

# The Day of Atonement Services and Their Meaning

## INTRODUCTION

The saving work of the Lord Jesus Christ is foreshadowed by various types and symbols. In the services of the annual Day of Atonement the typical system reached its highest development and made its fullest revelation. The solemn proceedings of that great day made a profound impression upon the Hebrew mind, and to this day make a similar impression upon Gentile believers.

A prominent feature of the day was the selection and sending away of the goat commonly designated "the scape-goat." Seventh-day Adventists have taught throughout their history that this particular goat represented Satan. The present treatise advocates an entirely different view. It is proposed to consider the subject under the following three divisions:

**Part One:** The Significance of the Sin-Offering and Services of the Day of Atonement.

**Part Two:** An Examination of the Teaching that Sins were Transferred to the Sanctuary throughout the year, and Removed on the Day of Atonement:

**Part Three:** A Consideration of the View that "Azazel" (Lev. 16:8 R.V.) refers to Satan; and a Refutation of the Doctrine that the Sins of the Redeemed will finally be placed upon the great Adversary.

## PART ONE

### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SIN-OFFERING AND SERVICES OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

The Day of Atonement was the one day of the year when the Jewish high priest was permitted to enter the most holy place of the sanctuary. See Heb. 9:7. The services of that day are described in the 16th chapter of Leviticus. The high priest was required to present for himself and his house "a young bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering." v. 3. Then "of the congregation of Israel" he was to take "two kids of the goats for a sin-offering, and one ram for a burnt-offering." v. 5. Lots were cast upon the two goats. v. 8. The one indicated by Jehovah was slain, and its blood applied to the mercy-seat and other appointments of the sanctuary. v. 15, 16, 18. The remaining goat (spoken of in the A.V. as "the scapegoat") was "presented alive before the Lord." The sins of Israel were confessed over him and laid upon him, and he was sent away "by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness." v. 10, 21.

It is important to notice that the two goats of the sin-offering were presented "before Jehovah" (v. 7 A.R.V.), and that Jehovah Himself, through the casting of lots, indicated which was to be slain, and which kept alive. The making of the atonement was thus shown to be an act of God. This accords with the teaching of the New Testament, which speaks of Christ as One "whom God

hath set forth to be a propitiation." Rom. 3:25.

### A CONTRAST

In the daily service throughout the year, the Israelites approached God by means of the individual offerings. On the Day of Atonement God took the initiative, and Himself designated the offering. Throughout the year the individual offerings were all presented on man's side of the veil. On the Day of Atonement the service emanated from God's side of the veil.

#### THE APPROACH FROM MAN'S SIDE OF THE VEIL

The blood of the sin-offerings of the people and of their rulers was applied to the horns of the brazen altar in the outer court. Lev. 4:22, 25, 27, 30, 34.

The blood of the sin-offerings of the priests, was applied to the golden altar of incense, before the veil. v. 3. 7.

The blood of the sin-offering of the high priest was applied to the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat, within the veil. Ch. 16:6; 11-14.

There was thus, from man's side, a gradual approach to God, from East to West.

#### THE OPPOSITE ORDER FROM GOD'S SIDE OF THE VEIL

On the annual Day of Atonement the service moved in the opposite direction, from West to East.

On that great day, after the goat indicated by Jehovah had been slain, its blood was applied first to the mercy-seat, within the veil (v. 15), next to the golden altar, before the veil, in the first apart-

ment or "tabernacle of the congregation" (v. 16, cp. Ex. 30:1), and **finally** to the brazen altar outside the sanctuary. v. 18, 19.

The reader should note that in the 16th chapter of Leviticus the second apartment of the sanctuary is seven times referred to as "the holy place" (v. 2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27), and once as "the holy sanctuary" (v. 33). It is in this chapter not even once called "the most holy place." The first apartment is six times called "the tabernacle of the congregation" (R.V. "tent of meeting"). See v. 7, 16, 17, 20, 23, 33.

Aaron "made an atonement for the holy place (v. 15, 16), by sprinkling the blood upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat; he next made an atonement "for the tabernacle of the congregation" (v. 16) by sprinkling the blood upon the golden altar and before the veil (Ex. 30:10; cp. Lev. 4:5-7); he then went out "unto the altar that is before the Lord" (i.e. the brazen altar; Lev. 16:18, cp. Ch. 1:5; 4:24) and "made atonement for it" by "sprinkling the blood upon it with his finger seven times." Ch. 16:19.

