

No.  
175.

"IF YE THEN BE RISEN WITH CHRIST, SEEK THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE ABOVE, WHERE CHRIST SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD." COL. 3. 1.

NOTES ON LEVITICUS XVI.

-----  
THE SCAPEGOAT.  
-----

*An Address (revised) at*

Forest Gate, E. 7.

14th August, 1921.

by

PERCY W. HEWARD.

---

MEETING ROOM, 61, Upton Lane,  
FOREST GATE, LONDON, E. 7.

No. 175.

NOTES OF LEVITICUS XVI.

THE SCAPGOAT.

An Address by Mr. Percy W. Heward,  
At Forest Gate, 14th August, 1921.

-----

No. 175.

NOTES ON LEVITICUS XVI. - THE SCAPEGOAT.

An Address by Mr. F. W. Heward  
At Forest Gate, 14th Aug., 1921.

It is delightful, beloved friends, when God the Holy Spirit interprets any portions of Scripture, and particularly we realize this as to any type. We have seen there is no doubt as to the sacrifices of the bullock and goat on the Day of Atonement. They, as the epistle to the Hebrews shows, WERE types of the Lord Jesus Christ. The blood of bulls and goats pictured, although it was contrasted with, His precious blood. We rejoice, therefore, to understand, and to live in the light of the fact that the way into the Holiest is now open, and that those who are in God's family by infinite grace are able to come boldly to the throne of Grace. The work of the Lord Jesus Christ is One Sacrifice for sins for ever, and so those who are redeemed have not only a possible salvation, but a secured and an eternal salvation, that they may act upon their privileges and recognize both their acceptance and their access.

The ONLY difficulty, the GREAT difficulty, is the Scapegoat. Our English translation calls it "the scapegoat". The Holy Spirit calls it the goat for Azazel, and this is wisely put in our margin. Azazel was ~~not~~ said BY THE JEWS to be a place, a mountain. Some placed it near Sinai, and they ADDED a tradition that the goat was taken to a steep cliff, pushed over and dashed to pieces. Always beware of any tradition which adds to the Scriptures. If God is suddenly silent, it becomes us to be silent too. Was the goat a picture of the Lord Jesus Christ? That is our first question. The usual arguments given are these. The goat bore the sins. The goat pictures the work of Christ in taking sin completely away so that it returns no more; and the goat that died, and the second goat, give a twofold view of the Lord Jesus, as the two birds in the cleansing of the leper. But these arguments are not so forcible as at first they appear. It is true that the goat bore the sin, but it is not true

that the goat bore the sin IN DEATH. It is true that the goat did not bring back the sins, but the goat did not come back itself. And if the parallel be taken with the two birds, it falls short in this respect. Moreover, the second BIRD would picture resurrection, and to suggest that in resurrection Christ bears sin is contrary to all the teaching of Scripture. We have further to notice the remarkable SILENCE of Scripture. This goat is nowhere said to be a picture of the Lord Jesus, although the epistle to the Hebrews explains at great length the 16th of Leviticus. Furthermore, that very epistle adds to the testimony from silence, a direct allusion, "Without shedding of blood is no remission of sins" - a principle of the law, a principle which God marks out as a hint to say how we must not interpret the goat. This is the more noteworthy because the place of rejection is brought before us in the epistle to the Hebrews. But is it in connection with the goat cast out? The bodies of those beasts, the living ones, which became a sin-offering, whose ~~xxx~~ blood was brought into the sanctuary, were burned without the camp. "Wherefore, Jesus, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate" Consequently, the "without" of which Hebrews speaks, is not the "without" of the goat that was sent to Azazel, but the "without" of the bodies of those beasts whose BLOOD is brought into the Holy Place. Further, as to the argument from silence - it is worthy of notice, the death of this goat is not mentioned. It is neither glorified, to picture resurrection, nor is it slain to picture death. It is sent away, with a hateful burden upon it. There are other Scriptures which are silent about death; for example Abel dies, Cain does not (so far as the RECORD goes). In the line of faith, in Gen. 5, we read "And he died"; in the line of unbelief, in Gen. 4 we do not read "And he died". There are remarkable pictures of eternal separation from God in an eternal existence, and as to this the omission of death is most remarkable. Furthermore, we are particularly reminded both before and after the 21st and 22nd verses that salvation, forgiveness, deliverance, were through the blood.

The atonement by blood is particularly emphasized, but the goat that goes forth to the wilderness is not associated with the pouring out of blood. And we have the definite statement in verse 8 "Cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Lord (ONE lot for the Lord), and the other for (margin) Azazel"; thus distinguished from that which was for the Lord. Azazel appears to be from a Hebrew root which denotes separation. Now I suppose that no one here would suggest that the sacrificial work of the Lord was toward Satan, or with a view to separation in a wilderness - it was toward the Father. But this second goat is NOT said to be for the Lord. It is said to be for Azazel. Furthermore, there is no goat for Azazel, there is no bullock for Azazel, there is nothing for Azazel with respect <sup>to</sup> ~~of~~ the high priest's family. It is only when we reach the SECOND aspect of the chapter that we have the Holy Spirit's references at length to the goat for Azazel. These points are very definite. And then we further notice, that in verse 17, no man is seen in the tabernacle of the congregation when Aaron goes in and makes the atonement for himself, for his household, for all the congregation of Israel. He goes in and he comes out again. Here we have brought before us the aspect of atonement very definitely with regard to the blood and with regard to the access before God. Then after the mention of this we have a stress on a completed atonement (verse 20) for the holy place, for the tabernacle and the altar. And THEN the live goat is mentioned. I suppose we realize that the atonement with respect to the holy place, the tabernacle and the altar, is an atonement with respect to access, approach unto God. WHEN THAT IS COMPLETED, the live goat is brought forth, and we read "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send away by the hand of a fit man (a man of opportunity) into the wilderness". "A fit man" - a man of opportunity, a man of an appointed time, as the word is literally. The

