

The Scapegoat

Paul Wyns

Etymology

The etymology of the name *‘Ăzâ’zêl*, cited four times in Leviticus 16 has long been a source of puzzlement. The lots were cast for two goats, one was “for *Yabweh*”, and the other “for *‘Ăzâ’zêl*” (the scapegoat) – in itself this parallelism would suggest that *‘Ăzâ’zêl* is a name. D. P. Wright notes four proposals:¹

- 1) a precipice or cliff face
- 2) the name of a demon
- 3) an abstract noun for “destruction”
- 4) a descriptive noun meaning “scapegoat”

The reasons for these proposals are as follows:

1) The scapegoat was released *alive* in the wilderness; however, by the first century the custom was changed and the scapegoat was thrown from a cliff (to prevent it returning?). According to Talmudic interpretation,² the term *‘Ăzâ’zêl* designated a rugged mountain or precipice in the wilderness from which the goat was thrown down.

2) The Book of Enoch brings *‘Ăzâ’zêl* into connection with the Biblical story of the fall of the angels; he becomes the leader of the rebellious angels.³ First century Jews thought of *‘Ăzâ’zêl* as denoting a demonic, satanic power in opposition to God. Alternatively, the medieval commentator, Ibn Ezra, proposes that *‘Ăzâ’zêl* belongs to the class of

¹ *ABD* 1:536-537.

² *b. Yoma* 67b, cf. *Sifra* Lev 16:10, *Ps.-J* Lev 16:10.

³ *1 Enoch* 8:1, 9:6, 10:4-6, 14:5, 38:1.

“*se'irim*,” goat-like demons¹ that haunt the desert, to which the Israelites were wont to offer sacrifice.

3) This suggestion is proposed in BDB and derived from the ideas of “strength” (*ʿaz*) and “removal” *ʾāzal* (to go away, remove).

4) This interpretation is derived from the similarity to the Hebrew *ʾēz* (goat) and *ʾāzal* (to go away, remove) – the scapegoat of the Septuagint.

In addition to these suggestions, more recently, Jacqueline C.R. De Roo proposes on the grounds of textual, semantic, and contextual evidence that *ʾĀzāʾzēl* is a metathesized form of *zāl* and interprets it as a reference to ‘the powerful wrath of God’.²

Proposal

ʾĀzāʾzēl was originally a cognate derived from the roots *ʾāzar* and *ēl* – meaning: *God helps*. The difference between *ʾĀzāʾzēl* and these roots (one letter) is accounted for – either by a copyist error, or more likely, a deliberate manipulation. The hypothetical form *azarel* עֲזָרֵל (God helps) is virtually identical to *azazel* עֲזָזֵל.

¹ The first appearance of *śāʾ ʾîr* occurs in Lev. 17:7, which states that sacrifices for the “goat idols” (NIV) or “goat demons” (NASB) are strictly forbidden. The mention of “goat demons” or devils [literally “hairy ones”] directly after the atonement chapter suggests that the unclean scapegoat became an object of worship. Similarly, the golden calf incident was probably a falsification of the calf-faced cherubim; “*And he ordained him priests for the high places, and for the devils, and for the [statues of] calves which he had made*” (2 Chron 11:15).

² Jacqueline C. R. De Roo, *Was the Goat for Azazel Destined for the Wrath of God?* (*Biblica* 81 (2000): 233-242 n.p. [cited 25 April 2007], Online: <http://www.bsw.org/project/biblica/bibl81/Ani06m.html>)

Scapegoat Typology

Paul Wyns

Yom Kippûr Typology in the Old Testament

Scapegoat typology permeates the Old Testament; Cain is the primary example of being cast away from the divine presence: *“A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth”* (Gen 4:12). However, his banishment did not mean exclusion from divine care, nor did it negate the possibility of restoration. The Law, and particularly the Day of Atonement, made no provision for capital sins, such as murder or adultery; King David committed both these sins, and like Cain was sent away from the divine presence; *“And David went up the ascent of the Mount of Olives, and wept as he went up”* (2 Sam.15:30). He sent the Ark of the Covenant back to the sanctuary, fully realising the extent of his estrangement: *“And the king said unto Zadok, carry back the ark of God into the city: if I shall find favour in the eyes of the Lord, he will bring me again, and shew both it, and his habitation”* (2 Sam.15:25). This was a terrible punishment for David, and is reflected in his penitentiary Psalms: *“Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me”* (Ps.51:11).