#### THE FIRST EFFECT OF THE ATONING BLOOD IS TO GLORIFY GOD

Why was the blood of the sin-offering, on this solemn day, presented in the inner apartment first of all? The reason is that the most holy place represented the immediate presence of God, in "heaven itself." Heb. 9:24. The atonement is primarily a Godward act, so the blood

was presented in the divine presence, in the holy of holies, first of all.

The chief object of the atonement is to glorify God, to clear his name, and to justify Him with regard to the whole matter of sin, and especially to justify Him in dealing with and saving sinners.

The scriptures emphasise the **Godward** aspect of the atonement. "Christ . . . through the eternal Spirit offered Himself **without spot TO GOD.**" Heb. 9:14. God "set forth [Christ] to be a propitiation" in order that first "**He might Himself be just,**" and beside that, and in that, "the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." Rom. 3:25, 26 R.V.

That God should be cleared, and his blessed name honoured and glorified is the prime requisite for the welfare and happiness of all the universe.

#### SIN AN OFFENCE TO GOD

No family could be truly happy and blessed while the head of the house is dishonoured, or his integrity impugned. The welfare of the whole universe therefore depends upon the name of God—his holiness and justice as well as his mercy and love—being completely vindicated, honoured, and glorified. **This sublime objective was at once attained through the blood of the cross.**

The **first** application of the blood of the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement was **at the mercy-seat and before the mercy seat.** Harmoniously, the first effect of the shed blood of Jesus Christ was to **cleanse the heavens.** Heb. 9:23.

## THE POSITION RESTATED

Sin is an offence to God. Its very existence, even in the remotest region of his infinite realm, defiles the heavens. Sin is a scandal and a reproach; and, until it had met its full answer, its very existence implied a reflection upon the holiness of Jehovah. The atoning sacrifice of Christ gave sin its full answer, and so glorified God that the heavens were cleansed forthwith from that scandal and offence.

The effect of Christ's death in this respect was immediate. Earth might be dull of apprehension and slow of response; but heaven was infinitely sensitive and instantly responsive to that "one act of righteousness" on Calvary. The resurrection of Christ and his exaltation at the Father's right hand were the inevitable sequel to his triumphant death.

The effect of the shed blood was not only immediate; it was also complete. Nothing more could be done, even in heaven, to add to its efficacy. God was not more highly honoured afterward, when Christ entered heaven. **God was honoured at Calvary.** It was **Christ** who was honoured afterward, in his exaltation at the right hand of God. God was glorified in the earth. Christ is glorified in heaven. John 17:4, 5; Phil. 2:8, 9.

### THE EFFECT OF THE CROSS MANWARD

In the typical Day of Atonement, after the blood had been presented in the most holy place, it was next applied in the holy place and at the brazen altar, or on man's side of the veil. The blood of the cross thus satisfies the claims of God's holiness; it also sanctifies the way of approach, for man to draw near to God.

The scriptures thus teach with abundant clearness, that the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ was most gloriously completed when He offered Himself without spot to God on Calvary's cross; that high heaven was first of all and most of all affected by that blest sacrifice; and that the salvation of believing men was assured when Christ was raised from the dead and exalted at the Father's right hand.

### THE "SCAPEGOAT"

We now come to the consideration of another important feature of the Day of Atonement services—the significance of the goat commonly spoken of as "the scapegoat." The sin-offering of the day consisted of two goats, not one only. It has been taught that the second goat represented Satan. This, the present writer believes, is a very great error.†

The two goats represented two different aspects of Christ's work; the first gives pre-eminence to the Godward aspect of the atonement; the second emphasises the effect of the atonement manward. It is, to begin with, well within the bounds of probability that both goats should represent Christ. Almost every feature of the sanctuary and its service represented Him in one way or another.

The two birds in the offering for the cleansing of the leper each represented

---

† The writer, when his book on the Sanctuary Question was published in 1932, had not at that time come to see clearly the light on the subject of the "Scapegoat," as he now endeavours to present it in this present treatise.

