the case that *ṣantērōt*, whether or not it is a corruption of an earlier \**ṣāhōrōt*, means “oil-pressers.”<sup>49</sup> In the light of our entire preceding discussion, I would propose that the question in Zech 4:12 be translated as follows:

What are the two spikes of the olive trees, which are in the hands of the two pressers of ‘gold’—the ones who express the ‘gold’ from (the olives) on them?

---

<sup>45</sup> Or just ה if the original spelling was defective.

<sup>46</sup> See E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress/Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992), 249. The postulated confusion of *nun-taw* with *he-waw* would not be surprising, given the presence in each of these pairs (at least in the standard square script) of three vertical strokes. If the tops of the letters were missing or obscured, the one sequence of letters could be easily mistaken for the other.

<sup>47</sup> For the idiom with *bēn*, see BDB s.v., 8 and GKC §128*v*. Compare Isa 5:1, where קרן בן-שמן is rendered “a very fertile hill” in the NRSV. That the “sons of oil,” in the context of the vision of the menorah and olive trees, refer to the “spikes” or branch-ends of the latter, is pointed out by R.H. Kennett, “Zechariah,” in A.S. Peake (ed.), *A Commentary on the Bible* (London: T. C. and E.C. Jack, 1929), 575–87, here 577. Note that already the Geneva Bible of 1560 translated בני היצהר here simply as “olive branches.” However, the words which follow (“who stand by the Lord of the whole earth”) suggest that “sons of oil” has a secondary level of meaning as well.

<sup>48</sup> See A. Wolters, “Word Play in Zechariah,” S.B. Noegel (ed.), *Puns and Pundits. Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature* (Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2000), 223–30, here 227–30.

<sup>49</sup> Note that the argument for the meaning “oil-pressers” stands on its own merits; it is independent of this proposed emendation. In fact, in my own research the semantic conclusion preceded the text-critical conjecture.

## APPENDIX

PREVIOUSLY PROPOSED INTERPRETATIONS OF ŠANTĒRŌT  
(ZECH 4:12)

1. LXX: *μξωτῆρες*,<sup>50</sup> “nostrils,” i.e. “lamp spouts.”<sup>51</sup>
2. Peshitta: *נחירין*,<sup>52</sup> “noses,” i.e. “lamp spouts.”<sup>53</sup>
3. Targum: *אסקריטון*,<sup>54</sup> “pourers?”<sup>55</sup> “lamp-nozzles?”<sup>56</sup> “bowls”<sup>57</sup>
4. Theodotion *teste* Syro-Hcxapla: *ῥmt*,<sup>58</sup> “thighs.”
5. Symmachus: *ἐπιχυτῆρες*,<sup>59</sup> “beakers.”
6. Jerome [ca. 400]: *rostra*,<sup>60</sup> “snouts,” i.e. “lamp spouts.”<sup>61</sup>
7. Rashi [11th c.]: *של בית הבד במין עריבות ועדשים*,<sup>62</sup> “like the vats and troughs of the oil-press.”

<sup>50</sup> Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, 299 (*μξωτῆρων*).

<sup>51</sup> See PGL s.v. *μξωτῆρ*; cf. LSJ s.vv. *μσπτήρ* (“metaph., of a lamp-nozzle”), *μύξα* (“lamp-wick”), *διμύξος* (“with two wicks”).

<sup>52</sup> A. Gelston and T. Sprey (eds.), *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version. Part III,4: Dodekapropheton—Daniel-Bel-Draco* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 78.

<sup>53</sup> See J. Payne Smith, *Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903) s.v. *nhūrā* (“nozzle of a lamp”).

<sup>54</sup> A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. III: The Latter Prophets According to Targum Jonathan* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 483. Notice that the words *דביד תרין אסקריטון דדהב* are not printed in Sperber’s text, but are listed in his second critical apparatus as a variant found in some manuscripts of the Targum. His third apparatus also records the variant reading *אסקרירון*.

<sup>55</sup> So S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* (2 vols.; 1898–1899; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1964), 2.97, reading *אסקרירטוב*, and taking this as the equivalent of Greek *χυτῆρων*.