Although he was punished, David was forgiven and restored to favour (forgiveness and restoration occurred *outside* the law, for the law could not save David, only condemn him). Earlier in his reign David himself had exercised forgiveness, when one of his sons had murdered the other; his military captain, Joab, perpetrated a ruse (employing an old woman) to remind David of God’s concern for restoration: *“Neither doth God respect any person: yet doth he devise means, that his banished be not expelled from him”* (2 Sam.14:14).¹

¹ The background to this quote is a ruse perpetrated by Joab. It involved an old woman seeking justice from David. She told him the story of her two sons, one whom had killed the other and who was now himself in danger of being killed by the rest of the family (the avenger of blood),

The individual examples of Cain and David are applied to the whole nation - also sent away from the divine presence into exile; "*And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face*" (Ezek. 20:35). The release of the sin-bearing scapegoat into the wilderness becomes a metaphor for the nation, alienated and exiled because of their sin; "*My God will cast them away, because they did not hearken unto him: and they shall be wanderers among the nations*" (Hos 9:17).

Yom Kippûr Typology in the New Testament

Tertullian interprets the two goats of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:5-28) typologically to argue that two advents of Christ were prophesied in that text.¹ Tertullian's interpretation fails to understand the theology of

leaving her childless. The object of the ruse was to make David forgive his son Absalom for murdering his half-brother Amnon, David's other son, and to restore Absalom from exile. There is no doubt that Joab was playing on David's guilt, as he was aware of David's sin with Bathsheba and employed this to manipulate him for his own nefarious ends. The two sons in the old woman's story are based on *Cain and Abel*: the phrase "*in the field*" demonstrates this, as it is unique to the Samaritan Pentateuch's narrative of Gen.4:8 (Cain murdered Abel in the field), although it has dropped out of the Masoretic text.

¹ Geoffrey Dunn compares Tertullian's rhetorical use of Leviticus 16 to those of Barnabas and Justin's Dialogus. In Barnabas the goats are not two advents, but rather Jesus' suffering both as sacrificial victim and as the rejected one, whereas Justin's Dialogus explicitly links the goats to Jesus' two advents. In Justin and Tertullian, the second goat "was a typological reference to the first coming of Jesus . . . while the first goat referred to the second coming of Jesus"; both authors used this

Yom Kippûr - it focuses on the sin-bearing quality of the scapegoat and neglects the banishment (exile) from the divine presence. The scapegoat is not a *substitute* for the nation – it *represents* the nation (or individual) who is alienated and exiled from the divine presence because of sin. Jesus was never alienated from God because of *personal sin*; neither can his death be considered an exile as the consequence of personal sin. Jesus was not the scapegoat, he was the “goat for *Yahweh*,” destined for sacrifice not for release. Second Temple Judaism had introduced the innovation (contrary to the atonement ritual) of killing the scapegoat by casting it from a cliff: “*And they rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong. But he passing through the midst of them went his way*” (Luke 4:29, 30). They sought to identify Christ with the goat “for *‘Ăzâ’zêl*”, but God would not allow it for three reasons:

- It was not yet his time.
- The scapegoat was never killed.
- He was not the goat for *‘Ăzâ’zêl* , he was the goat for *Yahweh*.

