Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal — https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

Atonement Constructions in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls

by Paul Garnet

The importance of the Old Testament terminology, especially for its influence on New Testament usage, is well recognized. The parallel influence of the Old Testament terminology on usage at Qumran has considerable relevance for this area of biblical study, and it forms the subject of the following paper, prepared by Dr. Garnet at St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, while he was on sabbatical leave from his post at Loyola College, Montreal. The paper may be regarded as a sequel to his McGill University doctoral thesis on "Atonement Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls".

IN 1955 *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* by Leon Morris examined "certain key words . . . crucial to the New Testament picture of the atonement . . . against the background of the Greek Old Testament, the papyri and the Rabbinic writings."[1] The work contained an important section on the use of the verb *kipper* (A.V. "atone") in the Old Testament,[2] where he distinguished two uses of the verb: the cultic and the non-cultic. He looked first at the non-cultic passages since it was in this sphere that the word probably had its original home. Within this sphere Morris was impressed by the similarity in meaning between the verb *kipper* and the noun *kopher* (a ransom, or substitution payment). He concluded that the verb is the denominative of this noun, so that *kipper* means in effect "to avert punishment, especially the divine anger, by the payment of a *kopher*, a ransom".[3] He went on to argue that the idea of giving a *kopher* is present in the cultic usage also. Thus Morris sees the dominant idea of *kipper* as propitiation.

In 1959 Stanislas Lyonnet examined the Old Testament and Qumran usage of *kipper* in his article in Latin "De notione expiationis".[4] This material has since been made available to the non-Latinist in *Analecta Biblica*, 48.[5] This author, following the

---

1   Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (London: Tyndale Press, 1955), p. 8.
2   *Ibid.*, pp. 142-152.
3   *Ibid.*, pp. 147f.
4   *Verbum Domini*, 37 (1959), pp. 336-352.
5   S. Lyonnet and L. Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1950), pp. 127-136.

lexicographer F. Zorell, distinguished three uses of the verb *kipper*:
the profane ("to appease"), the non-liturgical religious ("to wipe
out sin"), the liturgical religious ("to perform the rite of expiation").
Whereas Morris had classed together the profane and the non-
liturgical religious under the general heading "non-cultic", Lyonnet
distinguished the two but focused all his attentions on the religious
usage of *kipper*, arriving at its essential meaning through a con-
sideration of the various constructions which are used with the verb.
He concluded that the verb cannot mean to propitiate since God is
never the direct object, though often the subject, whilst the sinner
or the sin to be forgiven sometimes appears as the object. The
basic meaning according to Lyonnet is forgiveness or expiation,
not propitiation. Atonement only placates God's anger in so far
as it removes its cause: the sin of man.[6]

Lyonnet examines the Qumran scrolls as well as the Old Test-
ament. He finds that Qumran applies the liturgical locutions to
God himself, who appears often as the subject of the verb. This
confirms his conclusion that the liturgical and the non-liturgical
were not very different. In the Scrolls expiation is often mentioned
in close connection with cleansing and this lends weight to his
contention that the basic meaning of *kipper* is to wipe out sin.
This author lists the various constructions governing either the
person, the object or the sin to be expiated and in the case of the
Old Testament he suggests a meaning for almost every instance.

It may at first sight appear strange that two soteriologists, both
working from the same data and using similar methods, should
reach opposite conclusions. Both authors rejected the idea that
etymology determines the meaning of a word, both believed that
the non-cultic usage would give the clue to the cultic meaning.
Yet there were important differences in approach. Lyonnet excluded
the secular usage from consideration, as well as the use of the
noun *kopher*, and Morris took no account of the constructions
and of the Qumran evidence. It also makes a difference where one
begins the investigation. Lyonnet started with those passages where
the particular *kopher* to be offered is not mentioned and where
God is the subject and sin the object of the verb.[7] Morris, however,
treated these passages towards the end of his section on non-cultic
atonement.[8] It need hardly be added that both Morris and Lyonnet
were considering the Old Testament usage of *kipper* within the con-
text of much wider studies and that the findings of each author in
the narrower field obviously tended to fit in with his view of biblical
soteriology as a whole.

6   *Ibid.*, p. 122.
7   *Ibid.*, pp. 127f.
8   Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 146f.

The present study aims to take account of both *kipper* and *kopher*, both in the Old Testament and in the Qumran Scrolls and to treat the material as far as possible in what is usually held to be the chronological order. The various words construed with the root *KPR* will be noted and an attempt will be made to account for the different constructions in terms of the developing usage. This means that I shall try not only to give a meaning to the various prepositions used, but also to suggest why a given preposition is used in any given instance. The material will be set out in tabular form, as we proceed, for ease of comparison. We shall start with what is generally admitted to be early material: the "J" and "E" strands of the Pentateuch and the "Early Source" of Samuel. If we try to interpret subsequent usage in the light of these early texts, we shall be respecting normal historical probabilities, rather than prejudging the issue by choosing our own starting point.

1. *The early literature of the Old Testament*

In the tables which follow, column 1 will give the reference in the English Bible, followed by the Hebrew reference whenever this differs. Other words and abbreviations in brackets indicate the putative source when necessary.

Column 2 gives the subject of the verb *KPR*. It should be noted that when the verb is in the infinitive it is sometimes difficult to see what subject is in the author's mind, if any.

Column 3 shows the conjugation of the verb and also indicates if it is in the infinitive.

Column 4 gives the person or object towards which the action of the verb is directed, preceded by the preposition or construction which governs it.

Column 5 indicates the expression for the sin which is said to be atoned for, preceded by the preposition or construction governing it.

Column 6 shows the means by which the action of the verb is attained, preceded by the preposition governing the means.

If the verb is in the passive the agent is given in column 2 and the subject, which is invariably sin, in column 5. These are equivalent to the subject and the direct object respectively of the active construction. If the verb is used absolutely, this is shown in columns 4 and 5.

If the noun *kopher* is used, this is indicated in column 3, whilst the person giving the *kopher* is shown in column 2, the person for whom it is given in column 4, any offence involved in column 5 and the nature of the *kopher* in column 6.

Wherever there is doubt about the subject, the object or the means of the action of the verb, this is shown by means of brackets.

1	2	3	4	5	6
2 Sam 21:3 (Early S.)	David	pi'el		absolutely	*be* what?
Gen 32:20 (21) (J)	Jacob	„	Dir. obj. Esau's face		*be* gift
Ex 32:30 (E)	Moses	„		be'ad your sin	(intercession)
Ex 21:30 (E)	man	kopher	*pidyon naphsho*	(homi- cide)	(money)

In 2 Sam 21:3 David asks the Gibeonites how he can compensate them for those of their number who had been wrongfully put to death by his predecessor. In reply, they request that seven sons of Saul be hanged. David's aim is to conciliate the Gibeonites ("so that you may bless the inheritance of Yahweh"—vs. 3). Since the verb *kipper* is used absolutely here, it is impossible to say from the construction alone whether it means to propitiate or to expiate. From the context, however, it is clear that it means both. David is seeking both to satisfy the Gibeonites and to "make up for" the wrong done to them. It is equally clear that he cannot achieve the latter without the former. There is no expiation without propitiation.

In Gen 32:20, where Jacob seeks to conciliate Esau by means of gifts of cattle, the meaning is obviously "to appease" or "to propitiate". Although Jacob had wronged Esau over the birthright and the stolen blessing, the narrative stresses not so much this fault as the anger of Esau.

We can say that both in 2 Sam 21:3 and in Gen 32:20 the meaning is "to appease". Both of these would be classed by Lyonnet under the secular usage of the verb. I shall call it rather the "social usage", so as to distinguish it from the material usage which we shall meet later in this study (in the qal) and also in order to avoid the notion, implied in the term "secular", that it is irrelevant to religion. In point of fact it was ultimately a religious motive that led David to seek to conciliate the Gibeonites (2 Sam 21:4, 14). Really he was propitiating Yahweh via the Gibeonites.

Ex 21:30 allows a man whose life is forfeit, because he has brought death upon another by his criminal negligence, to substitute a money payment for his life. Presumably this would be paid to the family of the deceased. It is called a *pidyon naphsho*, "a ransom of his life". Here the use of *kopher* seems to be in the same social sphere of usage as the other two examples we have already examined. It is basically a means of satisfying the deceased's relatives and of making up for the negligence by which the homicide had forfeited his life.

In Ex 32: 30 Moses says he will attempt to *kipper* for Israel's sin of worshipping the golden calf. Immediately after saying this, he intercedes for Israel, confessing the sin and pleading with God to endure (*nasa'*) their sin, or else to delete Moses' name from the register of the living.[9] The context seems to admit a meaning for the verb similar to that in the rest of the early literature. Moses is the subject of *kipper* and there appears to be no reason why God should not be understood as the direct object, as the one Moses is to "appease". How then can we account for the preposition *be'ad*? Perhaps it is used here because Moses is about to pray for the people and *be'ad* is frequently used after verbs of entreaty (e.g. Ex 8: 28 (24) (J), Gen 20: 7 (E), where it governs the person for whom entreaty is made. Here the verb *kipper* governs the sin and this is the only instance in the Old Testament where this is the case. Even here, however, the people to be forgiven are linked with *be'ad* by means of a pronominal suffix after *chatta'*. We conclude that the means which Moses intended to employ to effect propitiation was the whole content of his intercession, so that Israel would be saved by either Yahweh's enduring her sin or by his accepting the life of Moses as a *kopher*. It seems that God agreed to the former but not the latter.

