

Kippurim

'At-one-ment' is, actually, what the word is supposed to express, whatever exactly that might mean. That concept, undefined as it is, has been attached to the word *kaphar*. But *kaphar* is also supposed to mean 'cover'. So - 'cover', sometimes; and 'at-one-ment' at others. There do not seem to be any rules as to when the word is one meaning and when it is the other. And then that undefined 'atonement' word - a singular word - is attached, also, to the word *kippurim* - which is a plural word. After which, a claim is made - contrary to evidence - that *kippurim* is the same word as *kaphar*, by which, I suppose, an excuse is being made for larding this undefined English word on to two completely separate Hebrew words, both of which are highly significant - or should be, if we are serious about the future of our immortality - in the doctrine that is being taught us.

More than that is the fact that the word *kaphar* has been, repeatedly, translated 'make an atonement' or similar wording, implying that the Hebrew consists of a phrase containing the verb 'to make', then an article, then a noun. This is not so. Underlying this phrase, 'make an atonement' is simply the verb *kaphar*. Given the English wording, one would have expected to see, in the original, the verb *asah* or such, and then the noun form *kopher*. Instead, the original contains just the verb *kaphar*.

It is also noteworthy that nowhere in the English bible does the verb 'atone' ever occur. It seems to have been decided that an 'at-one-ment' shall be 'made' and we are not allowed to know what it means.

Nor are we permitted any explanation as to why, when something is expressed as a noun - or perhaps a participle - in a plural way, why the English remains singular.

All of this is supposed to be instructing me about the way in which God, in the Person of the Son, redeemed an innumerable multitude. Therefore it matters. Therefore I want it cleared up. Even if I were not a beneficiary, I would still want it cleared up. Because I am intensely interested and I would still want to clear it up so that those who *do* benefit from it will understand it better. I think I would feel I had done something worthwhile during these winter months if I were able to achieve that, no matter who does, or does not, actually benefit from the outcome.

Kaphar is a verb. It has no plural. Unless one takes the participle, which may be used as a noun, and pluralises that. Feast is a verb, feasting its participle. 'Their feasting' uses the participle as a noun and 'their feasting' pluralises the participle. Yes, it is true that *kaphar* has twice been translated (wrongly) village (it should be 'city', for it is walled - it is a 'containment') and that is because *keparim*, the genuine participle of *kaphar*, is used in those two places. If *kippurim* were the participle of *kaphar* we would have eleven occasions of *kippurim* in holy scripture. But we do not. We have nine *kippurim* and two *keparim*.

Kippurim cannot be the plural of *kaphar*; *kaphar* is a verb. *Kippurim* cannot be the plural participle of *kaphar*; *keparim* is the plural participle of *kaphar*. There are not two forms of *kaphar*. There is just the one. See later, regarding Maseritic pointing.

The participle of *kaphar*, *keparim*, is seen, twice, in I Chronicles 27:25 and in Song 7:11. The list of locations in I Chronicles is *sadeh*, *arim*, *keparim*, *migdallowt*. The translation of 'village' for *keparim* is incorrect, being disagreeable to the context of a progressive list of fields, settlements, walled cities and strengthened castles. It is also disagreeable to the context of a bridegroom, Song 7:11, who would wish to lodge his bride-to-be in a safe place, that is, not a vulnerable settlement but a substantially protected environment. A garden *enclosed* is my sister, my spouse. It is quite clear that there is a progression from *arim* to *keparim*. It is quite clear from this and other places which I cover in the book 'The Burden of Sins' that *kaphar*, and its noun form *kopher*, is a matter of containment. Not 'cover'.

The noun form, *kopher*, has also, once, been used, in the context of settlement, in I Samuel 6:18 when it is evident that the writer is making plain the disorganised state of the Philistines - that's what it's like, being a Philistine - when he states that they have *mibstar ir*, fenced villages, and *perazi koper* - open cities. If *ir* meant city and *kopher* meant village, then were there no need to add the adjectives, *mibstar* and *perazi*. I assume that through misunderstanding this earlier reference, the translators of the AV

have, therefore, felt it necessary to rearrange the progression, later, in I Chronicles, in an illogical order. *Ir* or *arim*, relates, clearly, to a hamlet or insecure settlement of some kind; *kopher* or *keparim* conveys a settlement of considerable size which one would normally expect to be secure. Such a place would merit the description 'enclosure' or 'containment', unless, deliberately, the adjective *perazi* were applied to it, revealing a disorganised condition.