The Fourth Gospel combines the typology of Atonement and Passover with the release of Barabbas (John 18:39-40; the scapegoat) and the death of Jesus (the goat for *Yahweh*). Barabbas means the “son of the father”; he was incarcerated because of rebellion and released by Pilate - the other “son of the Father” was innocent and is sacrificed. Clearly, both men typified different principles – this excludes the scapegoat (goat for *‘Ăzâ’zêl*) from typifying Christ.

interpretation against the Jewish contention that "Jesus could not be the Messiah because he did not come victoriously. Geoffrey Dunn, *Two Goats, Two Advents, and Tertullian's Adversus Iudaeos* (Augustinianum 39, 1999), 245-264

The Commentary of Jesus on Yom Kippûr

The words of the Lord Jesus Christ on the atonement ritual are paramount to our understanding, and are an incisive commentary on Second Temple Judaism. His commentary is to be found in Luke 11:21-26 in the form of a prophetic parable (parallel accounts Mk.3:9-30; Mtt.12:22-37). The context is the accusation that he is casting out evil spirits by the power of Beelzebub – the prince of demons. This was an *unforgivable* accusation for they were blaspheming the Holy Spirit. Jesus highlights the Day of Atonement themes concerning *forgiveness of sins* and *repentance*. This is reinforced in Matthew (12:38-42, parallel Luke 11: 29-32) by the saying about the men of Nineveh and the queen of the South, who would rise up and condemn that generation.

Custom dictated that the book of Jonah¹ was read in full on the Day of Atonement – and it still is to this day. The theme of the book of Jonah

¹ The Fourth Gospel employs the thematic of atonement by alluding to Jonah alongside elements associated with atonement theology including the deaths of Nadab and Abihu and the murderer Cain.

John 7:51-8:44	<i>Yom Kippûr</i>
Out of Galilee no prophet (Jhn.7:52).	The prophet Jonah came from Galilee and was read every <i>Yom Kippûr</i> .
The adulteress forgiven (Jhn.8:3-11).	Expiation of sins on <i>Yom Kippûr</i> .
I do always those things that are pleasing to him [Yah] (Jhn.8:29).	Nadabiah- willing for Yah.
We have one Father even God (Jhn.8:41).	Abiyahu –Yah is my Father.
Your Father a murderer from the beginning (Jhn.8:44).	Cain –sent away from the sanctuary because he murdered his brother.

was seen as suitable to the ritual, for it recounts the repentance of Nineveh at the miraculous appearance of Jonah, after being dead three days in the belly of the whale. Temple sacrifice was still practiced in the time of Jesus, but after the destruction of the temple the book of Jonah would occupy an even more prominent position in the atonement liturgy. To the Jews it came to signify that sacrifice was not necessary for forgiveness, merely repentance. Bearing the context in mind, the passage reads as follows:

“When a *strong* (man) armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: But *when a stronger* than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. He that is not with me is against me: he that gathereth not with me scattereth. When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through *dry places*, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. And we he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first.”

The background of the parable is the Day of Atonement ritual. The unclean spirit symbolises “*all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins*” (Lev.16: 21), which are sent into the wilderness (dry places) seeking rest. In the original Greek the word “man” is absent (denoted by italics in the AV): “*When a strong fully armed guardeth his palace his goods are in peace.*” The scapegoat *‘Azâ’zêl* carried the meaning of *strong* after the exile (although this was probably a corruption of the original meaning). The house into which the unclean

spirit returns was the temple; note that the unclean spirit refers to it as *my house*.¹

When he returned to his house he found it “*swept and garnished*.” This is a reference to the *feast of unleavened bread*. The Jews were commanded to remove the leaven from their houses (Ex.12:15) in preparation for the Passover. Jesus Christ had “swept” the temple and cleansed it just before the Passover (John 2:13-16). The final condition of the “strong” is *complete madness* (seven unclean spirits).² This is obviously a reference to *Legion* an acted parable that bears many similarities with the “strong” in this chapter. In the parallel account in Marks gospel Christ says the following: “Verily I say unto you, all sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation” (Mk.3:28, 29).

We note that this passage is about forgiveness (Day of Atonement) and that it contains an oblique reference to Enoch.³ The book of Enoch

¹ Jesus said, “*Your house* (Mtt.23:38) is left desolate” – it was no longer his Fathers house.