This early literature manifests a social usage of the root *KPR*, which appears with varying degrees of connection with religion. The basic meaning is "to appease". Where, however, it is God who is to be appeased, this is not expressed by means of the direct object. This leaves the door open for the term to take on a life of its own in the religious sphere, carrying only overtones of its original social meaning of appeasement by presents.

2. *The Assyrian period*

1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Sam 3: 14		hithpa'el		iniquity of	*be* sacrifices
(Late S.)		neg.		Eli's house	

---

9   Lyonnet takes Ex 32: 32 to mean that Moses "does not ask of God that he may accept his life to save his people, but that he himself may also perish, if God does not wish to pardon his people: in other words, he rejects to separate his lot from that of the people" (*op. cit.*, p. 123, n. 11). The passage, however, stresses not the people but the sin, so solidarity with Israel is unlikely to have been the basis of Moses' plea. He does not ask for *Israel* to be pardoned, but for the *sin* to be tolerated (*nasa'*. The contexts of the phrase *nasa' chatta'* both here and in 34: 7 point to this meaning, rather than "to forgive sin", for in each case God reserves the right to inflict punishment later). It is difficult to see how Lyonnet classifies this passage. On p. 123 he says that it is not a ritual or sacrificial expiation, yet he states on p. 127 concerning the non-liturgical usage, which presumably includes all non-sacrificial non-ritual cases, "God is always the subject of the verb." Here, however, God is not the subject.

1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Sam 12:3 (Late S.)	guilty	*kopher*	guilty		bribe
Amos 5:12	oppressors	*kopher*	oppressors		bribe
Isa 6:7	seraph	pu'al		thy sin	coal from altar
Isa 22:14	(God)	pu'al	*le* you (Judah)	this iniquity	
Isa 28:18		pu'al		Judah's covenant with death	
Deut 21:8 (D) - a	God	pi'el	*le* thy people	.	(heifer ritual)
Deut 21:8 (D) - b	(God)	nithpa'el	*le* them	the shed blood	(doing right)

In these passages the social usage is limited to the noun *kopher*, which simply means a bribe. The use of the passive of *kipper* is now predominant and a strong characteristic of this period is sin as the direct object of the verb or as the subject of its passive.

If sin is the direct object, can the meaning still be "to appease"? How can one appease sin? It could be argued that the Hebrew terms for "sin", "iniquity" etc. can also mean "punishment" and that it is the punishment which is being appeased, or rather the wrath (cf. Prov. 16: 14) that is active in it. There would be certain passages in this period of biblical literature which would not fit into this interpretation: Isa 28: 18 and the Deuteronomy passage. For these another meaning would have to be sought. Yet all the instances fit into the same pattern: to *kipper* sin for (*le*) the sinner by (*be*) some means or other. We have to admit that "expiate", "purge" or "cancel" are the best words in English to fit into such a formula in the place of the Hebrew verb. Any attempt to translate it as "propitiate" or "appease" appears forced. Here, then, we have a different type of usage, which I shall call "Isaianic". How can its emergence be accounted for?

At this point the dominant power in the Near East was Assyria. Assyrian cult objects were set up even in the temple in Jerusalem (e.g. 2 Kings 16: 10ff). Did Assyrian cult language influence Hebrew atonement usage? The Assyrian pi'el verb *kuppuru* means "to purify magically", [10] but its object is naturally the person or thing purified and not the sin which is purged away as in the Hebrew Isaianic usage. Perhaps the Assyrian influence was sufficient to shift the meaning of *kipper* in the direction of "to cleanse", at least as far as "to purge". One reason why the meaning stayed there

---

10   *The Assyrian Dictionary*, edd. M. Civil, I. J. Gelb, A. L. Oppenheim and E. Reiner, vol. 8 (Chicago; Oriental Institute, 1971), p. 179.

at this time may have been the greater stress on sin in prophetic Yahwism as compared with Assyrian religion.[11]

It is also possible that 1 Sam 3: 14 represents a type of usage which formed a transition from the social and socio-religious (e.g. Ex 32: 30) usage of the earlier period to the later Isaianic usage. If we take the hithpa'el in this verse as a reflexive of the pi'el *kipper* (appease), we arrive at a rendering: "The iniquity of Eli's house will not appease itself by offerings", or "The iniquity will not appease the iniquity (viz. the punishment)".[12] Even here the subject of the verb would have to be a figure of speech for "the members of Eli's iniquitous house", because of the mention of sacrifices as a means. If this interpretation is accepted, we have here a metaphor taken from the social sphere and applied to iniquity, personified as would-be appeasers and appeased. God is not understood as the agent, even if the hithpa'el has a passive and not a reflexive force. In Deuteronomy, however, God is clearly the subject of the verb's action and there is no longer any metaphor from the social sphere of appeasement. Instead we have a dead metaphor, which has taken on a new life of its own in the religious sphere of usage. Words tend to become conventionalized in meaning when transferred in this way.[13] The "appeasing" element would then survive as an overtone,[14] connoting God's putting away of his wrath when he forgives sin.

The preposition *le*, governing the person to be forgiven, indicates that the action of the verb is on his behalf and for his benefit.

During this period the prophets were fulminating against attempts by Israel's wealthy oppressors to bribe the judges with presents and Yahweh with whole burnt-offerings. The word *kopher* has acquired a bad meaning and it is not surprising that the religious usage of *kipper* should take leave of its original moorings in the social sphere. God may be appeased, but he cannot be bribed.

3. *The exilic period*

In this section we shall include Jeremiah, since his work overlaps with the period of the Exile. The priestly strand of the Pentateuch, though it has strong affinities with some of the usage of this period

---

11 For an assessment of how far the Assyrians developed a sense of sin, see S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1953), pp. 98ff.

12 See Ps 69: 27 (28) for another example of *'awon* meaning both iniquity and its punishment in the same sentence.

13 See David Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings* (Cambridge: C.U.P., 1967), pp. 31-34.

14 Even this overtone must be very strongly muted in Isa 28: 18, where the meaning is that Judah's covenant with death will be annulled. The root KPR here has become almost a dead metaphor. Its use is perhaps due to the fact that a covenant usually implies *sanctions*.

(especially Ezekiel's) and is often dated around this time, will be given a separate section of its own because of the comparative frequency of its use of *kipper*.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Jer 18:23	God	pi'el		'al their iniquity	
Lev 17:11 (H)	blood	pi'el (inf.)	'al your souls		
,,	blood	pi'el	absolutely		be the soul
Lev 19:22 (H)	priest	pi'el	'al offerer	'al his sin	be ram of guilt offering
Lev 23:28 (H)		pi'el (inf.)	'al you		(Day of Atonement)
Ez 16:63	God	pi'el	le Jerusalem	le all thou hast done	(everlasting covenant)
Ez 43:20	Ezek. via Zadokites	pi'el	dir. obj. settle		(blood)
Ez 43:26	Zadokites	pi'el	'eth altar		
Ez 45:15	(people)	pi'el (inf.)	'al prince		offerings
Ez 45:17	(prince)	pi'el (inf.)	be'ad house of Israel		offerings
Ez 45:20	ye, via priest	pi'el	'eth house of God		blood
Deut 32:43 (Song of Moses)	God	pi'el	dir. obj. his land, people		(taking vengeance on enemies)
Isa 43:3	God	kopher	Israel		Egypt
Isa 47:11	Babylon	pi'el		disaster	(magic)
Isa 27:9 (Isa. Apoc)		pu'al		iniquity	be destruction of idol altars

In this period the Isaianic usage persists, but only in the corpus of Isaiah.[15] There is also a return to the socio-religious usage in Isa. 43:3. The language there is quite metaphorical. Yahweh is pictured as paying Egypt over as a ransom price for Israel at the time of the Red Sea deliverance. This is an example on the national scale of the truth of the proverb that the wicked is a *kopher* for the righteous (Prov 21:18), which is merely a picturesque way of saying that as the righteous is coming up, the wicked is going down. It seems that they must both be connected to the same pair of balances: the scales of God's justice. A similar thought may be

---

15   In Isa 47:11 the object of *kipper* is the punishment rather than the sin (cf. *supra*, p. 136), but this does not mean that those passages in the earlier chapters, where sin is the subject of the pu'al, refer to punishment. It is sufficient to realize that *kipper* in Isaiah sometimes means "cancel" and little else.

involved in the Song of Moses, Deut 32: 45, where Yahweh exults in the thought of taking vengeance on Israel's enemies, but he will *kipper* (perhaps="redeem") his land and his people Israel.

Except in the Isaiah passages it is the thing to be cleansed which is now placed as the direct object of the verb and not the sin to be purged. The influence of the Assyrian usage is clear at this point and can be explained by the fact that the Jews were now living in Mesopotamia. In contrast to Assyrian, however, the person to be forgiven never appears as the direct object of *kipper* in the Hebrew Old Testament.