Christ. One was slain, and the other was dipped in the blood of its slain companion and let loose in the open field. Lev. 14:1-7. Two views may be taken of this offering; either that the slain bird represented Christ crucified, and the bird set free, Christ resurrected and ascended to heaven; or else that the bird released represented the sinner saved from death and set free by the blood of Christ. In either case the birds represented two different aspects of Christ's work.

### TWO BIRDS AND TWO GOATS

There is every reason to believe that the two goats of the sin-offering of the Day of Atonement similarly represented two aspects of the Saviour's work. Not that the offering of the two goats was similar in all respects to that of the two birds. There were differences. In the case of the birds, one was dipped in the blood of the other; but in the scriptures no such direction was given in connection with the two goats. There is a tradition that one goat was "dyed with its fellow's blood" (See *Oxford Helps*, Art. *Goat*). We propose, however, to adhere closely to the Biblical record in this study, and do not ask the reader to accept tradition as authoritative. There is abundant scriptural evidence to support the view that each of the two goats represented Christ.

The sin-offering of the Day of Atonement has at least these features in common with the offering for the cleansing of the leper—(1) In each case the offering comprised two creatures of the kind

specified,—two birds and two goats; (2) in each case one was slain and the other kept alive; and (3) the bird "let loose" proclaimed the release of the leper from his uncleanness (ch. 14:7), just as the goat "let go" signified the removal of the sins of the congregation (ch. 16:22).

### TWO CREATURES BUT ONE OFFERING

In either case the two creatures together constituted but one offering. The law directed that the high priest should "take . . . of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin-offering." Lev. 16:5. Of those who regard one of the goats as representing Satan, we would ask, Is Satan a sin-offering? The law directed that the sin-offering must be "without blemish" (Lev. 4:3, 23, 28, 32). Is Satan "without blemish"?

It is moreover said of the second goat that they were to "make an atonement with him" (R.V. "for him," margin "over him"). Ch. 16:10. Does God make an atonement "with" Satan? or "for" him? or "over" him? Impossible!

### ONE LOT FOR AZAZEL

The R.V. of Lev. 16:8 reads, "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for Azazel."

It is maintained by some that *Azazel* is a proper noun, a name that was applied by the Jews to Satan. It is true that some Jewish authorities speak of *Azazel* as a demon or evil spirit of the wilderness, to which the second goat was sent. This is, however, not by any means a unanimous opinion of the rabbis. But we shall leave

the question of the identity of Azazel to be discussed in Part Three of this paper; accepting for the present the marginal reading of the R.V., "one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for dismissal." It will be clearly shown in Part Three that whatever the meaning of **Azazel** may be, the second goat of the sin-offering represented the sending away of the sins of men by means of the one and only sin-bearer, Jesus Christ.

#### FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF IMPORTANT EVIDENCE

We would here invite further consideration of the fact that man's approach to God by means of the individual sin-offerings was from East to West, in three progressive stages of nearness: (1) at the brazen altar, (2) at the golden altar, and (3) at the mercy-seat; and that on the annual Day of Atonement the service moved in the opposite direction, from West to East. Commencing within the veil, the blood was applied (1) at the mercy-seat, (2) at the golden altar, and (3) at the brazen altar. This West to East order of the service is specified no less than three times in the 16th chapter of Leviticus; the first time in v. 16, 18, the second in v. 20, and the third in v. 33.

We quote here the following interesting note on Lev. 16:20 A.V. from "**The Cambridge Bible**":—

"When he hath made an end of atoning." The three things mentioned here indicate the order in which the atonement was made—for the holy place (i.e. the Holy of Holies); the tent of meeting (the outer part of it); and the altar (outside the tabernacle)—and the course of the high priest was from W. to E."

The Eastward course of the service did not cease at the brazen altar, however. The procedure immediately following sent the goat of the "dismissal" (R.V. margin) still farther to the East. We reproduce v. 20 with context, in order to notice what immediately followed the application of the blood at the three places appointed for the sin-offering.

"And when he hath made an end of reconciling the holy place, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, he shall bring the live goat: and 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 him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." v. 20-22.

This was a most spectacular method of representing the removal of sin farther and farther away from the presence of Jehovah, until it was lost in "a land not inhabited." The sins were borne away from Jehovah's presence in the extreme Western apartment of the sanctuary, until lost to sight and knowledge at the opposite point of the compass, the extreme East. Thus literally was warranted the joyful exclamation of the Psalmist: "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us." Psa. 103:12.