<sup>56</sup> So M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (1943; repr., New York: Judaica Press, 1996) s.v. *אסקרירטון*, taking this to be a corruption of *מקסוטירין* = *μξωτῆρες*.

<sup>57</sup> So R.P. Gordon in K.J. Cathcart and R.P. Gordon (eds.), *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (ArBib, 14; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1989), 195, assuming that the Aramaic word in question reflects the Greek *ἑσχαρίς*, “brazier,” “fire-pan.”

<sup>58</sup> Ceriani, *Codex Syro-Hexaplaris, ad locum* (folio 110, verso).

<sup>59</sup> Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 1020; Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, 299.

<sup>60</sup> R. Weber (ed.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (2 vols.; Editio altera emendata; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1975), *ad locum*.

<sup>61</sup> P.G.W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) s.v. *rostrum*, 2a (“applied to the nozzle of a lamp”).

<sup>62</sup> I. Maarsen (ed.), *Parsbandatha. The Commentary of Raschi on the Prophets and Hagiographs. Part I: The Minor Prophets* (Amsterdam: Hertzberger, 1930), *ad locum*. See also Rosenberg, *Twelve Prophets*, 333.

8. Ibn Ezra [12th c.]: צנתרות שנדרכו בהם זיתים,<sup>63</sup> “*ṣantērôt* in which olives are pressed.”
9. David Kimchi [13th c.]: כלים כמין צפחת,<sup>64</sup> “vessels like a jar.”
10. Abravanel [15th c.]: הכלים שהשמן נעשה בהם,<sup>65</sup> “the vessels in which oil is made.”
11. de Zamora [1517]: *canalis*,<sup>66</sup> “pipe.”
12. Oecolampadius [1527]: *rostra* = *torcularcula*,<sup>67</sup> “little (olive) presses.”
13. Luther [1532]: *Schnentzen*,<sup>68</sup> “(lamp) snuffers,” i.e. “trimmers.”
14. Ribera [1571]: *unci*,<sup>69</sup> “hooks.”
15. Montanus [1571]: *canthari*,<sup>70</sup> “tankards.”
16. à Castro [1650]: *fistulae aduncae*,<sup>71</sup> “curved pipes.”
17. Coccejus [1667]: *instrumenta comprimentia oleas & oleum exprimentia*,<sup>72</sup> “tools which squeeze olives and express oil.”

<sup>63</sup> Rosenberg, *Twelve Prophets*, 336. Cf. T. Muraoka and Z. Shavitsky, “Abraham Ibn Ezra’s Biblical Hebrew Lexicon: The Minor Prophets II,” *Abr-Nahrain* 29 (1991), 106–28 (117).

<sup>64</sup> Rosenberg, *Twelve Prophets*, 336. Cf. A.M. M’Caul, *Rabbi David Kimchi’s Commentary upon the Prophecies of Zechariah* (London: James Duncan, 1837), 45 (“vessels of the cruse-species”).

<sup>65</sup> *Mikra’ot Gedolot*, 8.638.

<sup>66</sup> *Vocabularium hebraicum atque chaldaicum*, folio cxxxvii, recto.

<sup>67</sup> I. Oecolampadius, *In minores quos vocant prophetas* (Geneva: Typographia Crispiniana, 1558), 185 (“duorum aureorum torcularculorum, quae hic rostra nominantur”).

<sup>68</sup> Luther, *Die gantze Heilige Schrift Deudsch*, 1654. See also D. Martin *Luthers Werke: kritische Gesamtausgabe. Die Deutsche Bibel. 11. Band, Zweite Hälfte* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1960), 338–39.

<sup>69</sup> As reported by C. à Lapide, *Commentaria in duodecim prophetas minores* (Antwerp: Verdussen, 1720), 678D: “Ribera censet duo rostra fuisse duos uncas, ex quibus suspenderentur infusoria, id est, vasa quibus oleum infunderetur in lucernas” (“Ribera thinks that the two ‘beaks’ were two hooks, from which were hung the beakers, that is, the vessels by which oil was poured into the lamps”).

<sup>70</sup> As reported by à Lapide, *Commentaria*, 678B: “*santerot* quod Arias Latinâ voce Hebrææ affini vertit *cantharos*” (“*ṣantērôt*, which Arias [Montanus] translates *canthari*, a Latin word related to the Hebrew”).