Jer. 18: 23 is a prophetic usage which must be distinguished from the Isaianic. It is prophetic and not priestly, since God is the subject and this is never the case in the Priestly Code of the Pentateuch. It differs from the Isaianic in having *'al* governing the sin. This preposition seems to mean here simply "regarding" and it is futile to attempt to give it a local sense. The sentence could be translated, "Do not be propitious regarding their sins". There are strong overtones of appeasement here as the context shows, but the verb no longer means "to appease", since God is the subject.

The use of *'al* in the other passages is due to a distinct Levitical usage and the same applies to *be'ad* in Ez. 45: 17. This Levitical usage covers all atoning acts, whether cultic or non-cultic, performed under the Levitical regulations. It is found in the Holiness and the Priestly codes, in Ezekiel and in the work of the Chronicler. In only two instances in this literature is God the subject of *kipper* (Ez 16: 63 and 2 Chr 30: 18) and in both cases the atoning action is performed outside the Levitical system. In Ez 16: 63, for instance, Yahweh declares he will make a new covenant with Jerusalem, since she has forfeited her rights under the old one. The context is altogether prophetic, however, and the usage too is prophetic, not priestly, in so far as God is the subject of *kipper*.

Although God was not the subject in the regular Levitical usage of *kipper*, he was not the object either. Instead the action of the verb is said to take place "before Yahweh", *liphne Yahweh*. This phrase occurs in Lev 23: 28 as well as in several passages in the Priestly Code. It takes the basic imagery of man appeasing God by a present and lifts it onto a more spiritual plane.

In Lev 17: 11 the persons benefiting from the action of the verb are expressed by the term "your souls" (="your lives"), whereas the means by which the blood makes atonement is said to be "the life" which is in it. This seems to mean that a life is given to save a life. The sacrifice is thus a kind of *kopher*. In general, it would appear that the Levitical usage is more amenable than the Isaianic to the idea of a propitiation. This is natural in view of the fact

that it mainly concerns the cult, in which gifts are given to God. It is probable that this propitiation idea is also present even where the direct object of the verb is a piece of sacred furniture, since the reason for the need to cleanse this is the contamination due to Israel's sin[16] (viz. that which displeases God).

4. *The Priestly Code* ("*P*")

The usual expression in P with *kipper* is given as the first item in the list which follows. There are about thirty instances of this, though not every term in the formula is expressed in every instance. Sometimes *kipper* is used absolutely in a way that is quite compatible with this formula, including Ex 29: 33, where it is used absolutely in the passive.

1 usually	2 priests, Moses, Aaron	3 pi'el	4 '*al* persons	5 *min* sins	6 *be* offering
Gen 6: 14	Noah	qal	ark (dir. obj.)		*be* pitch (*kopher*)
Ex 29: 36	Moses	pi'el	'*al* altar		(sacrifices)
Ex 29: 37	Moses	pi'el	'*al* altar		(sacrifices)
Ex 30: 10 bis	Aaron	pi'el	'*al* horns of altar	*min* blood	
Ex 30: 15	Israel	pi'el (inf)	'*al* your souls		(half shekel)
Ex 30: 16	half shekel	pi'el (inf)	'*al* your souls		(half shekel)
Lev 1: 4	burnt offering	pi'el (inf)	'*al* offerer		(burnt offering)
Lev 5: 13	priest	pi'el	'*al* offerer	'*al* his sin	(sin offering of flour)
Lev 5: 18	priest	pi'el	'*al* offerer	'*al* his ignorance	(ram of guilt offering)
Lev 6: 30 (23)	blood	pi'el (inf.)	absolute		(sin offering)
Lev 8: 15	Moses	pi'el	'*al* altar		
Lev 9: 7	Aaron	pi'el	*be'ad* the people and himself		(burnt and sin offer- ings)
Lev 10: 17	flesh of sin offering	pi'el	'*al* congregation		(eating flesh of sin offering)
Lev 14: 53	priest	pi'el	'*al* leprous house		(living bird)
Lev 16: 10	Aaron	pi'el (inf.)	absolutely		'*al* living goat
Lev 16: 16	Aaron	pi'el	'*al* sanctuary	*min* sins of Israel	(blood with- in veil)
Lev 16: 17	Aaron	pi'el	*be'ad* him- self, his house, the congregation		(sprinkled blood)

---

[16]   Lev 16: 16, 18f (P).

1	2	3	4	5	6
Lev 16: 18	Aaron	pi'el	'al altar		(blood)
Lev 16: 20	Aaron	pi'el	'eth holy places, altar		(blood)
Lev 16: 24	Aaron	pi'el	be'ad himself, the people		(burnt offerings)
Lev 16: 33	priest	pi'el	'eth holy places, altar		(Day of Atonement rituals)
Num 8: 19	Levites	pi'el (inf)	'al Israelites		(Levites)
Num 16: 46f (17: 11f)	Aaron	pi'el	'al the people		(incense offering)
Num 25: 13	Phinehas	pi'el	'al Israelites		(punishing the guilty)
Num 31: 50	Israel	pi'el (inf)	'al their souls		(spoil)
Num 35: 33	(Israel)	pu'al	le the land	le blood shed	be blood of killer
Ex 30: 12	Israelite	kopher	his soul		(money)
Num 35: 31f	(guilty)	kopher	soul of killer		

The terms in the usual formula are not too difficult to account for. Since the priests are normally active in cultic atonement, these (*or* Moses or Aaron, Israel's first priests) appear as the subject of the verb. Neither persons nor sins are construed as the direct object. The reason seems to be that cultic atonement is still a propitiation, albeit conceived in a rather spiritual way.[17] Man cannot be the object of it. He is only the beneficiary. The action of the verb takes place on behalf of (*'al*) the offerer and it can be thought of as clearing or cleansing him from (*min*) his sin. The instrument is expressed, as often by *be*. It remains to note the various deviations from the usual formula and to attempt to explain them. We shall consider the different areas in which these occur in the following order—

(a) The object of the atonement (b) The means

(c) The subject (d) The sin

(e) The conjugation of *KPR*

(a) Objects other than the offerer

A. The offerer's "soul" or life: Ex 30: 15f, Num 31: 50. In both passages the means of atonement is material wealth, offered in the first passage in order to avert a plague and in the second in gratitude for the preservation of lives. The money payment is called a *"kopher*

for the life" in Ex 30: 12. The same phrase occurs also in Num 35: 31, where it seems to refer to the commutation of the death penalty, possibly into a compensation payment for the family of the murdered man.[18] The use of the term *kopher* in these religious contexts and in connection with *kipper* indicates that the meaning of *kipper* is still being influenced by the social usage.

B.   The land. Num 35: 33 states that no atonement can be made for (*le*) the land for (*le*) the innocent blood shed there, except by the blood of the murderer. The land is viewed as polluted by the blood. This is offensive to Yahweh and he is liable to act in wrath against it (cf. 2 Sam 21: 1-14). Yahweh's wrath against the polluted land, however, is clearly a metaphor for punishing Israel through the land for her corporate sin in tolerating evil in her midst (cf. Deut 21: 9). The construction is the same as Ez 16: 63: "*le* Jerusalem *le* what she has done". Both passages probably reflect an accepted Levitical usage for speaking about an atonement for the land. In Ez 16: 63 the subject is God. In Num 35: 33 the verb is in the passive. Should God be supplied as the agent here? Hardly, since it is not according to priestly usage to have God as the subject of *kipper* and the verb is used too closely in conjunction with the noun *kopher*. The passage seems to be stating that there is no *kopher* for the land except the blood of the murderer and that no *kopher* can be accepted for the murderer.

C.   A leprous house. Lev 14: 53 states that atonement is to be made for ('*al*) a house which has recovered from the plague, by means of an apotropaic-cathartic ritual. The preposition means simply "regarding" and requires no explanation in the priestly writings.

D.   Sacred objects. Sometimes these are construed with '*al* and sometimes with '*eth*. Lev 16: 18-20 has both constructions, but no difference in meaning can be ascribed to them here, since the clause in vs. 20, where *kipper* is used with '*eth*, simply summarizes the statements of vss. 16 and 18, where it is used with '*al*.

Elsewhere there are a few cases where it is necessary to decide whether '*al* means "for" or "upon". In Ex 30: 10, Aaron is to atone '*al* the altar of incense and its horns. '*al* here should be rendered "for", since Lev 16: 18f shows that this is a rite to cleanse the altar from Israel's sin.

---

18   Here it occurs in the same context as *kipper, pace* Lyonnet (*op. cit.*, p. 127, n. 23), who states that Ex 30: 12 is the only place where this happens.

Ex 29: 36f. presents rather more difficulties. It is best studied alongside Lev 8: 15, since Lev 8 is the account of the performance of the instructions given in Ex 29.