In I Samuel 6:18, the plural of *kopher* is seen to be not *kippurim* but *koper*.

Nor is *kippurim* the plural of *kephir* which is usually translated as lion or young lion, but once given as villages. The plural of *kephir* is *kepirim*, as seen in the expression *bak-kepirim* which was a veiled threat or a sly challenge made in Nehemiah 6:2 involving an invitation to the plains of Ono, a place where craftsmen were found. The use of the word *kepirim* appears to me to be a veiled play on words, as against *keparim*, and it is clear that Nehemiah took it to be so and did not respond, though it was repeated four times. My own supposition is that Nehemiah was in danger of being confronted by a larger force than expected and that the furnaces of the burly craftsmen would be a suitable place to dispose, secretly, of a body or two. Maybe I am just a suspicious type of person. In which case I am in good company - the company of Nehemiah.

The text should, in my view, reflect the play on words in some way. But English does not have a similar juxtaposition of lion and village to make that feasible, without it being clumsy. Perhaps a mind more adept than my own will supply the necessary play on words. What it does tell us, for now, is that *kippurim* is not the plural of *kephir*, either.

It is apparent to myself that the Holy Spirit has deliberately inspired the writer of I Samuel to use the noun '*kopher*' in relation to Philistine disorganisation, but has then, just as deliberately, inspired the writer of I Chronicles and inspired Solomon in his Song of Songs to use the participle of *kaphar*, in order to avoid, firstly, a relationship of Philistine to the verb *kaphar* which has been used more exclusively in connection with the concept of containment in a spiritual sense; and in order, secondly, to maintain such a relationship when mentioning matters of provision under David's royal rule and mentioning matters of the Beloved and his bride. Such is the power of the Divine Spirit in inspiration, such is his masterful use of language and such is his sensitivity in all that pertains to that which God redeems and holds precious. To God be the glory, amen.

The propagation of a meaning 'cover' in scripture is wholly foreign to the tenor of scripture whose entire focus is a matter - not of covering up anything, but - of righteousness. This 'cover' concept relates to the idea expressed by the English word 'forgiven' - a meaningless word concocted from two small words, 'for' and 'given' in order to copy the German word, '*vergeben*'. So I am informed. None of this do I find in my bible or in my own soul's experience. My experience has been a matter of righteousness, not a matter of unjust favouritism or a matter of emotional indulgence.

As to the vague word 'atonement' it is said that William Tyndale introduced it into the English translation of scripture. It is true that my own edition of his New Testament translation, that of 1534, does, indeed, in Romans 5:11, contain the word 'atonement', wrongly, as a rendering of *katallage*. (My own wording for *katallage* is 'restoring' but others refer to 'reconciling'.) And my own edition of the Wycliffe translation of 1388 does *not* contain the word 'atonement' in that place, but refers to 'by whom we have received now reconciling'. So perhaps it is correct that it is Tyndale's word.

But this I know of William Tyndale, that, at the still young age of forty two, imprisoned for doing no wrong whatsoever but for providing 'every ploughboy in England' the English translation of the Greek scripture - contrary to the clergy of the day who secreted the original, used Latin sparingly and kept the populace as far from holy writ as possible, so they could enrich themselves by means of a mixture of superstition and religious fear - that, in his distress with sitting alone in the dark in the evenings, awaiting execution, he asked for a candle and for his Hebrew grammar that he might be relieved of his lonely, dark vigil and might, profitably, spend his time.

His request was refused.

Henry the Eighth, King of England, had required Tyndale's extradition from the continent but under an

extant treaty, evidence had been demanded and the request was denied. However, later, by the betrayal of Henry Phillips and under the auspices of Charles the Fifth, the so-called 'Holy Roman Emperor' at the time, Tyndale was imprisoned, then tried for 'heresy' and then executed.

Had he been granted the opportunity, William Tyndale would, without doubt, have continued to strive to express, in English, all scripture as accurately as possible.

As I do, this very day, with tears in my eyes at the thought of his last days on this earth.