² The exorcism in Acts 19:13-20 is interesting in this context. Note the term “vagabond” Jews in v.13. This is a reference to Cain condemned to the land of Nod (wandering) – he would be *a vagabond in the earth* (Gen.4:14). Note also the reference to the “seven sons” of Sceva the chief priest. They attempted to exorcise the “strong man” but could not. The “seven sons” in this incident are obviously a reference to the high priest 1. Annas and his dynasty. (2. Eleazar son of Annas, 3. Caiaphas son-in-law of Annas, 4. Jonathan son of Annas, 5. Theophilus son of Annas, 6. Matthias son of Annas, 7. Annas son of Annas)

³ Although the Greek spelling of the name Enoch is different, it is phonetically similar, a fact that would not be lost to the listening audience.

influenced Jewish theology on the Day of Atonement. The only occasion where the book of Enoch is quoted is Jude 14: “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgement upon all, and to convict all works of ungodliness which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.”

In the book of Enoch, *‘Ăzâ’zêl* was understood as the embodiment of evil – synonymous with the devil, Satan, or a fallen angel. The Day of Atonement ritual entailed sending the goat to *‘Ăzâ’zêl* (strong one) in the wilderness and sacrificing the other to Yahweh.

The parable of the wandering spirit can be paraphrased as follows:

ACCUSERS: You cast out devils by Beelzebub (...by *‘Ăzâ’zêl*, or by Satan etc).

JESUS: Tells them a parable about the Day of Atonement: “The strong one” has been sent away by one who is stronger. Those who make such accusations will not be forgiven (no Day of Atonement for them) in fact even their own book of Enoch will condemn them for their hard speeches against him – the Ninevites who repented at Jonah’s preaching (which book they read on atonement) will also condemn them.

Conclusion

The scapegoat represents a sinful state of alienation and exile from God – as such it represents the nation. The condition is, however, not irredeemable.

The Day of Atonement

Paul Wyns

Introduction

The Day of Atonement is a complex subject. The problem addressed in this article is: If the Day of Atonement is a post-exilic feast, does it have an origin rooted in the history of Israel - as does, for example, the Passover?

The Day of Atonement in Genesis

Analysis using historico-critical methodologies has led scholars to the conclusion that the Day of Atonement is essentially a post-exilic feast,¹ for the Fast is only mentioned in Leviticus. Nehemiah makes no mention of it when he read the Law to the people, and the earliest mention of public fasting is in the post-exilic book of Zechariah (7:35, 8:19). Ezekiel on the other hand enjoined two atonement days—the first day of the first month and the first of the seventh (Ezek 45:18-20), the ritual being different to that described in Leviticus.

While, it is true that the Fast is not explicitly mentioned in the Pentateuch (except for Leviticus) it forms an intrinsic thematic backdrop to one of the earliest Biblical narratives; that of Cain and

¹ According to E.O. James, *Seasonal Feasts and Festivals* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1963), 119, *Yom Kippur* is of a later origin, although he believes that the symbolism was borrowed from earlier sources; he speculates as follows: “In the book of Ezekiel the sanctuary is said to have been cleansed twice a year--on the first day of the first month and on the first day of the seventh month --but no mention is made of the Day of Atonement as described in the Levitical narrative. Therefore, the post-exilic observance would seem to have been an addition to the autumnal festival after the return from Babylon when the Jewish calendrical sequence was established, the symbolism of which was borrowed from earlier sources”.

Abel. Despite the consignment of Genesis 4 to the earlier pre-exilic Yahwist sources¹ it contains many cultic overtones – the offering of sacrifices, the priestly function of the two brothers,² and the banishment of Cain from the ‘presence’ of Yahweh.³ J. Moster⁴

¹ Standard critical scholarship has divided the sources of the Pentateuch into four main sources dubbed “J”, “D”, “E” and “P”. Whereas the Yahwist (J) source is considered to be earliest and largely anthropomorphic, the (P) Priestly source is thought to be concerned with stressing cultic elements – however, literary criticism, particular the presence of chiasm, indicate that consignment to separate sources is an over simplification.