Ex 29: 36f.	Lev 8: 15
and thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin offering for atonement	and he slew it
and thou shalt de-sin 'al the altar	and Moses took the blood and put it upon ('al) the horns of the altar . . . and de-sinned 'eth the altar
in thy atoning 'al it	and poured the blood at the bottom of the altar
and thou shalt anoint it to sanctify it	and sanctified it
vs. 37. Seven days thou shalt atone	by atoning/to atone (le plus inf.)
'al the altar and sanctify it . . .	'al it

It is clear that in Ex 29: 36 de-sinning the altar cannot mean the same as atoning 'al it, otherwise there would be a pointless tautology. It is probable from the Leviticus parallel that de-sinning 'al the altar means cleansing it from sin. The meaning of *kipper* 'al in vs. 36 would have to be distinct from this: "when thou makest atonement *upon* it." In vs. 37, however, 'al probably means "for", since it is connected with the sanctification of the altar. It seems that the altar is sanctified as a result of anointing and de-sinning and in vs. 37 the atonement includes the de-sinning. It may appear strange that *kipper* 'al can mean in turn "atone upon" and "atone for" in two consecutive verses, but it is probable that the two meanings were connected. To atone for ('al) X means to *kipper* X by putting blood *upon* it, just as to de-sin ('al) X means to de-sin X by putting blood upon it (see parallels above).[19] The meaning of *kipper* 'al in Lev 8: 15 depends upon the force of the preposition *le* governing the infinitive construction in which it is used. If the latter means "in order to atone", 'al would have to mean "upon it" and the clause would signify that Moses sanctified the altar to make it a fit means of atonement. The parallel with Ex 29: 37, however, makes it probable that the sense is that Moses sanctified the altar by atoning *for* it. The rationale of this action would be the same as for other occasions when atonement was made for sacred objects: Israel's sin pollutes the holy things and it is imperative that this be atoned for, lest Yahweh abandon his holy place in his wrath and it thus cease to be holy. Atonement obtains and maintains sanctification and not *vice versa*.

19 See also Lyonnet, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

In Lev 16: 20 and 33, sacred objects and places are construed with *'eth*. In both instances we have summarizing statements concerning the Day of Atonement ceremonies. In vs. 33 a clear distinction is made between these objects and places, on the one hand, which are construed with *'eth*, and human beings on the other, who are construed with *'al*. The construction with *'eth* may be a limited borrowing from Assyrian usage at this time.

E.   The High Priest, all of Israel. When the theocratic community as a whole, or its head, is the object of the atoning act, the preposition used can be *be'ad* if the occasion is an especially solemn one: the launching of the Levitical system itself (Lev 9: 7) or the Day of Atonement (Lev 16: 6, 11, 17, 24). There are many places, however, where Israel or the High Priest are construed with the usual *'al*. Probably *be'ad* conveys a note of extra solemnity. It is reminiscent of the construction used in connection with Moses' intercessory atonement for Israel in Ex 32: 30.

(b)   Means of atonement other than the offering

I shall arrange the various means of atonement according to their possible relation to the *kopher* idea. The fact that such an arrangement is possible may be taken as corroborative evidence for Morris's thesis of a link between *kipper* and *kopher*. Morris had his own order of presenting the different means of atonement,[20] but his treatment ranges throughout the Old Testament. The present list is confined to the Priestly Code and to Levitical atonement as we have defined it. Thus, these means are all linked together in any case and one is justified in seeking to interpret them in terms of a unifying concept.

A.   A money payment for the "soul" (life):-

Ex 30: 12, 15: the half shekel—*kipper, kopher* both used.

Num 31: 50: booty—*kopher* used.

Num 35: 31f: no compensation payment (*kopher*) is to be accepted for the life of a murderer.

B.   Levites, appearing before Yahweh as Israel's substitutes and representatives: Num 8: 19.

C.   The punishment of the guilty: Num 25: 13. If Phinehas had not punished the guilty, the whole of Israel would have suffered for her corporate laxity in tolerating the evil. The incident is an

20   Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 143ff.

example of the principle that the wicked becomes a *kopher* for the righteous.[21]

D. The blood of the murderer: Num 35: 33. This blood does not atone for the murderer, but for the land. It does not avert punishment from the guilty, since the shedding of the murderer's blood is itself the punishment.[22]

E. The blood of the Day of Atonement sacrifices. Although the various sacrifices are often stated or implied as the means of atonement, the blood is specifically mentioned in this connection only for the Day of Atonement offerings (Ex 30: 10 and Lev 16: 16-18, 20, 27, 30, 32) and only in Ex 30: 10 is the blood explicitly stated to be the means. This is probably due to the importance of blood on this day for atoning for the holy objects themselves. The preposition used in Ex 30: 10 (*min*) seems to have a partitive force, for not all of the blood was placed upon the golden altar.

Is there any connection between this atoning blood of sacrifices and the atoning blood of the executed criminal? The language of P does not encourage us to seek such a connection, but Lev 17 (H) displays certain affinities with Num 35: blood guilt in connection with animal as well as human blood, the concept of atonement for the "soul". P was not concerned to give a rationale for the sacrificial system; this had already been done by H in any case.

---

21 Lyonnet interprets Phinehas' atonement here as either a priestly atonement he was to perform in the future (*op. cit.*, p. 123), or an expiation by means of intercession. The former is based on a translation of *tachath 'asher qinne' . . . waykapper* by "because he was zealous . . . he will perform the rite of expiation". G. V. Wigram gives only two other instances of *tachath 'asher* (Deut 21: 14, 28: 62; unfortunately Lisowsky does not list the occurrences of this conjunction) and in both of them the main clause precedes the subordinate clause with *tachath 'asher*. It is probable that the same applies here. In support of his second alternative, Lyonnet adduces Ps 106: 30: "Phinehas stood up *waypallel*". *PLL* in the pi'el appears to mean "to judge" and in the hithpa'el "to pray". Lyonnet states that this verb, though rendered by the Greek translators as *exilasato*, appears elsewhere as (*pros*)-*euchesthai*, where it represents either the pi'el or the hithpa'el of the Hebrew (*ibid.*, p. 144). Yet in Ez 16: 52 the pi'el of *PLL* is translated by *phtheiro* not *euchesthai*. Indeed, 1 Sam 2: 25 is the only instance where the pi'el of *PLL* is translated by (*pros*)*euchesthai*. Consequently, there seems to be no reason to reject the A.V. rendering of Ps 105: 30: "Then stood up Phinehas, and executed judgement". If the pi'el means the same as the hithpa'el, it is difficult to account for the change from one to the other in 1 Sam 2: 25, where it is best to see a pun on "judge" (*PLL* pi'el) and "pray" (*PLL* hithpa'el), especially if the hithpa'el has the connotation, "pray for a (favourable) judgment".

22 Cf. the teaching of later Judaism, e.g. J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, tr. by John Bowden (New York: Scribner's [1971]) p. 287, where the dying criminal is encouraged to pray, "May my death be an atonement for all my sins." Qumran, with its stress on atonement *for the land*, was much nearer to the Old Testament in this respect.

F.   The flesh of certain sin offerings: Ex 29: 33; Lev 10: 17. The priests are to eat the flesh of those sin offerings whose blood was not brought into the holy place. It seems that, if the blood was not brought before God, the flesh must be consumed by his representatives.

G.   Incense: Num 16: 46f. (17: 11f.). Aaron places incense in the censer, which has been filled with live coals from the altar, and stands between those who have died of the plague and those who are still alive. Thus he stays the plague. It is as though the cloud hides the surviving Israelites from the sight of Yahweh as he advances in his wrath (cf. Lev 16: 13). Incense offerings are connected with the usual sacrifices via the burning coals, which must be taken from the altar (see Lev 10: 1f).

H.   A released living creature: Lev 14: 53; 16; 10. Both the living bird in the leper-cleansing ceremony and the scapegoat of the Day of Atonement are connected with their peers which are slain. The live bird is dipped in its fellow's blood and the scapegoat is presented before Yahweh at the same time as the goat which is sacrificed. The preposition used to designate the scapegoat as a means of atonement (*'al*) is in keeping with the idea of Israel's iniquities being placed *upon* it.

I.   Non-bloody offerings:-

Lev 5: 13, a sin offering of flour for the very poor—a substitute for a bloody offering.

Lev 14: 18, anointing with oil which has been presented as a wave offering along with a bloody offering (vs. 12).

Lev 14: 31, a meal offering mentioned in connection with a bloody offering.

Thus the means of atonement in the Priestly Code is either a *kopher*, or a sacrifice, or something connected with sacrifice. The sacrifice may possibly be connected with the *kopher* idea via Lev 17.

(c)   Subjects of the atoning action other than priests

A.   Those who pay for the offering can appear as the subject of *kipper*. In Num 28: 22, 30; 29: 5 this is Israel. [23]

B.   The means of atonement can appear as the presumed subject of *kipper* in the infinitive: the sacrifice, Lev 1: 4; 6: 30; the half shekel, Ex 30: 16; Levites, Num 8: 19; the flesh of the sin offering, Lev 10: 17.

---

[23]   Cf. Ez 45: 15 and 17, where it is the people and the prince respectively. See too 2 Sam 24: 24.

C. A zealous individual in the community, when it is a matter of executing judgement: Num 25: 13. The fact that Phinehas was also a descendant of Aaron was merely incidental at this point.