As to the AV translation of the Hebrew scripture, the verb *kaphar* is sometimes rendered as 'atone' and the plural noun *kippurim* is eight times rendered as 'atonement'. Once, and once only, *kippurim* is also rendered in the plural as 'atonements'. Strong's concordance tells me that *kippurim* occurs eight times in the bible. The rear of Young's concordance says the same - eight times. But in the body of his concordance, Robert Young lists nine texts containing *kippurim*. I suggest that there is some confusion.

Let us try to be logical, and let us clear up the confusion :

I, personally, accept that there are nine occasions of the use of the word *kippurim* :

Exodus 29:36; 30:10; 30:16(a); 30:16(b).

Leviticus 23:27; 23:28; 25:9.

Numbers 5:8; 29:11.

Let us state some facts in our clearance of confusion :

1. *Kippurim*, a noun, cannot be the 'plural' of the verb *kaphar*.
2. The plural participle of *kaphar* is *keparim*, which is twice translated as settlements of some kind.
3. Nor is *kippurim* the plural of *kopher* or *kephir*, which are *koper* and *kepirim*.
3. *Kippurim* is the plural of a certain noun, yet to be disclosed, or the plural participle of a verb yet to be disclosed.

I understand the singular of *kippurim* to be *kippurah*, a word not used in the bible, for reasons that will become clear. I would not object to the notion that *kippurah* is a verb. Not at all. Then *kippurim* would be its plural participle. But it is not an issue whichever is the case.

Here, I have to say that I do not accept other arguments which are based on Hebrew 'pointing' - the series of dots and other symbols attached to Hebrew letters. Pointing was added to the text about one thousand years after the close of the Hebrew scriptures. Not only so, but the text was without any vowels in its original form. If different forms are suggested for Hebrew verbs, whose forms only differ in the matter of pointing, then I cannot accept such an argument.

I am referring, in particular, to the attempt to invent a connection between *kaphar* and *kippurim* by the doubling of the 'p' in the inflected forms of the verb *kaphar* by the Masoretes, using pointing. The very fact that they attempted to alter holy writ by this means indicates that there is a desperate subterfuge being perpetrated and that there is an insidious desire to bring something into scripture that - *is just not there*. Their '*kipper*' is a red herring. My apologies for the pun; it was just too tempting.

How desperate is this attempt to 'cover' up. For this is what human religion does; and all that it does. It just deceitfully covers up, rather than have the patience and the faith to examine, to appreciate, to understand and *to believe* the gospel of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ which covers nothing up at all but which *demonstrates righteousness* !

I do not believe - and it is not my living experience - that God, the Holy Spirit, that Divine Person who, from within, inspired the mind of one who wrote scripture to write distinct words on parchment, has now left us to wander, confused, in a morass of jumbled data, complicated by historical alterations, contradicted by unspiritual scholars and made impossible to understand due to clouded antiquities.

I believe we have all we need within the pages of the holy writings. I believe that God, the Holy Spirit, will guide the true enquirer, who seeks to worship the one True God. And it is my experience that the

scripture, from within itself, will demonstrate the path to follow - logically and sensibly.

I proceed :

Kippah occurs three times in scripture and is translated 'branch' each time in the AV:
Job 15:32; Isaiah 9:15; Isaiah 9:15.

Thus, *kippah* and *kippurim*, together, occur a total of twelve times - a significant number of covenant.

There is a further word, *agmon*, which is relevant because Isaiah twice uses it in conjunction with *kippah*, branch, and it has bearing on the meaning. The AV offerings on this little word are a curiosity of wonderment, or 'various', if one wants to be polite : bulrush 1; caldron 1; hook 1; and rush 2.

And lastly, there is yet one more word I consider relevant which is *purah*. This noun occurs three times and is translated, a single time, 'bough', once, 'wine' and, once, 'wine press'. There are only these three occasions of its use in the bible. The associated verb is *pur* - translated 'break', 'bring to nought' and 'utterly take' on the three occasions it occurs.

All this might sound a little complicated - but it is not. Not if one progresses logically.
To sum up the words that require to be investigated :

1. Three times we have *pur*.
2. Three times we have *purah*.
3. Three times we have *kippah*.
(Four times we have *agmon* which twice appears in conjunction with *kippah*.)
(The word *kippurah* - a singular noun or a verb - is not used in scripture.)
4. Nine times we have *kippurim*, the plural.
5. Then we have an associated word - *kapporeth*, used twenty seven times.