² Bruce K. Waltke comments in “Cain and his Offering”, *WTJ* 48 (1986): 363-372, “The unity of the Pentateuch also enables us to discover, interpret, and validate clues regarding the brothers as priests. Leviticus 8-9, 26 teaches that the priest's character qualified him or disqualified him from the altar. An encroacher, be he Israelite or non-Israelite, must be put to death. In this light, the statement in vv. 4-5 that the Lord accepted one priest, Abel, and rejected the other, Cain, takes on new significance. Whereas the text explicitly characterizes Abel's offering, and more or less infers Cain's, it dwells on Cain's character, and more or less infers Abel's”.

³ In Gen 4:16 – the “presence” (לפני, “from-before”) suggests that the offerings were brought to a sanctuary. The mention of *Sin* in Gen 4:7 is usually understood as a zoomorphism but this no more than an educated guess; the ellipsis must be supplied in order to understand the Hebrew idiom as – the *sin-offering* laid at the *door* (לפתח) of the sanctuary. The same words are used in Lev 16:7; “And he shall take the two goats, and present them *before the* (לפני) *Lord* at the *door* (לפתח) of the tabernacle of the congregation”.

⁴ J. B. Moster, “Cain: Why Is He Featured So Prominently in the Bible?” *JBQ* 24 (1996), 238. Cain goes through the following six-step cycle: (1) He sins; (2) He leaves a safe environment; (3) He enters a

recognizes the importance of the Cain Narrative as a Biblical 'introductory story', as the pattern is repeated many times in the Bible in the lives of individuals and the nation. However, most scholars neglect to make the connection with Day of Atonement typology, where one goat is slain at the sanctuary (Abel) and the other is sent away (Cain). Furthermore, the offering of the *wrong sacrifice* (as Cain did) is integral to the genesis of the atonement ritual.

The Day of Atonement in Exodus

Although the Fast is not specifically mentioned in Exodus, it is alluded to in Exodus 30: 8-10. A cursory examination shows that the first half of the chapter concerns both the construction of the altar of incense and atoning for it, and the latter half concerns the payment of atonement money as a ransom for the male population whenever a census was taken. The Day of Atonement was not initially introduced with the other feasts but the mention of atonement in connection with the altar of incense reflects the essential historical core that later developed into *Yom Kippûr*: "And when Aaron lighteth the lamps at even, he shall burn incense upon it (altar of incense), a perpetual incense before the Lord throughout your generations. Ye shall offer *no strange incense thereon*, nor burnt offering nor meal offering; neither shall ye pour drink offering thereon. And Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it **once in the year**: with the blood of the sin offering of atonement: once in the year shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations: it is most holy unto the Lord." The expression "*once in the year*" demonstrates that we are dealing with ceremonial elements usually associated with the Day of Atonement; however, the full rite is not introduced in Exodus. The stress is on atoning for the incense altar,

hostile environment; (4) While in the latter, God protects him; (5) He parts from God; and (6) He ends up in favourable circumstance.

whereas in Leviticus it is on entering the inner sanctuary to atone for the people's sins.¹

Leviticus

Although the Feast of Passover was instituted *before* the giving of the law, it was nevertheless incorporated into the Sinai covenant. The Passover traces its historical origins to the deliverance from Egypt and although (like Tabernacles) it may have older associations with harvest festivals it was the defining historical reality of the Egyptian deliverance that gave the Feast true meaning - the offering of the 'first-fruits' became a rite that was rich, not just with agricultural significance, but with theological symbolism - a thanksgiving festival for saving the 'first-born.'

Although the Day of Atonement is anticipated in the Cain narrative and in the account of the construction of the incense altar in Exodus - it is not explicitly enumerated among the Feasts until Leviticus. The reason for this omission is that the Fast was instituted *after* the giving of the Sinai covenant, for the historical core that gave rise to Fast was the contamination of the altar of incense² by the sons of Aaron.

¹ The expression 'once a year' is used in Lev 16:34 in connection with atonement for the sins of the people (rather than for the incense altar). The New Testament picks up on this expression: "But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people" (Heb 9:7). The author to the Hebrews is using the atonement ritual as a metaphor to stress the unique, never-to-be repeated, effectiveness of the sacrifice of Christ. The Day of Atonement was, of course, repeated every year, but that does not diminish the analogy.