D. The understood agent of the pu'al in Num 35: 33 is probably Israel. Israel cannot give any atonement for the land in respect of innocent blood, except the life of the one who shed it. The pu'al cannot be a "divine passive", with God understood as the agent, since it is not God who is to slay the murderer, but Israel, through the avenger of blood.

E. In Num 8: 19 ("I have given the Levites . . . to Aaron and his sons . . . to perform the service of the children of Israel in the tent of meeting and to atone for ('*al*) the children of Israel") the assumed subject of *kipper* in the infinitive is probably the Levites, for they are the presumed subject of the preceding clause. Further-more, it appears that the formula, "I have given X to you to *kipper*" implies X as the subject of *kipper*. Compare—

Lev 17: 11 (H): "I have given it (the blood) to you . . . to make atonement . . . for it is the blood that makes atonement" *and* Lev 10: 17: "He (God) has given it (the flesh of the sin offering) to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation to make atonement for them before Yahweh" (Ex 29: 33 shows it was the flesh that made atonement here).

If the Levites are the subject in Num 8: 19, the verb *kipper* must mean "to act as a substitute". It cannot mean that they offered atoning sacrifices. Only the priests did that.

(d) Exceptional expressions used with the sin

A. In Lev 5: 13, 18 '*al* is used. It seems to have the loose sense of "concerning". It is difficult to find any significance in the change of preposition here. *min* was used in 5: 10, when the guilt offering was a bloody sacrifice. In vs. 13 it is a flour offering, but in vs. 18 it is a bloody offering expiating a sin of ignorance.

B. In Num 35: 33 the formula is "*le* the land *le* the sin". A similar construction occurs in Ez 16: 63 and we have suggested that this was an acceptable formula when atonement for territory was involved.

(e) Conjugations other than the pi'el

A. Qal in Gen 6: 14. Noah is told to daub (*kaphar*) the ark with pitch (*kopher*). This is the only instance of the qal of *KPR* and it may be termed the material usage. It should be noted that here too there is a link between the verb *KPR* and the noun *kopher*.

The influence of Assyrian terms is evident: *kaparu* ("to smear on") and *kupru* ("bitumen").[24]

B.   The pu'al is used in Num 35: 33 in order to exclude every possible subject for the atoning action: *no-one* can atone for the shedding of innocent blood, apart from the execution of the murderer. The use of the pu'al in Ex 29: 33 ("and they shall eat those things by which atonement is made") tends to distinguish the subject of *kipper* from the priests who eat the sacrifice. The subject of the atoning action here is probably the sacrifice itself and in particular its flesh. Lev 10: 17 ("He has given it (the flesh of the sin offering) to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make an atonement for them before Yahweh") does not contradict this. In the light of Lev 22: 9 (H) even the phrase "to bear iniquity" must refer to the offering and not to the priests.

Except for Gen 6: 14, all uses of the root *KPR* in the Priestly Code can be classed as Levitical usage. This usage is a unity. It makes no difference to the construction whether the subject-matter is "cultic" or "non-cultic", "liturgical" or "non-liturgical". The preposition '*al* governs the beneficiaries of the atoning action, whether it be achieved by means of a sacrifice, a money payment, an incense offering, the substitutionary service of the Levites or the punishment of the guilty in the midst of the congregation. Only where the object of the atonement is the land itself is the construction changed (Num 35: 33), but this appears to be an accepted formula in Levitical circles (cf. Ez 16: 63). It has nothing to do with the means of atonement.

The Levitical usage is characterized in the following ways:

(a)   God is neither the subject nor the object of the verb.

(b)   Man is never the object.

(c)   There are signs of the influence of prophetic and Assyrian ideas of purification (*min* with the sins, '*eth* with the objects to be cleansed).

It seems to represent a refinement of the concept of propitiation, with occasional overtones of cleansing. It is closer to the socio-religious usage than to the prophetic.

5. *The post-exilic period*

1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Chr 6: 49 (34)	Aaron his sons	pi'el (inf)	'*al* Israel		(activity of subject)
2 Chr 29: 34	priests	pi'el (inf)	'*al* all Israel		(Hezekiah's sacrifice)

---

[24]   The construction with *be*, however, does not appear to correspond to the Assyrian usage in the examples given by Civil *et al.*, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. 8, p. 179.

1	2	3	4	5	6
2 Chr 30: 18	good Yahweh	pi'el	*be'ad* every-one who prepares his heart		(Hezekiah's prayer)
Neh 10: 33 (34)	the people	pi'el (inf)	*'al* Israel		(sin offerings)
Dan 9: 24	seventy weeks	pi'el (inf)		dir. obj. iniquity	(seventy weeks)

The Chronicler follows the Levitical usage except that in 2 Chr 30: 18 God is the subject. This is because of the exceptional state of affairs for which there was no provision under the Levitical system: some worshippers were grossly incorrect in their manner of celebrating the festival, though their heart was right before God. The use of *be'ad* in this context stresses the solemnity of the atonement requested by Hezekiah's prayer at this time. The idea of averting the wrath of Yahweh is present in the context (vss. 8f., 20), but the fact that God is the subject of the verb in vs. 18 shows that the meaning of *kipper* did not always involve the giving of a *kopher*, though it always involved the idea of averting wrath. Here God turns from his wrath for Israel, but he does not give himself a present! The priestly usage, therefore, is not incompatible with the prophetic stress on God's gracious willingness to forgive (*kipper*) Israel. In the present passage it merely tends to highlight man's need for such forgiveness, together with God's sheer goodness in displaying it, when man not only has sinned but also has failed to avail himself properly of the cultic means of atonement and forgiveness which God has provided.

In Neh 10: 33 (34) the people appear as the subject of the atoning action, because it is they who pay the expenses of the sacrifices.

Dan 9: 24 resembles Isaianic usage, except that the subject is not God, but a period of time. It is not surprising that a prophetic usage should be followed here, since there is no priestly atonement for *iniquity* (as opposed to sin) apart from the Day of Atonement rituals and national contrition. Dan 9 begins with Daniel's own prayer of contrition on behalf of Israel, but he has to acknowledge that a true national repentance had not taken place (vs. 13). He is concerned to know when the promise of a restoration after seventy years of exile (Jer 25: 11f.) would be fulfilled. The answer he receives is that these are to be seventy *weeks* of years. Presumably this is because God had reserved for himself the right to punish Israel seven times for her iniquity (Lev 26) in order to bring her nationally to a confession of sin and repentance. It seems, then, that in vs. 24 this time of remedial punishment is conceived as an atonement. Lev 26 and its re-interpretation in Dan 9 later

became highly influential features in the soteriology of Qumran, as I argue elsewhere.[25]

1	2	3	4	5	6
Ps 49: 7 (8)	a man	*kopher*	his brother		
Ps 65: 3 (4)	God	pi‘el		dir. obj. our trans- gressions	
Ps 78: 38	God	pi‘el	(Israel)	dir. obj. their iniquity	
Ps 79: 9	God	pi‘el		‘*al* our sins	
Prov 6: 35	adulterer	*kopher*	himself	adultery	gifts
Prov 13: 8	a man	*kopher*	his soul		riches
Prov 16: 6	(the repentant)	pu‘al		iniquity	*be* mercy and truth
Prov 16: 14	a wise man	pi‘el	the king’s wrath		
Prov 21: 18		*kopher*	the righteous		the wicked
Job 33: 24	angel	*kopher*	(man threatened by death)		
Job 36: 18	(Job)	*kopher*	(Job)		(money)

6.   *The poetic books*

Ps 49: 7 (8) states that no man can give a *kopher* for his brother to prevent him from dying when his time has come. The usage is socio-religious and the sentiments resemble those expressed in the early literature, in 2 Sam 14: 14.

Ps 65: 3 (4) and 78: 38 employ the Isaianic usage. Since God is the subject of the verb here and sins are the object, *kipper* must be rendered "forgive" or "purge".

Ps 79: 9 reflects Jeremiah's prophetic usage. Because of its contents this psalm must be dated after the fall of the kingdom of Judah.

Prov 6: 35 and 16: 14 are examples of the social usage of *kopher* and *kipper* respectively. The latter means to appease and the former a gift of appeasement. 13: 8 states that the *kopher* of a man's life is his wealth, but the poor does not hear rebuke. The N.E.B. interprets this as an advantage for the poor man and renders, "The rich man must buy himself off, but a poor man is immune from threats." In vs. 1, however, it is a wise thing to hear rebuke (*ge‘arah*, the same word as in verse 8). This passage does not condemn riches

as such. Indeed, abiding riches can be the reward of hard work and righteousness. Vs. 8 would seem to point to one of the advantages of such riches: they can buy off human threats to one's life. If this is the thrust of this proverb, it is an instance of the general principle enunciated in 21: 18: the wicked is a *kopher* for the righteous. This verse certainly borders on the socio-religious usage, since the sphere in which this metaphorical "exchange of prisoners" operates is God's general judicial dealings with mankind.