#### JESUS CHRIST THE SIN-BEARER

The second goat of the sin-offering of the Day of Atonement is graphically pictured as a sin-bearer. There can be no doubt as to who is represented here. It

is the Lord Jesus Christ. The language of Leviticus 16 is echoed in the great Messianic prophecy of Isaiah, and re-echoed again through the New Testament.

### ECHOED IN ISALAH'S PROPHECY

"And Aaron shall lay...all the iniquities...upon the head of the goat."

Lev. 16:21.

"And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities." v. 22.

"And the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."

Isa. 53:6.

"For He shall bear their iniquities." v. 11.

### RE-ECHOED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

"The goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited." v. 22.

"Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." John 1:29.

"The goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land." v. 22 R.V.

"I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the peoples there was no man with Me."

Isa. 63:3  
R.V.

"Who his own self carried up our sins in his body to the tree."

1 Pet. 2:24  
R.V. Margin.

We conclude, then, that Christ was our Sin-Bearer when He was "made a curse for us" (Gal. 3:13), "made to be sin for us" (2 Cor. 5:21). May all who read these lines, "through faith, by His blood," "be made the righteousness of God in Him."

### PART TWO

#### AN EXAMINATION OF THE TEACHING THAT SINS WERE TRANSFERRED TO THE SANCTUARY THROUGHOUT THE YEAR, AND REMOVED ON THE ANNUAL DAY OF ATONEMENT

One of the basic ideas on which the Satan scapegoat theory is built is the conception that in the daily offerings sin was represented as being transferred to the sanctuary. It is thought that sins were transferred from the sinner to the sanctuary, and then, on the Day of Atonement, transferred from the sanctuary to the head of the "scapegoat."

In his article published in the "Day Star Extra" in 1846 (the article which originated the Adventist sanctuary teaching), O. R. L. Crozier wrote:—

The sins were borne from the people by the priest, and from the priest by the goat. 1st, They are imparted to the victim. 2nd, The priest bore them in its blood to the sanctuary. 3rd, After cleansing them from it on the 10th of the seventh month, he bore them to the scapegoat. And 4th, The goat finally bore them away beyond the camp of Israel to the wilderness." "The Advent Review," p. 48.

Mrs. E. G. White continued the teaching thus:—

"It [the sin-offering] had only provided a means by which the sin was transferred to the sanctuary." "Patriarchs and Prophets," p. 355.

Uriah Smith writes:—

"There was thus a continual transfer of sins from the people to the offerings, and through them to the sanctuary, through the year." "Looking Unto Jesus," p. 90.

This teaching is based upon the mistaken impression that the blood of the sin-offering of individual members of the Hebrew congregation was sprinkled before the veil and applied to the golden

altar in the first apartment of the sanctuary. Thus, in 1846, O. R. L. Crozier wrote that when the individual offerer brought his victim to the door of the tabernacle and slew it, the priest "with its blood entered the Holy and sprinkled it before the veil and upon the altar...." In the same article Mr. Crozier taught that "this altar was the golden altar of incense in the Holy upon which the blood of individual atonements was sprinkled during the daily ministration." "The Advent Review," p. 46, 43.

Mrs. E. G. White evidently held the same mistaken view when she wrote:—"The most important part of the daily ministration was the service performed in behalf of individuals. The repentant sinner brought his offering to the door of the tabernacle, and placing his hand upon the victim's head, confessed his sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice. By his own hand the animal was then slain, and the blood was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil....By this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary." "Patriarchs and Prophets," p. 354; p. 340, some editions.

Uriah Smith expounds the teaching thus:—

"This [the slaying of the victim] the sinner did with his own hand....The work now passed to the priest. He took the blood, and....bore the blood into the sanctuary, and....sprinkled of that blood seven times before the veil.... In that blood the sin had been lodged in the sanctuary itself." "Looking Unto Jesus," p. 89; 90.

The truth is, that the blood of the sin-offerings of individual Israelites, whether rulers or common people, **was never taken into the sanctuary at all.** See Lev. 4:22, 25, 27, 30, 32, 34.

This fact is recognised in Note 9 in the Appendix to "Patriarchs and Prophets." And, in the context to the passage quoted above, Mrs. E. G. White continues:—

"In some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place; but the flesh was then to be eaten by the priest....Both ceremonies alike symbolised the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary." p. 354.