My understanding of the development of the words from the common root is thus :

- a. The verb *pur* made into a noun = *purah*.
- b. The noun *purah* added to the noun *kippah* = *kippurah*.
- c. *Kippurah* made into a plural = *kippurim*.

(It should be noted that *purah* is used, only three times in scripture, as an originally botanical term.
Thus *kippurah*, thence *kippurim*, would have a similar connotation.)

- d. *Kippurah* made into a structural term, thus a singular noun or adjective = *kapporeth*.

Original Hebrew would have distinguished little between the noun *kphr* - *kopher* without vowels - and the verb *kphr* - *kaphar* without vowels. It is my impression that Hebrew is a highly fluid language, developed from original pictorial form, similar to hieroglyphic, and developed within a nomadic culture whose environment was mostly desert. We can see from the book of Job, which I understand to be the first book of scripture written not long after the Flood, that such men of the time were deeply attached to their rudimentary surroundings and expressed themselves in vivid imagery drawn from their own living experience of botany, agriculture, and biology.

These men gazed at the stars and knew their patterns. These men could sit together for long periods, not speaking, deep in thought. Or they could speak, in order, neither arguing nor interrupting, but rather giving time and space for each to express himself, then allowing silence for an organised and sensible response to be made.

Their language is pictorial, imaginative and profound.
It is not cluttered. It is efficient.

It is neither the language of the cloister, nor the language of the desk. It is the language of men who

struggled for survival in harsh circumstances, who passed their lifetimes without a drop of modern comfort, without an inkling of modern distraction and without a trace of unnecessary technology.

And it is clear to me that Deity has been expressed, in word, in mysterious ways in the Hebrew language. There is deliberate ambiguity in the matter of the covenant made upon earth and the everlasting testament yet to be fully revealed. Surely he is a God that hideth himself, as the prophet says. The superficial, the haughty and the hypocrite shall never find him. He clothes himself with mystery and he speaks dark sayings. He rides upon a cherub and he doth fly.

Kphr, or maybe even just *kpr*, conveys a concept in active mode or in descriptive mode. *Kpprm* is a related, but different concept. And that is all we need to find our way.

So, to sum up the past :

Pur and *purah* have given problems to translators; *agmon*, the associate of *kippah*, has had them totally confounded; and it has been generally accepted that *kippurim* is the associate, not of *kippurah*, but of *kaphar*. Beside all of which, the word 'atonement' is a meaningless word invented by - well, whomever - and then attached to both *kaphar* and *kippurim*, except that it is given in the singular eight times out of nine. And, presumably, therein lies the confusion of eight or nine occurrences.

The term '*Yom Kippur*' is meaningless. '*Yom Kippurim*' is the Hebrew behind the English translation 'day of atonement'. The English, remember, gives the singular, wrongly, eight out of nine times. Some have chosen to shorten '*Yom Kippurim*' to '*Yom Kippur*', possibly in an attempt to singularise it. But there are others who have singularised it to '*Yom Kippurah*', which, at least, is the correct singular, except that such an expression never appears in scripture.

It is not obvious what *kippurim*, the plural form of *kippurah*, actually means. I take it that similarities in context have led men to assume - or to pretend, perhaps - that *kaphar* and *kippurim* are the same word and have led men to gratuitously attach an indiscriminate meaning to both. The meanings are different, and the concepts are delicately spiritual, but men who have misunderstood them have applied a vague concept - 'atonement', whatever it might mean - to the two words. The fact that one of the words is a plural has, largely, been ignored except the once when it might well have caused confusion regarding its numeric occurrences; eight or nine.

The word 'atonement', to me, is quite like the other English words 'repentance', 'redemption', 'forgiveness', 'expiation', 'substitutionary' or 'vicarious' which have become traditionally part of the general vocabulary of preachers and teachers for the past five hundred years or so of the development of the English language. But these are words that, as far as I am concerned, do not actually translate the words that the Holy Spirit has chosen, out of the Hebrew and Greek languages, to breathe into the minds of his chosen vessels who, exclusively, demonstrate the word 'inspiration' in connection with their writing - the word which translates *Theopneustos*, God-breathed.

I find myself using 'redemption' and 'repentance' but I take the time to qualify my usage of the words in order to clarify what the words *should* be understood to mean.