Prov 16: 6 belongs to the Isaianic usage ("iniquity" as the subject of *KPR* in the pu'al). It is very similar to Isa 27: 9, except that there the means of atonement was the destruction of idolatrous cult objects. It is uncertain whether this destruction was to be performed by Israel or by God himself when he makes the cities of the land desolate. In the former case the broken stones of the altars would be a sign of repentance, in the latter case they would be part of the punishment, which, according to Lev 26, was to lead to Israel's repentance. In Prov 16: 6, however, the means of atonement is neither the outward sign of repentance nor the punishment leading to it. It is rather repentance itself, as exhibited in the moral qualities of mercy and truth.

In the Elihu speeches of the book of Job there are two instances of the socio-religious usage of *kopher*. In both cases it is a question of offering a price to God to release a man from death. 33: 24 envisages such a possibility as a rare piece of good fortune, realizable only through the intervention of an angel intercessor. 36: 18 declares that no ransom would be accepted on behalf of the persistent sinner.[26]

The poetic literature is thus seen to contain the social, socio-religious and prophetic usages of *KPR*, but not the Levitical.

The word *kopher* occurs in the Song of Solomon (1: 14, 4: 13 and perhaps 7: 12) in a material sense, but different from that in Gen 6: 14, where it meant "pitch" and was related to an Assyrian word of similar meaning. In the Song of Solomon *kopher* is usually taken to mean henna, a plant useful both for its fragrance and for the dye which was obtained from it. The contexts seems to indicate the flower itself or the perfume. In the Ugaritic literature, however, where the word *kpr* occurs in connection with the maquillage of the goddess 'Anat, it is probably the dye which is intended.[27] The question whether the various material senses of *KPR* cognates in the different Semitic languages are linked in any way under a

---

[26]   LXX and N.E.B., however, interpret this verse as referring to Job's accepting bribes. This would put the passage in the sphere of the social usage.
[27]   See references given under *kpr* by G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), p. 146.

general concept such as "covering" is hardly relevant to our enquiry, since in any case the social meaning of *kipper* is quite clear. It has a life of its own, as does also each of the various religious usages of the term.

We have distinguished in the Old Testament the social, the socio-religious, the prophetic and the Levitical usages, together with certain variations within each group. The social usage is the first to be attested, closely followed by the socio-religious, but these continue in use after the earliest period. The Levitical usage may have its roots earlier than the prophetic (except perhaps for the Assyrian type of variation which has the place to be purged in the "accusative"), for it has affinities closer to the social usage than the prophetic has. In any case, it appears to have been confined largely to priestly circles in Old Testament times, for we do not find it in the poetic literature. Basically the verb *kipper* means to bring about a state of affairs in which wrong doing is not held against a person. The way it is translated into English will have to vary according to the subject or direct object. The subject of the verb is often made doubtful by the use of a passive or an infinitive and the direct object is often omitted, prepositional phrases being used instead. Sentences of this kind leave the reader with the impression that an action is being performed by which acceptance before God is brought about regarding a man and his sin. The action may be very concrete, the offering of a sacrifice or a money payment, but the atonement in view of which the action is being performed is deliberately given a very spiritual flavour by language of this kind.

7. *The emerging Qumran community*

1	2	3	4	5	6
4Q Dib. Ham. 2:9	Moses	pi'el		*be'ad* their sin	(intercession)
1QH 4:37	God	pi'el		dir. obj. iniquity	(*be* thy *tsedaqah*)
1QH 15:24		*kopher*		works of evil	
1QH 17:12	(God)	pi'el (inf.)		(*be'ad*)	
1QH f2:13		pi'el (inf.)		dir. obj. guilt	(spirit of holiness)

4Q Dib. Ham. [28] is a prayer of confession after the manner of the great post-exilic doxologies of judgement in Ezra 9, Neh 9 and Dan. 9. In it the justice of God's punishment of Israel is acknowledged and its reforming purpose appreciated, whilst Israel casts herself upon the sheer grace of God as her only hope of salvation.

---

[28] "Les paroles des luminaires," first published in 1961 by M. Baillet, *R.B.*, 68, pp. 195-250.

In 2: 9 God is reminded of his past mercy to the Israelites at the time when "Moses atoned for their sin". The construction used with *kipper* here is the same as that in Ex 32: 30, which is clearly the passage the author has in mind. This document shows no trace of tenets peculiar to the Qumran community. It is therefore probable that it is pre-Essenian and quite early.[29]

Of the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH), some at least appear to have been composed by the founder of the Community. 4: 37 comes from such a hymn, where the author, having confessed that he has committed the sin of unbelief at the time of his former troubles (line 35), expresses his confidence that God will pardon (*kipper*) iniquity. In the Old Testament this verb occurs with *'awon* as the direct object only in Ps 78: 38 and Dan 9: 24. The former is more likely to be the background here because of the hymnic language. The theme in Ps 78 is God's recurring forgiveness of Israel in the desert following her repeated disobedience and unbelief. The construction here is Isaianic. God is the subject and sin the object. The stress is on God's pure goodness in forgiving, rather than on any means of atonement, unless it be simply God's *tsedaqah*, his saving righteousness whereby he is true to his covenant.

The remaining passages from 1QH are from hymns which were probably composed for the use of members of the Community. 15: 24 states that God will not accept a *kopher* for evil deeds. Riches will not avail for acceptance before God. Here we are in the sphere of the socio-religious use of the term *kopher*, with which we have become familiar from the Old Testament. The use of *le* governing the sins after the noun *kopher* is not found in the Old Testament. It is, however, found after the verb *kipper* in Num 35: 33, in close connections with the *kopher* idea, as the context shows.

17: 12 contains some lacunae, but it is probable that God is the subject of the verb, and that this is followed by *be'ad* governing the sins to be forgiven. The influence of Ex 32: 30 would then be present again, but the change of subject from Moses to God would indicate that this passage has been re-interpreted in the light of its sequel in 34: 7, where God proclaimed as the one who is merciful and forgives. Thus in 1QH 17: 12 Moses, instead of atoning for Israel, proclaims that God atones. The principle behind this interpretation is that, if man is said to forgive, this means that he proclaims God's forgiveness.[30]

In 1QH fragment 2: 13 there is the Isaianic usage again as in 4: 37, but here we see more clearly the manner in which God's

29   G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Penguin, 1965), p. 202.
30   Cf. 4Q Nab., where a Jewish exorcist is said to have pardoned the king of Babylon. This probably means that by healing the king he effectively assured him of God's forgiveness.

saving righteousness operates in forgiveness: by the spirit of holiness which God himself bestows.

8. *The Manual of Discipline and the Messianic Rule*

1	2	3	4	5	6
1QS 2: 8	God	pi'el (inf.)		dir. obj. your iniquity	
1QS 3: 6		pu'al		man's ways, all his iniquities	*be* the spirit of the counsel of the truth of God
1QS 3: 8		pu'al		his sin	*be* upright and humble spirit
1QS 5: 6	(God)	pi'el (inf.)	*le* all who volunteer		
1QS 8: 6	formed community	pi'el (inf.)	*be'ad* the land		
1QS 8: 10	formed community	pi'el (inf.)	*be'ad* the land		
1QS 9: 4	Community as foundation	pi'el (inf.)		*'al* guilt of transgression	(spirit of holiness, discipline)
1QS 11: 14	God	pi'el		*be'ad* all my iniquity	*be* his great goodness
1QSa 1: 3	Community	pi'el (inf.)	[*be'ad* the la]nd		

The Manual of Discipline (1QS) is a rule in the form of a programme. It purports to give regulations for the life of a community which is to be formed when certain moral conditions obtain amongst those who would become its members. It is clear, however, from the amount of detail in the document as we have it, that the Community was probably already functioning at the time when it was written in its present form. It may be a rule which has grown out of a manifesto. In any case it emerged towards the beginning of the Qumran community's existence and the main manuscript we have, 1QS, has been dated 150-100 B.C. by the palaeographer S. A. Birnbaum. The Messianic Rule, 1QSa, which was first discovered joined to 1QS, is a rule intended for the last days when the whole of Israel was expected to become converted to the Qumran way of thinking.

At first 1QS follows the Isaianic usage which the founder of the Community had already employed in IQH 4: 37. A new feature is that the means of atonement is the spirit which God himself bestowed upon the members, as in 1QH f2: 13. It reflects the type of thinking exemplified in Prov 16: 6, except that the virtues, by which atonement was effected there, would here be ascribed to a spirit sent from God.

The subject of the infinitive in 5: 6 depends upon one's interpretation of the puzzling w"m in the previous line. I have argued elsewhere[31] in support of W. H. Brownlee's suggestion that it is a cipher for the divine title "God of Gods and Lord of Lords".[32] This would make God the subject of *kipper* here. The use of *le*, governing the people who are to benefit from the atonement, is relatively rare. Properly speaking it only occurs in Deut 21: 8 and Isa 22: 14 (in Ez 16: 63 and Num 35: 33 *le* governs the territory and not the people and the construction is a formula involving a second *le* governing the sin). Both of these possible background passages exhibit the prophetic usage in which God is regularly the subject. This circumstance tends to add further support to Brownlee's thesis. The passage would then be stating that God would spiritually circumcise the Community members and thus lay a foundation for Israel in order to atone for all who voluntarily join the Community. The instrument of atonement is the existing Community viewed as a foundation upon which new members can be built. In practice this means the whole "atmosphere" or spirit of the Community. A similar thought has already been expressed in 3: 6.