² The altar of incense is associated with the cessation of the Aaronic priesthood - the death of the first two priests to inherit the office, but also with the announcement of the birth of the last legitimate Aaronic priest - John the Baptist (Lk 1:10, 18, 20).

In Leviticus 10, we are informed how Nadab and Abihu are struck down when they offered strange fire on the altar of incense. It is this incident that gave rise to the necessity to cleanse the sanctuary. Our suspicion is confirmed by the opening words of the Atonement chapter,

“And the Lord spake unto Moses *after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they offered before the Lord and died*; and the Lord spake unto Moses, speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place with the vail, before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark; that he die not: for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat.” Lev 16: 1, 2

The passage implies that the sons of Aaron penetrated into the “Most Holy” after offering “strange fire.” Schneir suggests that the death of Aaron's sons was a tragic accident - they were engulfed in flames from the unexpected flash fire of their new and untried mixture of flammable incense.¹ However ingenious this is extremely unlikely, as the prohibition on drinking alcohol (Lev 10:9) during the performance of priestly duties demonstrates that it was a deliberate act while in a state of intoxication.² The similarities with Cain deliberately bringing the ‘wrong’ sacrifice are obvious.³

¹ L. Schneir, “Sense and Incense”, *JBQ* 21 (1993): 242-247.

² As a priest on duty, Jesus Christ refused to drink wine again (after the last supper) until the establishment of the kingdom (Matt 26: 29).

³ Many commentators regard the divine rejection of Cain's worship as a mystery, or worse, as an arbitrary or capricious act by God - Christadelphians have long recognised that Cain knew that blood sacrifice was required to cover sin (Gen 3:21) and that the ground (and its produce) was under a curse (Gen 3:17) - God would not accept what had been grown ‘in the sweat of thy face’ (justification by works) as *a sin offering* (although agricultural produce was sometimes offered

The smoke from the altar of incense represented prayer rising up to God (Pss 141:2), it is this prayer that allows man into the presence of God, but only if the incense is kindled by fire taken from the brazen altar in the outer court. The brazen (sacrificial) altar in the outer court had *already been atoned for* (Exod 29: 36, 37) and was therefore holy. To the ancient Israelites it was clear that man could only enter into the divine presence through prayer that was sanctified by an atoning sacrifice. Moreover, it was God, not man, who determined the manner in which he was to be approached.

The Aaronic priests acted as mediators for, and representatives of, the people; therefore their actions defiled both the sanctuary, and the people. Aaron and the priests were forbidden to mourn for Nadab and Abihu, instead; *“Let your brethren the whole house of Israel bewail the burning which the Lord hath kindled”* (Lev 10:6).

Conclusion

While standard critical scholarship assigns development of the Day of Atonement to the post-exilic period, we would argue that the *form* of the “Cain and Abel” narrative and the Altar of Incense ritual in Exodus both constitute evidence of the existence of a Day of Atonement earlier than the post-exilic period.

The Day of Atonement was instituted in the first instance in order to cleanse the sanctuary, the people and the priesthood from the sins of

together with blood sacrifice, or for different occasions). Garry Herion comes to a similar conclusion regarding the cursed ground in his essay; “Why God Rejected Cain's Offering: The Obvious Answer” in his *Fortunate the Eyes That See* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 52-65. It was therefore a deliberate, pre-meditated act of defiance on Cain’s part – did the sons of Aaron purposely get drunk in order to work up the courage to offer strange fire?

Nadab and Abihu. The “affliction of the soul” that forms such an integral part of the ceremony found its origins in the people’s mourning for the deaths of the two priests. The sin involved the whole nation, not just the two perpetrators – for the people no longer had access to the contaminated sanctuary. It demonstrated both the limited efficacy of the Aaronic priesthood and the necessity for the repentance from *national sin*. It was instituted as a constant reminder of these principles – looking forward to a time when a greater priest would make atonement ‘*once and for all*’ for the sins of the people.