If words do not translate the words which God has inspired, then are these words not among those of which Jesus spoke, Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God. The words which God has spoken convey, if they are understood aright, concepts. In order to have right concepts in the mind, it is necessary to have - and to understand - the correct concepts conveyed by accurate wording. That is, God's wording.

The scriptures were breathed by God himself when holy men were inspired to write them. And if we humbly and diligently seek after him in reverencing his word, then shall we, in his mercy, be aware of his breathings within ourselves as we study what he has breathed within those chosen, separated, sanctified and trusted individuals.

Of course, it must be remembered that the English bible, itself, was not inspired. Just studying it

reveals that the veneration granted to the various English versions is simply not warranted. What was inspired was the collection of original autographs of the prophets and apostles. *That* is what we must always return to in order to clarify exactly what has been delivered to men by *God himself*. And those writings are not in English. At least we have, in our own tongue, a version - the King James Authorised - which was translated from the true text, called the Received Text or the *Textus Receptus*. The English versions after 1881 - the Revised Version and all that have been spawned from it, in deteriorating quality, thereafter - are not translated from the Received Text but from faulty manuscripts previously rejected and, particularly, from the Codex Sinaiticus which would best have been left, and thereafter burnt, in the waste paper receptacle from which it was, supposedly, rescued. Though I have my doubts about the authenticity of that story.

As to traditionally favoured terms like 'vicarious' and so forth, I cannot help but notice that when error has arisen, men have chosen, mostly, to first of all publicise the error in great detail - with which I disagree - and have then chosen, secondly, to think up technical terms which combat the error; terms which are supposed to define truth more clearly in the face of conflicting untruth. With which I also disagree.

I prefer to be aware of error, but to positively state truth as it is conveyed in scripture and with the technical terms actually given to us therein. It is my firm belief that we have already been given all that we need. We need invent nothing new. If we express truth, all the truth, and nothing but the truth, error shall have no foothold to enter in. It shall find no place for the sole of its foot, for the doctrine of Christ - as stated by scripture in its entirety - is like walls around a city and like gates within the walls.

Many of the terms which men have invented against error are, themselves, erroneous. They badly define the truth, because they are reactionary, not logically definitive. Thus, also, terms which convey humanly invented concepts, are also erroneous, for they are not strictly and exclusively attached to concepts which are expressed in the scripture.

If it be the case that the word 'atonement' has been invented to express a certain Hebrew word, well and good. Let us firmly attach that word to the Hebrew word and let that English word be in our mind when we think of the concept that is expressed by the word. But if it be the case - and I believe it definitely is the case - that two concepts have been hidden underneath a word that means, well, whatever it is supposed to mean, then I think we must do something about it.

Which is what I now propose. Let any who disagree with my logic either inform me personally, for I am willing to be corrected if I can be shown to have erred; or let them publish their own findings. But let them not criticise what they have not fully studied, for that is correctly described as 'bigotry'. And let no man slander me in secret. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

I speak as unto wise men; let them judge what I say.

1. First, it is necessary to go back to the beginning and to start again. Which I am content to do.

2. Secondly, kaphar needs to be recovered from the confusion. I have already investigated this word extensively in the book, 'Burden of Sins', Belmont, and I do not need to repeat that work on these pages; I simply refer the reader to it. Basically, my own conclusion, after examining the subject in detail, is that *kaphar*, from *kaph* - the hand - is a matter of containment 'in hand'. A matter has been contained, in the hand of God, prior to its full resolution. It is not contained in the *yad* - the working hand or fighting hand - but in the *kaph* - the vulnerable, sensitive hand. And it is not gripped, but is contained in the way that one would carry water to one's mouth in a cupped hand. As to the whole background of the concept of *kaphar*, I have tried to express it to the best of my ability in the previous book.

I notice, on re-reading that section today, that I had a notion, then, that *kippurim* sprang from *kippah* directly but I concentrated, then, on the word *kaphar* and did not fully pursue *kippurim*. Now I do so.

I see the word *kaphar* as having strong connotation to the word *nasa* - uplift. And these two words

together reveal something that should be borne in mind with regard to such as David who clearly experienced an unburdening regarding his own sins. Some seem to think that God accepted - in antiquity - the blood of beasts as being a satisfaction for sins. The apostolic writer to the Hebrews banishes this very thought from once being in the mind by telling us - quite categorically - 'it is not possible'.