In 1QS 8: 6, 10 and 9: 4 and in 1QSa 1: 3, however, a distinctive "Serek usage", not found in the Old Testament, is manifest: the Community atones *be'ad* the land. The way this atonement is effected appears to be by the punishment of the wicked as well as by the very existence of the Community as an opportunity for repentance. The concern for atonement for the land by the punishment of the wicked is reminiscent of Num 35: 33, but the use of the preposition *be'ad* is probably intended to add a note of great solemnity to what they are doing. It is a national atonement that is involved and the construction reflects the Old Testament priestly use of *be'ad* governing the beneficiaries and thus intimates the priestly nature of the Community.

In the hymn which concludes 1QS *kipper* is used (11: 14) in a way reminiscent of Ex 32: 30. We have already noted this usage in the hymnic passage 1QH 17: 12.

9. *The Damascus Document* (*CD*)

1	2	3	4	5	6
CD 2: 5	God/his goodness	pi'el (inf.)	*be'ad* the repentant		(God's kindness)
CD 3: 18	God	pi'el		*be'ad* their iniquity	*be* his wonderful mysteries

31   *Atonement Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls*, pp. 122-126.
32   See W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, Translation and Notes* (New Haven, Conn.: A.S.O.R., 1951), p. 19, n. 18 and pp. 49f.

1	2	3	4	5	6
CD 4: 6	God	pi'el	*be'ad* first members		
CD 4: 9	God	pi'el (inf.)		*'al* their sins (of first members)	
CD 4: 9	God	pi'el	*be'ad* later members		
CD 14: 19	(Messiah)	pi'el		dir. obj. their iniquity	
CD 20: 34	God	pi'el	*be'ad* those who fulfil Community programme		(trusting in God's name)

This work is dated by J. Starcky[33] in the Pompeian period. The document takes the form of an ancient covenant between a sovereign and his vassals. It starts (1-8, 19f.) by recounting the saving acts of the King (God). The second part (9-16), outlines the behaviour expected of his faithful subjects (the Qumran covenanters).

A characteristic of the *kipper* usage in CD is the formula: "God forgives *be'ad* the repentant". This formula only occurs once in the whole of the Old Testament: 2 Chr 30: 18. It is thus highly likely that this passage underlies the CD usage. In 2 Chr 30 the construction reflects the priestly awareness of the gross irregularity of the condition of the worshippers, in spite of their repentant attitude. In these circumstances the only resource was the inherent goodness of the character of Yahweh. It is this goodness which is stressed in the context of CD 2: 5, the first instance of the construction. In the rest of the book the same construction is maintained to express the beneficiaries of the atonement (4: 6, 9; 20: 34). This is probably due not only to the continuation of the habit started in 2: 5, but also to the strong feeling throughout the work of Israel's Levitical incorrectness.

In the remaining instances of *kipper* in CD we find three different ways of construing the sin to be atoned. In 3: 18 God forgives (*kipper be'ad*) the sin of the Community, when even this remnant has erred through taking a possessive attitude towards the revelation it had received. The preposition reflects the construction used in Ex 32: 30 and in 1QH 17: 12. It seems to emphasize God's sheer goodness in forgiving.

[33] *R.B.*, 70 (1963), pp. 493f.

In 4: 9 it is stated that as God forgave *'al* the sins of the first members, so he would forgive *be'ad* those who joined later. It appears that the author is using the prepositions with some care. We have already explained *be'ad*. *'al* governing sins and following *kipper* with God as the subject is found in the Old Testament only in Jer 18: 23 and Ps 79: 9. The latter passage is probably more influential here, since Ps 79 concerns the gentile pollution of Jerusalem after its capture by the Babylonians. For Qumran, the period of exile and desolation, which started at that time, had not yet ended. Ps 79 asks the question, "Yahweh, how long?" (vs. 5) and implores God to forgive (*kipper*) his people. CD 4 is aware that there is a fixed time for the desolation of Israel (lines 8-10), but proclaims that God has already forgiven the remnant of Israel who have separated themselves from the surrounding defilement.

The construction in 14: 19 reflects another Old Testament passage about the period of Jerusalem's desolation: Dan 9: 24, where the passage of time is the means of atonement. It is probable that the same means is effective here too, so that the coming of the Messiah is a sign that this period of time has come to an end and the promised atonement effected. There is, of course, mention of Anointed Ones in Dan 9: 25f and it is possible that the author of CD took these to be one person, a priestly and princely Messiah. Because of a lacuna, it is uncertain who is the grammatical subject of *kipper* here. Even if it is the Messiah, as I think probable, the meaning is that the Messiah by his coming demonstrates that God has forgiven Israel.[34]

10. *Other Qumran material*

1	2	3	4	5	6
1QM 2:5	priests	pi'el (inf.)	be'ad God's congregation		(offerings)
1Q34 1:5f	God	kopher	the elect		the wicked
11Q Melch 7f		pi'el (inf.)	'al all the sons...		be plus?
1Q Myst f6:2		pi'el		'al ignorance	
1Q Myst f6:3		pi'el (inf.)	dir. obj. plus?		
1Q DM 3:11		pu'al	absolutely		(Day of Atonement rites)
1Q DM 4:3		pu'al	le them		be it (? shed blood)
4Q Ord 2:2		pi'el (inf.)		le your sins	

---

[34] Cf. *supra*, pp. 152f. and n. 28 for other instances where a human subject of *kipper* signifies only the one who *proclaims* God's forgiveness.

1QM in its present form probably belongs to the Roman period, as Y. Yadin has argued,[35] but it is difficult to date the rest and they are often fragmentary.

Most of this material manifests the Levitical usage in some form. 1QM 2: 5 expresses the Community's expectation of a restoration of pure temple services. The preposition *be'ad* indicates that Day of Atonement ceremonies are chiefly in mind.

11Q Melch contains commentaries on a series of texts centring on a messianic figure who is symbolically referred to as Melchizedek.[36] The texts are mainly passages about the law of jubilee, justice in trying lawsuits and the coming of Israel. Lines 7f. speak of the tenth jubilee "to *kipper* by (*be*) it for ('*al*) all the sons . . ." The use of '*al* indicates that a cultic atonement by this priestly Messiah is probably in mind, although it is also possible that the language of cultic atonement is here used metaphorically for the final forgiveness of Israel to be achieved after the 490 years foretold in Daniel.

1Q Myst is a meditation on the mystery of iniquity and on its ultimate destiny. Fragment 6: 2f seems to be using the language of cultic atonement (perhaps based on Lev 5: 18 and Ez 43: 20 for lines 2 and 3 respectively) to express metaphorically the final conquest of evil in the universe.

IQ DM is an apocryphal little Deuteronomy, mainly concerned with the sabbatical year and the Day of Atonement, which may be linked in the thinking of the Community.[37] 3: 11 clearly refers to the Day of Atonement. 4: 3 is more difficult. The context mentions something being shed on the earth, presumably blood. The *kipper* usage here seems to correspond most closely to Deut 21: 8. One is tempted to interpret this as meaning, "blood guilt will be forgiven them by this means (pouring out the blood in the act of secular slaughter)". This would involve a harmonizing of the teaching of Lev 17: 4 with Deut 12: 21-25 in the light of Deut 21: 1-9. Although this fits in with the immediately preceding context, however, it hardly accords with the remainder of the column which concerns the Day of Atonement rites.

4Q Ord is a commentary on the laws concerning provision for the poor at harvest time and concerning the half shekel. It is uncertain whether the atonement mentioned in 2: 2 is to be achieved through kindness to the poor or through the half shekel as a *kopher*

---

35 *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. by B. and C. Rabin (London: O.U.P., 1962).
36 See J. Carmignac, *R.Q.*, 7 (1970), pp. 343-378.
37 Cf. 1QM 2: 5f. It may also be significant that LXX uses the same word (*aphesis*) for the sabbatical release as it does for the release of the scapegoat.

(cf. 2: 6). The construction used, *le* governing the sins, perhaps reflects Num 35: 33 or Ez 16: 63, but in the fragmentary state of the text it is difficult to offer any good reason for the choice of preposition.

The statement in 1Q 34 1: 5f that God will give the wicked to be "our *kopher*" clearly shows that Isa 43: 3 and Prov 21: 18 were linked in the Community's thinking and that the socio-religious usage was still alive in its midst. The fact that it is God and not man who is giving the *kopher* accords with the fact that in the Community's parlance it is God and not man that is usually the subject of the verb *kipper*.

11. Conclusions

Apart from the material usage (daub, bitumen, henna) we may distinguish four main usages of *KPR* in the Old Testament and three at Qumran: the social, the socio-religious, the prophetic, the Levitical, the Qumranian, the Serek usage and the Damascus usage. Within some of these there are various sub-usages, some of them very important (e.g. the Isaianic within the prophetic usage). The following table sets out all the more important types and sub-types.