Let the reader note the statement that "in some cases the blood was not taken into the holy place." The truth is that **in not one single instance throughout the year** was the blood of the sin-offerings of individual rulers or common people among the Jews taken into the sanctuary at all. This fact is a fatal obstacle to the theory that sins were represented as being transferred to the sanctuary. Uriah Smith evidently saw this, and sought to overcome the difficulty thus:—

"It was not the case that the blood of all the different offerings was thus borne within the building of the sanctuary, but those which were so treated, stood as representatives of the whole." "Looking Unto Jesus," p. 90.

How far this is from accuracy the reader may judge from the facts of scripture. Of all the individual sin-offerings, only in the case of priests (not even in the case of the Levites), was the blood brought within the sanctuary. See Lev. 4:3, 6, 7. The priests, Aaron and his sons, were a mere handful as compared with the vast hosts of Israel. There were very evident reasons for the variation in their case, as we shall later show. The variation would apply also "if the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance." In this case, the priests being



involved as well as the people, the blood was brought into the holy place. v. 13-18. This was not an offering of regular or frequent occurrence. See Num. 15:24-26 for the circumstances.

It would be pure assumption to take these variations as "representatives of the whole." The fact remains that the blood of the numberless individual sin-offerings of both rulers and people was never brought into the sanctuary at all. This fact, we repeat, is fatal to the theory under consideration.

The eating of the flesh of the sin-offerings by the priests did not represent "the transfer of the sin from the penitent to the sanctuary." The appointed portion of the offering was part of the priest's patrimony. "They which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar." 1 Cor. 9:18.

#### THE SCRIPTURAL VIEW OF THE SERVICE

In contrast with the teaching considered above, we ask the reader to consider the following, which we believe to be the scriptural view of the service:

##### I.

There were three appointed meeting places, where Jehovah promised to meet with priests and people:

1. With the people at the brazen altar. Ex. 29:42, 43.
2. With the priests at the golden altar. Ch. 30:36.
3. With the high priest at the mercy-seat. Ch. 25:22.

##### II.

The blood of the sin-offerings was applied at the same three appointed places of meeting:

1. For the people at the brazen altar. Lev. 4:22, 25, 27, 30, 34.
2. For the priests at the golden altar. v. 3-12.
3. For the high priest at the mercy-seat. Ch. 16:3, 6, 11-14.

When the sin-offering was presented for the whole congregation the blood was applied at ordinary times to the golden altar, and poured out at the base of the brazen altar (Ch. 4:13, 17, 18); and on the annual Day of Atonement at the mercy-seat, as well as at the golden altar and the sacrificial altar (Ch. 16:15, 16, 18, 19). The reason for this seems obvious. The whole congregation included the priests, so the blood had at such times to be presented at the place appointed for the priests. The priests could carry the congregation with them (so to speak) just so far as they were themselves authorised to go.

#### EXPIATION OR TRANSFER?

What was the significance of the application of the blood at the three appointed places of meeting? Did it signify the transfer of the sin to the meeting place, or its removal? The two ideas are direct opposites. The deposit or accumulation of sin must be just the opposite to its removal.

We maintain that the application of the blood represented the removal of the sin of the transgressor, and thus the opening of the way for him to come to God through the appointed channels, which otherwise would be blocked against him.

If an Israelite (ruler or common people) had sinned, that sin came be-

tween the transgressor and his God. He could no longer approach acceptably to the brazen altar, the meeting place appointed for him. The application of the blood to that altar covered the sin, in the sense of expiating or removing it, and opened and sanctified once more the channel of communication between the offerer and Jehovah. It is obvious that if the applied blood **transferred the sin to the altar**, the result would be to place a barrier of condemnation between the offerer and Jehovah, and thus **prevent** his approach.

If a priest sinned, that sin would come between him and his God, so that he could no longer approach acceptably to the golden altar for himself and for the people. The application of the blood to that altar expiated or removed the sin, and opened the way for the priest to approach acceptably once more. If the blood **deposited** the sin at the altar, the result would inevitably be to **prevent** the acceptable approach of the priest.