Demonstrated before David's eyes in the temple were sacrifices whose precise mechanics conveyed spiritualities. Understanding those spiritualities, David believed God, and in particular, David - along with Abraham, believed that God himself would, in the future, provide all that was necessary to fulfil his promises regarding his people, their eternal redemption and their eternal inheritance.

But it is not possible that the blood of beasts can take away sin.

Logic cries out that it is just not possible. What the scripture actually teaches me is that David's sins were *nasa* - uplifted - and, being then lifted up from him, were *kaphar* - contained in hand by God - until that time when all would be fully resolved, in righteousness, within Christ at Golgotha.

And I believe that the scripture has taught me more in regard to *pur*, *purah*, *kippah* and *kippurim*. Thus I shall now convey what I have been taught. And then I desire to look at *kapporeth*.

3. Thirdly, *pur* and *purah* need to be examined, each in their three occurrences.

I understand *pur* would be pronounced 'poor', not 'purr'.

a) Ezekiel uses the word in 17:19; Therefore thus saith the Lord Jehovah, I live ! Mine oath that he hath despised and my covenant that he hath, *pur*, broken; have I not put it on his head ? (Young's literal.) I would point out that if one 'breaks' a covenant, one does not actually damage or tear apart the covenant, even if one dramatically tears up the paper on which the covenant is written. One could quite easily destroy the written document and then continue to behave in such a way as to abide by what had been written down.

My point is that one keeps a covenant by one's behaviour. If one's behaviour departs from the conditions of the covenant, then one has broken its terms - by departure.

This is a matter of parting.

b) The writer of Psalm 33 uses the word in verse 10. AV has, 'bringeth the counsel of the heathen to nought'. Young has, 'made void the counsel of nations', in literal. I see the prime example of this at Babel when God, at the first gathering of nations after the judgment of Flood, disrupted their project with the brilliant strategy of multiplying languages, something as yet unknown in the world as it then stood.

No longer able to sensibly communicate with one another, their counsels would have been in disarray.

This is a matter, I would say, of disruption.

c) 'Utterly take' is the translation of the third occurrence. Thus the possessor and the possession would be parted one from another - to the utmost. It is listed in the rear of Young's Concordance as an occurrence but I could not find it in the body of the Concordance as a text, nor could I remember its place in scripture. I found it in Strong's Concordance. It is in the context of God's everlasting covenant, Psalm 89:34.

Psalm 89:33, Young's literal, My kindness I break not from him. AV, My lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him.

My kindness I 'break' not from him expresses that something is growing, attached to the living person. To remove it, would be a surgical manoeuvre.

To sum up the word *pur* - as it is used in scripture :

1. The rebellious of the house of Israel were guilty of wrenching themselves out of the covenant that God had made with their forefathers - Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. And, eventually, God accepted their adultery and was content with a bill of divorcement.
2. When the nations rose up against God in their counsels, God disrupted their counsels and brought them all to nothing.
3. But God's everlasting covenant shall he never rend asunder nor shall he ever surgically remove his loving kindness when he has bestowed it.

I can see, already, the botanical imagery involved in parting, disrupting and abstaining from a surgical process. Bearing in mind what *purah* conveys then let us look at *purah* :

d) Isaiah 10:33 expresses *purah* as the topmost bough which is lopped off by the Lord such that the high ones of stature are hewn down and the haughty are humbled. And there shall come forth a rod out of Jesse and a branch shall grow out of his roots. Rather than the high and lofty of the tree, there shall arise a sprout from its roots.

I understand the *purah* that is lopped off, here, to be the topmost portion of the tree. The 'head' of the tree, as it were. This is a contrast with the shoot that grows out of the roots. The word 'branch' growing out of the roots, is not one of our words here, but is a different Hebrew word conveying the idea of shooting out, not the concept of branching, as such. There should be a distinction made in the English in these types of words, but in the AV it is not so, in this place.

e) Haggai 3:16 records the drawing out of liquor from the 'press'. What is pressed, that is, the contents of the press, is not just grapes. Harvesting grapes is not a matter of plucking individual grapes from twigs. Harvesting grapes is a matter of wrenching clusters of grapes, twigs and all, off the vine. Twigs, leaves and fruit are all tipped into the winepress and trodden down. Liquor is then drawn off from the tap beneath for fermenting and ageing.