	Usage	Main Instances	Subject	Object	Origin
A	social	Gen 32: 21 Prov 16: 14	offender	face *or* wrath of offended	early
B	social (*kopher*)	throughout O.T.	offender	himself, his "soul"	early
C	socio-religious	2 Sam 21: 3	offender's representative		A
D	Mosaic	Ex 32: 30 4Q Dib. Ham. 2: 9	offender's representative	*be'ad* offence	C, entreaty language
E	soc.-rel. (*kopher*)	throughout, except Assyrian	man	his brother, his "soul"	B
F	Isaianic	Isa, D, Pss, Qumran	usually God	*le* person, dir. obj.= sin	prophetism, Assyrian
G	soc.-rel. (*kopher*) Isaianic	Isa 43: 3 1Q 34 1- 5f.	God	the elect	E, F
H	Jeremiah's	Jer 18: 23 Ps 79: 9	God	*'al* sin	prophetism, Levitical
I	Levitical	H, P, Chron-icler, Ezekiel, Qumran	usually priests, means, financer	*'al* persons, *'al* or *min* sins; never dir. obj.= pers. or sin	spiritualized A
J	Levitical territorial	Num 35: 33 Ez 16: 63		*le* territory, *le* sin	

	Usage	Main Instances	Subject	Object	Origin
K	Levitical Assyrian	P, Ezekiel	priests	dir. obj.= sacred objects	Assyrian
L	Levitical solemn	Lev 9:7; 16 Ez 45:17, 1QM 2:5	as I	*be'ad* people	I, D
M	Danielic	Dan 9:24	period of time	dir. obj.= iniquity	F, Lev 26
N	Qumranian	1QH 17:12 1QS 11:14 CD 3:18	God	*be'ad* iniquity	D reinterpreted by Ex 34:6f
O	Serek	1QS, 1QSA	Community	*be'ad* land	J, L, Community's view of its role
P	Damascus	CD	God	*be'ad* repentant	2 Chr 30:18 (a rare form of Levitical)

The apparent Levitical influence upon Jeremiah's usage (*'al* governing the sins occurs in H and sometimes P) may be due to his priestly family connections.

It is difficult to account for the construction in J. Lyonnet (*op. cit.*, pp. 127f) said that in Ez 16:63 the *le* governing the sin is the accusative sign, though he explained Num 35:33 differently. It is more probable that all the instances of *le* here represent the general Levitical avoidance of direct objects.

The boundary between the social and the socio-religious usages is not always easy to determine, since the latter is really a metaphorical application of the former in the sphere of man's relationship with Yahweh. It should also be noted that the Levitical usage, which we have seen to be a unity, is capable of sub-division according to the spheres in which *kipper* is used (e.g. cultic, non-cultic). Yet it is a real unity. Not only are the constructions used uniform throughout, but also every instance, whether "cultic" or "non-cultic", belongs to the sphere of Levitical regulation, with the exception of Ez 16:63 and 2 Chr 30:18 where Israel's failure excludes her from the Levitical provisions for atonement.

The earlier usages did not die out in the course of Old Testament history and in particular the social and socio-religious persisted, especially with *kopher*. Looking at the broad sweep of the development, we can discern—

(a) an original Hebrew social usage, where the verb means to appease. The word was beginning to be used in the religious sphere, but Yahweh never appeared as the direct object.

(b) the later Isaianic usage, probably based on an Assyrian word for "purify", where the word means to cleanse or forgive.

There is an obvious tension between a and b: does *kipper* mean to propitiate, or to be propitiated, to forgive, or to obtain forgiveness? The result of this tension seems to be that *kipper* came to be used in a more flexible way. In the Levitical literature, it does not really mean "appease", for God is never the direct object. Yet it could often be rendered "make an appeasement" or "make propitiation". At Qumran, on the other hand, God is frequently the subject and the verb must often be translated "forgive". Sometimes the Community or the Messiah is the subject, apparently because these human atoners are the sign or instrument of God's forgiveness. Qumran seems to be less conscious of *kipper* as the giving of a *kopher* than the Old Testament was. At Qumran the atoning gift is mostly the spirit of holiness within the Community, but whenever this is construed with *be* after *kipper* it should be seen only metaphorically as a *kopher*, for it is really God's gift to man. A Levitical usage survived at Qumran in connection with their expectations of restored temple services. In some of the fragmentary material, however, it is uncertain whether Levitical terms are being used in a literally cultic sense, or as metaphors for some non-cultic means of atonement.

The findings of the present study agree on the whole with the dates we have assumed for the composition of the various documents of the Old Testament. The method of following the usual "critical orthodoxy" in this respect has had the advantage of giving us a block of generally admitted early material with which to start, in the light of which it was reasonable to interpret whatever followed. It is interesting to note, however, that we have found P's concept of *kipper* to be closer than the Isaianic to the earlier, social usage (except for the occasional use of *'eth* governing a sacred object, which resembles the Assyrian). This would seem to lend support to the view that the tradition underlying P is far older than the Exile. Furthermore, the usage of *kipper* throughout the book of Isaiah is a unity.[38]

To return to the differing views of Morris and Lyonnet with which we opened the present discussion, I would like to make the following points in conclusion.

(a) Morris is supported by the fact that *kipper* was originally linked with *kopher* in the social sphere from the earlier times. The link is also manifest in the socio-religious sphere in the Priestly Code. With the exception of Isa 28: 18, *kipper* always retains overtones of the putting away of wrath, both in the Old Testament and in the Qumran literature. The idea of a gift of appeasement (*kopher*), however, is by no means always present.

(b) Lyonnet is supported by the fact that the verb can seldom

---

[38] Cf. the use of the phrase, "the Holy One of Israel" throughout the Isaianic corpus.

be translated as "appease" and must often be rendered "cleanse", "forgive" etc. The Isaianic usage on which he bases much of his argument, however, did not emerge until the Assyrian period.

(c) There are many more usages than the two or three envisaged by Morris and Lyonnet. The latter's "profane" usage tapers off into what we have called the "socio-religious". Consequently the "profane" should not be hastily excluded from the discussion.

(d) Expiation and propitiation. Each implies the other. Expiation is making up for the offence. Propitiation is satisfying the person who has been offended. There can be expiation without propitiation only if the offended person is implacable and demands more than what is right. In the case of Yahweh this is unthinkable. There can be propitiation without expiation only if the offended person is too easily satisfied, but the God of Israel was not to be manipulated in this way. Atonement is a product, not of folly, but of the divine wisdom, whereby he "seeks out devices, lest the banished one be expelled from him" (2 Sam 14: 14).

(e) Lyonnet has spoken of expiation as "removing sin", but it is not clear what meaning can be attached to this term, if propitiation is excluded or subordinated to the idea of expiation. Sin is patently *not* removed in the literal sense by any of the means of atonement usually mentioned in the Old Testament. It is clear, however, that the guilt and punishment of sin are so removed, but this surely involves Yahweh's attitude to the sinner, hence propitiation. Lyonnet's contrast with pagan cults which sought to propitiate their deities through sacrificial bribery is, of course, very valid. Israel's cult was of God's provision, not man's, and the very fire which consumed their sacrifices had to be provided from heaven. God is never said to be propitiated in atonement, as if man is altering his mood.

(f) The denotation of the verb *kipper* should be distinguished from its connotation, which we have sometimes called its "overtones". The denotation differs widely according to the subject and the direct object of the verb. If man is the subject and a man's face, or wrath, the direct object, it denotes appeasement or propitiation. In religious contexts, where man is the subject and there is no direct object, it can mean "to make propitiation", absolutely, the prepositions *le*, *'al* and *be'ad*, with sins or sinners, having the loose sense of "concerning". If man is the subject and sin the direct object, it means "to expiate". If God is the subject and man or sin the direct object, it means "to pardon". This wide range of possible denotations is due to the term's dual Israelite and Assyrian ancestry.

In spite of this wide range of *denotations,* we have maintained that there is a unity of *connotation* throughout. The term always

implies a change from wrath to favour. There is only one exception (Isa 28: 18), but the persistence of the social usage ensures that this does not remove the connotation of propitiation in the subsequent development. Wherever this exists, there is also present a connotation of expiation. In Isa 28: 18 the deadness of the metaphor excludes not only propitiation, but also expiation. It should be remembered that a word can have many connotations, though only one denotation in any given instance.

Because *kipper* usage had a dual ancestry, the word denoted sometimes propitiation and sometimes purging. It could not denote both in the same instance, but it could *connote* both of these ideas at once and it is the connotation rather than the denotation of this word which has provided its core of meaning common to all instances. The two examples of *kipper* (underlined), given below in their immediate contexts, from the A.V., may serve to illustrate the constant presence of these overtones of acceptance and of cleansing, of the removal both of wrath and of sin, which characterized Israelite language about atonement.

"Iniquities prevail against me: as for our transgressions, thou shalt *purge* them away. Blessed is the man whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts" (Ps. 65: 3f.).

"But he, being full of compassion, *forgave* their iniquity, and destroyed them not: yea, many a time turned he his anger away, and did not stir up all his wrath" (Ps. 78: 38).

Loyola College, Montreal