When the high priest sinned, he could not approach the mercy-seat without the atoning blood; but when he sprinkled the blood upon the mercy-seat, he was able to approach acceptably for himself and for the people. Did that sprinkled blood represent the transfer of sin to the mercy-seat? Never! It signified the removal of the awful shame and offence of sin from before the face of God.

**PUTTING THE SINS OF ISRAEL "UPON  
THE HEAD OF THE GOAT"**

From whence, then, did the high priest bring the sins that were put upon the

second goat of the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement? Did he not bring them from the sanctuary? Certainly not! He did not need to bring them from anywhere, any more than the individual offerer brought from somewhere the sins which **he** confessed when he laid his hands upon the head of his offering. Lev. 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33. **The sins came direct from the sinner to the sin-bearer.**

On the great Day of Atonement, the high priest stood as the representative of Jehovah, and confessed "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat." Ch. 16:21.

When we read that "Jehovah hath laid on Him [Christ] the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:6 A.R.V.), must we understand that Jehovah transferred those sins from some apartment where they had been accumulated? No indeed! The accumulation of sins was **on us and in us**; and God in infinite grace removed the dreadful load from us and laid it upon his own dear Son.

Will hands ever be laid upon Satan, and confession of sins be made over him? Whose hands will thus be imposed upon the great Adversary? and who will confess sins over him? If these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered (and of course they cannot), the Satan scape-goat theory should be abandoned forever. God grant that it may be thus abandoned!

## PART THREE

### 'IN THE MIDST OF THEIR UNCLEANNESS'

The theory under consideration supposes that sins were accumulated in the midst of the sanctuary. The opposite is true. The sanctuary was in the midst of the uncleanness. See this clearly taught in Lev. 16:16. "So shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, which remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness." For this reason the sanctuary had to be cleansed by Moses before the service could even begin; not because of interior iniquity, but because of surrounding iniquity. See Heb. 9:18-21. The work of Moses in "sprinkling with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry," at the very inception of the services under "the first testament," met its antitype when Jesus Christ cleansed "the heavenly things themselves" (v. 23) with "the blood of the new testament." Matt. 26:28. This Christ did when his blood was shed upon the cross.

This brings us face to face once more with the truth brought out in Part One of this paper, that the first effect of the death of Christ was to glorify God, and thus cleanse the heavens of the offence of sin, and open the way for God to bring lost man back to Himself.

What thanks therefore can we render to our God for this great salvation? **God is glorified in the expiation of man's sin!** "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift"!

A CONSIDERATION OF THE VIEW THAT 'AZAZEL' (LEV. 16:8 E.V.) REFERS TO SATAN; AND A REFUTATION OF THE DOCTRINE THAT THE SINS OF THE BEDEEMED WILL FINALLY BE PLACED UPON THE GREAT ADVERSARY

We now come to consider the claim that the word **Azazel** is a proper noun, and may be understood as having reference to Satan. It must be recognised that there are not a few ancient authorities, and able and scholarly modern critics and commentators, who regard **Azazel** as a name applicable to Satan. It must be remembered also, however, that the opinion is very far from being an undisputed one, among either ancients or moderns. The positiveness with which some now-a-days affirm the opinion is not warranted. Under **Azazel**, Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible has this note: "Etymology, origin, and significance are still matters of conjecture."

It seems advisable, nevertheless, to consider the question: If it be established that the word **Azazel** has reference to Satan, would that conflict with or overthrow the teaching advocated in Part One, that each of the two goats of the sin-offering represented Christ?

To this we reply, Even granting (which we do not) that **Azazel** indicates Satan, that would neither overthrow nor be in conflict with the view that both goats of the sin-offering represented Christ; nor would it establish the teaching that the sins of the redeemed will finally be placed upon Satan.

Adventists quote from a number of learned authorities, maintaining that these writers support their view regarding the scapegoat, because they identify Azazel with Satan; but a careful examination of the passages quoted reveals the fact that most of the writers cited **do not identify Azazel with the second goat of the sin-offering.** This is a very important consideration. They regard the goat as being **sent off to Azazel**, which is a very different thing. They could indeed take no other position, with faithfulness to the text.

McClintock and Strong, for instance (quoted in Adventist publications) say: "The goat, however, that was **sent to the evil spirit**. . . . was no sacrifice, but rather a witness that the accepted sacrifice had been made." (**Cyc. Vol. IX, Art. Scapegoat**). This passage plainly does not contemplate the goat and the evil spirit as being one and the same, nor one as representing the other.