The *purah* referred to, here, is a structure of clustered grape, leaf and twig, I take it.

f) The third and last use of the word *purah* in scripture is the most descriptive of all. I have trodden the winepress alone, as we have it in the English bible, Isaiah 63:3. This description, taken up by John in the apocalypse, relates to one who treads down the entire mix of twigs, fruit and juices. It is a vivid image of the pulverising of hard structure, fleshy filling and liquid. The image is of blood being extracted by trampling.

Purah, then, is used botanically in three cases and indicates that which is removed from growing vegetation. What is removed consists of woody stem, leaf and fruit.

4. Fourthly, *kippah* needs to be examined in its three occurrences.

a) Job 15:32 . . . His branch, *kippah*, shall not be green. He shall shake off his unripe grape as the vine and shall cast off his flower as the olive. Here, Eliphaz the Temanite is saying that one who is deceived and trusts in that which is vain shall find that he is recompensed with vanity. He shall not bear fruit. For, before time, he shall lose his fruit the way unripe grapes fall off a withered vine, or the way an olive blossom falls off a faulty bough before it is fertilised to become fruit.

Lack of continuance is here documented. To trust in a vanity is to be as a branch which has no connection to real life. The branch, itself, is detached from what is lifegiving. It is a broken branch. This is pregnant with meaning when one considers the words of Jesus, I am the vine, ye are the branches. To abide in him is to be not as a broken, half-detached or wholly detached, branch. He, himself, is firmly in union with the Father.

Robert Young, in this place, has 'bending branch', I notice.

b) The people turneth not to him that smiteth them, neither do they seek the Lord of hosts, says Isaiah

in 9:13-15. Therefore the Lord will cut off head and tail, branch and rush, in one day. The ancient and honourable - he is the head; and the prophet that teacheth lies - he is the tail. For the leaders of this people cause to err; and the led of them are destroyed.

Head; branch; ancient and honourable; and leaders - are all connected.
Tail; rush; lying prophets; and the led destroyed - are all connected.

This is a matter of headship - and the body. The apparently honourable aged - and the outrageously deceitful. The leaders in control - and those who are led to destruction under them. *Kippah*, in this place, is used by Isaiah in the context of headship and in the context of what follows on from headship in that which is of the body. Both are in view, here.

And there is a subtlety to be seen, here. That which abides in Christ receives of the Life of the Father, in Christ. Those who, thus abiding, minister to the body are not the Head of the body, but are servants to the body. But if such abide not in Christ and still attempt to be the headship and leadership, then the whole shall fail, head and tail, branch and rush. Detached from the Head, they shall - if they attempt to be leaders, become the head. But they are failed; and those who follow them shall share the same failure. Those who abide in Christ and serve the body, shall minister Christ himself to the body. And then shall the body be built up, livingly and fruitfully.

c) Isaiah repeats, in 19:15, his expression - head or tail, branch or rush - in a different context, that of Egypt. And he says that in that day Egypt shall be like unto women. He prophesies of a time when headship is affected and the result is a leaderless situation.

Summing up *kippah*, then, I would say that Job uses the word to demonstrate that if a man places his trust in that which is vain then he will - personally - lose any possibility of future fruitfulness of spirit, or of future enjoyment of that which anoints from the head. Isaiah uses the word in a corporate sense that if the branch of leadership or headship is faulty, then all that attaches to it shall be so and shall suffer the same fate.

Personally, or corporately, one must be found in the proper branch in order to survive and in order to be fruitful. This is quite obviously a matter, as revealed further in the apostolic writings, of headship in Adam and headship in Christ. And these sentiments are expressed, prior to that full revelation, in botanical terms in various scriptures such as Isaiah's prophecy.

As a matter of contrast, the word *agmon* is worthy of note in this place. It has been misunderstood in two of its occurrences, by certain of the AV translators, who did not confer enough to eradicate discrepancies of this kind. It is used by Isaiah in 9:14 and 19:15 as a derogatory contrast to *kippah*. 'Branch and *agmon*, rush', describes the leadership in wording that accepts their necessary existence, but the word *agmon* is more derogatory of them that follow such unworthy leadership. The 'tail' - also a derogatory contrast with 'head' - is the lying prophets.