goat bears their iniquities. What is the Scriptural language as to a sacrifice bearing sin? Is there any other use of the word to "bear"? There is. In Lev. 5:17 we read "If a soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord; though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall BEAR his iniquity". In other words, the term "bear" is used in two ways, of a bearing of iniquity under judgment from the SIN standpoint, and the bearing away from the COVENANT standpoint. The same word is used for both. Now this use of the same word with two aspects is a wonderful thought in Scripture. Likewise, a word from the same root is used for holiness to the Lord, and separation to evil. Again, the same root is used for that which is devoted to the Lord, AND that which is accursed. Again, the same word is employed for the sin-offering AND the punishment of sin, and not only so, but for the punishment of sin with respect to a sinner, and for a sin-offering, the sinless bearing of sin in the place of a sinner. The very same word is employed. Furthermore, in Isaiah we have remarkable references to Atonement, but in Isaiah 28:18 we cannot read "Your covenant with death shall be atoned for" though this word is used. What does the passage mean? Does it mean there will be a sacrifice and acceptance? Not at all. The parallel line is "It shall not stand". What then? We go back to the root meaning of the word. The word "atonement" is the word "cover". "It shall be covered". How shall it be covered? The overflowing scourge passes through, and you are trodden down by it. There are two coverings in Scripture; there is the GRACE-covering, and there is the WRATH-covering. There are two bearings; there is the GRACE-bearing by the sacrifice, and the WRATH-bearing by the unsaved soul. These two aspects are continually before us. This probably removes the difficulty in Lev. 16.

We come now to see how that which is brought forward for Azazel is nevertheless mentioned in verse 10 with regard to the word "atonement". There are two aspects of atonement. Every sin must be covered, either on

the Saviour or on the sinner. Now we have the key to a number of the "alls" of Scripture. Apparently in Romans 5 we have two "alls", and in other Scriptures. Sometimes we have a "world" as to judgment, and a "world" as to salvation. Universalism lays hold of one aspect. But Scripturally we have brought before us the Divine use of the word "all". "All" very rarely means "all without exception", ver frequently means "All without distinction", all classes, all kinds. Here we have brought before us, by comparing verses 16 and 21 of Lev. 16, the TWO positions, the TWO classes. We have brought before us the removal of sins for those who are brought near into God's presence. We have the bringing near of those who are delivered, in accord with verse 15, and then we have the sending away of the goat that pictures, it would seem, those who are driven away from the presence of the Lord under a covering of wrath. Aaron in type, confesses all their sins upon the live goat, and the live goat, unsacrificed, unslain, bears those sins in a land of SEPARATION - a fit picture of those who are forever away from the presence of the Lord (2 Thess. 1:9). In front, as it were, of the people there was the reminder "Here is a goat representing you sent away from God's presence, unless you are brought nigh". Now we can understand why there was NO BULLOCK FOR AZAZEL, since the bullock concerned THE FAMILY, the priest's family. None of the priest's family, of the holy priesthood, the royal priesthood, shall be driven away. But of Israel's NATION there are two parts. Now we can understand why there is the goat for Azazel with respect to the future, because the goat pictures the application of Christ's work when He returns, and it is then, in the day of judgment, that sinners will be driven away. Now we can understand the type of this, appointed when Christ died. Instead of bringing the two goats before the Lord, Pilate brought them before the people, and asked them which they would have - "This Man, or Barabbas". They chose Barabbas, the type of the goat driven away. They did not want the One on Whom the Lord's lot fell. They said, "His blood be on us and on our children".

Thus God overruled to give a type of the awful doom of those who will be sent away as Cain, away from the presence of the Lord, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched, and strikingly the 17th chapter of Leviticus goes on to say in the fifth verse (a chapter which is full of sacrifices), that Israel were to bring their sacrifices to the door of the tabernacle, and then verse 7 adds "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices to GOATS after whom they have gone a whoring" - the word "goat" being used for "demons" in the Scripture. Here then we have wondrous evidence that the word which brings before us the sin-offering of the perfectly valuable One (as the term itself may suggest), also brings before us Satan's counterfeit, and not only Barabbas, whose name means "the son of a father", and was probably "Jesus Barabbas" in full. Barabbas gives part of the type, so Antichrist gives a fuller illustration of the one sent away, the contrast with Christ. The goat for Azazel, for Antichrist, is in fellowship with Satan, and is sent away forever with Satan into the land of separation, and the word "separation" is the express word used that Uzziah the leper-king was cut off from the house of the Lord. Separation is away from the presence of the Lord, an everlasting destruction away from His presence, for those who are not brought near by the precious blood of Christ. Now we should rejoice in the Holy Spirit, because of our privilege of nearness, if we are in Christ Jesus.

-----