Dr. John Eadie is much quoted by Adventist writers on this subject. Eadie appears to support the Adventist view when he speaks of the sins of believers being "taken off them, and rolled back on Satan." (**Biblical Cyc. Art. Scapegoat**). A study of Dr. Eadie's article shows, however, that he did not by any means hold the Adventist view. He speaks of sin being "severed from God's people, and **sent away to man's first seducer.**" Compare the two sentences thus:

"Severed from God's people, and <b>sent away to man's first seducer.</b> "	"Taken off them and rolled back on Satan."
--	--

It is manifest that the goat "**sent away to**" the seducer is not regarded by this writer as being in itself a type of the seducer. In his view, sins are "**rolled back on Satan**" when "**sent away to**" Azazel by means of the second goat of the sin-offering.

Other authorities who maintain that Azazel is the name of an evil spirit, probably Satan, are quoted by Adventist writers; but generally without a word to show that the writers quoted **do not** regard the **goat** as being Azazel, or as representing Satan.

Uriah Smith follows a more commendable course, when he quotes at length from Charles Beecher, showing that that writer regarded Azazel as representing Satan, and then adds the following important admission:—

"It is but just to Mr. Beecher to remark that while he thinks that Azazel is the name for Satan, he does not regard the goat as representing Satan, but looks upon the ceremony as performed in some sense in reference to Satan." "**Looking Unto Jesus**," p. 261.

That is just the point. Many eminent writers who are triumphantly quoted as teaching that Azazel is a name for Satan, "**do not regard the goat as representing Satan.**" It is therefore quite unfair to give the impression that they support the theory that the putting of the sins upon the goat represented the placing of sins upon Satan. **The sins were placed upon the goat, not upon Azazel.**

The reason for this view is clear upon the surface, when one consults the R.V., where the literal rendering **Azazel** is retained. See the following passage:—

"And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats: one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for Azazel.... But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be set alive before Jehovah, to make an atonement for (margin, over) him, to let him go for Azazel into the wilderness." Lev. 16:8, 10 A.R.V.

#### "FOR JEHOVAH" AND "FOR AZAZEL"

According to this rendering, one goat was "for" or with reference to Jehovah, and the other was "for" or with reference to Azazel. The first goat was therefore not Jehovah, and neither was the second Azazel.

The "Cambridge Bible" speaks of "both the scapegoat and its destination to Azazel." **C.B., Vol. on Leviticus, p. 189.**

Viewing the reference to Azazel thus (as we necessarily must, the text requiring it), there remains no difficulty in regarding the two goats as each representing the work of Christ, even though **Azazel** be understood to refer to Satan. This we shall go on to show.

It will be well, however, to first dwell for a moment on the fact that it is not permissible to regard "**Azazel**" in the R.V. as the exact equivalent of "**scapegoat**" in the A.V.. The A.V. reads "the goat on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat"; but the R.V. does not read "the goat on which the lot fell to be Azazel." The R.V. reading is "The goat on which the lot fell for Azazel." And this "**for**" Azazel must (as pointed out by Charles Beecher) be regarded as meaning "in some sense in reference to" Azazel. See above, Beecher quoted by Uriah Smith.

Dr. Young defines "**scapegoat**" as "a goat for sending away." Rev. J. Farrar, in his Biblical and Theological Dictionary, says, "The meaning which renders the word expressive of the destination of the goat is much preferable. It may be translated, the goat of the departure." Annandale says that the verb "scape" is "a short form of escape," and gives "scapegoat" the derived meaning of "one made to bear the blame of others." In the A.V., the word "scapegoat" is evidently used in the sense of "escape goat." Harmoniously with this, the R.V. marginal reading is, "the lot for dismissal." v. 8.

#### THE GOAT "FOR AZAZEL"

But if we accept the reading in the R.V. text, thus regarding **Azazel** as a proper noun, then the reading must be "the goat... for Azazel." The conclusion becomes inevitable that the goat and **Azazel** are not one and the same; but that one (the goat) is spoken of as in some way having relation or reference to the other (Azazel). Then follows the further inevitable conclusion, of far-reaching import in its bearing on the teachings of Seventh-day Adventists, that when Aaron put the sins of Israel upon the head of the second goat of the sin-offering, he was not placing them upon the head of **Azazel** at all; but only sending the goat off for or with reference to Azazel. So that sins are not represented as being finally placed on Satan, as the denomination has taught! This conclusion is inescapable, being abso-

lutely required by the simple straightforward reading of the text.