It is bad enough to be irresponsible when in the leadership of religion, among the respected ruling class. To follow such failed leadership is, well, to be like a rush. If the Emperor has no clothes, best to overcome one's natural politeness, and best do something about it.

Jehovah uses the word *agmon* in Job 41:2, as being the wrong sort of thing to use to draw out a leviathan. It is therefore decidedly *not* a hook. And he uses the word again in verse 20. The AV completely loses sight of the idea here; the individual translator has either forgotten that he already called *agmon* a hook and now calls it a caldron or someone forgot to tell the next shift what happened on his own shift; Young expresses, 'as a blown pot and reeds'. Reeds are being burned and are smoking, underneath the pot, and the pot is steaming on top of them, is what I understand as the imagery.

Jehovah again uses the word *agmon* in Isaiah 58:5 where he describes the hypocritical sham of those who hang their heads in mock humility and make a show of fasting when they turn a blind eye to, or indulge themselves in, oppression and cruelty. Worthless.

In all cases, the word *agmon* is used in a derogatory sense. Reeds are useful only for burning, they have no strength for any other purpose. Branchless, they grow out of the soggy wet ground of the wetlands, independently. They are of no use in combating the force of leviathan, that creature evidently indicative of Satan, Job's adversary. They have no support within a branch. Their life is from the mud. They stand alone, hanging their heads in a pretence, or they follow errant leadership. And they are burnt. Even then, they give off clouds of smoke, ineffectively. Fruitless and useless.

This is a contrast with *kippah* and helps in understanding what *kippah* stands for.

Agmon was never joined to the branch. Weak and vapid, it is burnt. *Purah* has been wrenched away from the branch and is no longer a part of it; lopped off, it is bloodily trampled. *Kippah*, if not abiding, sensibly, in living and responsible headship, shall be counted with *agmon* and suffer the same fate. Head and tail, branch and rush; all is worthless if not solidly founded in absolute unity with the living trunk.

In short, it is *kippurim* that a man needs.

5. So, fifthly, we look at kippurah

My understanding is that the two words *purah* and *kippah* are combined together into one word. A word is created out of both concepts. *Kippah* means, essentially, a matter of that which parts and which then supports. *Purah* conveys the idea of a part of a tree or a vine that consists of woody parts, leafy parts and fruit. Therefore, the combination of the two conveys the entirety of that which parts from the trunk - a branch - and that also contains all that comes out of a branch: the woody twig structure, the leafy parts and the fruit content.

A trunk does not, in the concept of what a tree is, bear leaves or twigs or fruit. Yes, it may sometimes do so in a rather meagre way. But that is not the concept of a tree in our minds. Twigs and leaves and fruit come from a branch, not a trunk, is how we envisage trees.

Thus the word combination *kippah* plus *purah* gives us *kippurah*. But this botanical term is never used in scripture.

Instead, we have *kippurim* - nine times, a highly significant number indeed. And what it represents is, clearly, profoundly important in God's revelation. The day of *kippurim* was the highlight of the Jewish calendar when, once only in the year, the High Priest entered through the second veil into the Holiest of Holies. But this word should - it should - be conveying to our mind something which is, initially, botanical.

To the English ear, as a noun, the word 'branch' describes something woody. It is the wood structure that grows out of the side of a tree. But as a verb it describes the act of parting from something whilst still maintaining the inherent character of that thing and whilst still being attached to that thing.

If one parts from a covenant, one is no longer part of it. 'Depart' would be the correct term, in that type of scenario, not 'branch'. But the words that God, the Holy Spirit, has used indicate to me that those who are part of the everlasting covenant are part of a branching - a branching that is connected in life and thus, a branching that will be fruitful, both personally and corporately.

This idea is also visible, I believe, in what is expressed in connection with 'presbytery' in the Greek. The word *presbeia* which combines an adaptation of the preposition, *pros*, with *beia*, meaning branch, conveys that of an ambassage, or it may be the actual message delivered by the ambassage. The word *presbeia* further combines with *presbutes*, an aged man, into the word *presbuteron* which incorporates both the idea of a branched ambassage which conveys a single message, and also incorporates the concept of aged, sagelike, wisdom.

Here, authority is seen as corporate and the message delivered by the authoritative *presbeia* is one

which is multiple - branched - yet unified. Additionally, the authority is seen, in the presbytery proper, as coming from the honoured place of age, experience and wisdom.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~