<sup>71</sup> As reported by à Lapide, *Commentaria*, 678B: “à Castro & alij censent hæc rostra fuisse fistulas aduncas, in quas ex olivis supernè imminentibus distillaret oleum, ut per eas influeret in lampadem, & ex ea in lucernas, ad fovendum perenne earum lumen” (“à Castro and others think that these ‘beaks’ were curved pipes, into which the oil dripped down from the overhanging olives above, in order that it might flow through them into the bowl, and from the latter into the lamps, to fuel the perpetual light”).

<sup>72</sup> J. Coccejus, *Opera omnia theologica, exegetica, didactica, polemica, philologica. Tomus decimus: Lexicon et commentarius sermonis Hebraici et Chaldaici Veteris Testamenti* (Editio tertia; Amsterdam: Typographia Blaeu, 1706), 357.

18. Blayney [1797]: “spouts.”<sup>73</sup>
19. Rosenmüller [1828]: *epistomia*,<sup>74</sup> “spigots.”
20. Pressel [1870]: *Behälter*,<sup>75</sup> “containers.”
21. Lange [1876]: *Dornrinnen*,<sup>76</sup> “thorn-channels.”
22. Bredekamp [1849]: *Handhaben [Schnauzen] (des Oelkrugs)*,<sup>77</sup> “handles [spouts] (of the oil jug).”
23. von Orelli [1896]: *Trichter*,<sup>78</sup> “funnels.”
24. Rignell [1950]: *Nachfüllgefäße*,<sup>79</sup> “refilling vessels.”
25. Uffenheimer [1961]: cultic utensils.<sup>80</sup>
26. Zer-Kavod [1968]: כַּעֲיֵן כְּרוּבִים, דְּמוֹיוֹת,<sup>81</sup> “figures like cherubim.”
27. North [1969]: *trou*,<sup>82</sup> “hole.”
28. van der Woude [1974]: *Berge*,<sup>83</sup> “mountains.”
29. van der Woude [1984]: *onderdelen*,<sup>84</sup> “component parts.”
30. HALOT [2002]: “reeds” (*sic*, mistaking *Röhren*, “pipes,” for *Robre*).

---

<sup>73</sup> B. Blayney, *Zechariah; A New Translation, with Notes Critical, Philological, and Explanatory* (Oxford: Cooke, 1797), p. 6 (of the translation) and p. 20 (of the notes).

<sup>74</sup> E.F.C. Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum in compendium redacta. Post auctoris obitum edidit Jo. Chr. Sigism. Lechner. Volumen sextum, scholia in prophetas minores continens* (Leipzig: Barthius, 1836), 657.

<sup>75</sup> W. Pressel, *Commentar zu den Schriften der Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi* (Gotha: Schloessmann, 1870), 192, 197–98.

<sup>76</sup> J.P. Lange, *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja, Maleachi* (Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk; Bielefeld und Leipzig: Velhagen und Klasing, 1876), 45.

<sup>77</sup> C.J. Bredekamp, *Der Prophet Sacharja* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1879), 36–37.

<sup>78</sup> C. von Orelli, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den Heiligen Schriften; dritte neubearbeitete Auflage; Munich: Beck, 1908), 191. Cf. the English translation: *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (trans. J. S. Banks; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1897), 330.

<sup>79</sup> L.G. Rignell, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Eine exegetische Studie* (Lund: Gleerup, 1950), 169.

<sup>80</sup> B. Uffenheimer, *The Visions of Zechariah. From Prophecy to Apocalyptic* (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1961), 55 [Hebrew]; the text there reads: כַּעֲיֵן כְּרוּבִים, דְּמוֹיוֹת, יהיו אלה מולגות, מחתות או מלקחים, “auxiliary utensils like these, be they forks, censers or snuffers.”

<sup>81</sup> Zer-Kavod, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*, 83.

<sup>82</sup> R. North, *Exegèse pratique des petits prophètes postexiliens* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), 46.

<sup>83</sup> Van der Woude, “Söhne des Öls,” 267.

<sup>84</sup> A.S. van der Woude, *Zacharia* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1984), 94.