"The construction of the Hebrew is certainly not in favour of... Azazel being in any sense applied to the goat as a proper name. If on one of the lots the prepositional prefix has the ordinary sense of *for* or *to*, it is not likely that, on the other, it would mean appointed to be." "Commentary on Leviticus," by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church.

## WORDSWORTH ON THE TWO GOATS

8. *shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the LORD, and the other lot for the scapegoat*] Both of them, like the two birds (in xiv. 4. 49), were figures of Christ, but in different respects.

As the sacrifice of the one goat, and the escape of the other, were determined by the lot, which was "cast into the lap" by men, "but the whole disposal of it was of the Lord" (Prov. xvi. 33); so in the work of the Crucifixion, men were agents, but all that was done therein was foreknown by God; and although in the means used they sinned against Him, "and with wicked hands crucified and slew the Prince of Life," yet the salvation of the world thereby was foreordained by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God (see on Acts ii. 23; iv. 28).

The two goats were presented before the Lord, and one goat was "to be offered for a sin-offering," upon which the lot of the Lord should fall; and that lot of the Lord was lift up on high in the hand of the High Priest, and then laid upon the goat which was to die; so the hand of God is said to have determined what should be done unto our Saviour, whose Passion was typified by that Sin-offering (*Bp. Pearson*, Art. iv. p. 185).

— *for the scapegoat*] Heb. *for Azazel*: a word found only in this chapter (v. 8. 10. 26); and in each case it is preceded by the Hebrew prefix, signifying *to* or *for*.

The word *Azazel* is, probably, derived from the root *azal*, to remove, to ward off, to send away (*Gesen.*, pp. 6. 17; *Hengstenberg*, Moses and Egypt, p. 160), and it may therefore express the sense of removing, carrying away the sin of the people and its consequences. Therefore, the words "*for Azazel*" may mean "for carrying away," or "for removal" (so *Bähr*, Symb. ii. 668; *Tholuck*, in Hebr. ii. p. 80; *Winer*, R. W. B. ii. 659, 660), and the *Septuagint* has in v. 10, εἰς ἀνοσιωμήν: and this sense is adopted by *Philippson* and others. Cp. *Davidson*, Int. p. 269.

The truth seems to be (as many of the Ancient Expositors affirmed) that Christ Himself was typified by the Azazel. "He was numbered with the transgressors." "He bore our iniquities, and the chastisement of our peace was upon Him. God laid upon Him the iniquities of us all" (Isa. liii. 6. 11. 12. 1 Pet. ii. 24). And as the Azazel was *sent away*, loaded with the sin of the people, into the wilderness, and as he *carried* their sins into a land not inhabited (v. 22), so Christ *took away* the sins of the world (John i. 29). Cp. *Bp. Andrewes*, i. 26; and *Bp. Pearson*

quoted in the foregoing note. *Deyling*, Obs. Sacr. i. 84.

It is a mistake to suppose that the words in the text, "one goat for the Lord, the other goat for Azazel," imply an opposition as between two persons, the Lord and Azazel. *Both* the goats were *for the Lord*; both were presented to Him (v. 7. 10); both (as the Talmudists say) were to be exactly alike in age, size, stature, and value; they were to be like twins—or as *two* in one; but one was to be *received* by the Lord as a sacrifice, the other to be *sent away* into the wilderness.

As an ancient Father says, "Some erroneously imagine that one of the goats was destined for an evil and unclean spirit, and was sent to him into the wilderness;" but this opinion is to be rejected as false, and as savouring of heathen superstition. What then was the meaning of this ceremony? Two goats were taken by the Priest, both were alike in age and beauty, and lots were cast upon them; one was sacrificed; the other, after Aaron had laid his hands upon it, and made a confession of sin over it, was to be sent free into the wilderness. *Christ was typified by both these goats*. The goats being alike in nature and size, prefigured one and the same Christ. But they signified two different acts of Christ. *S. Cyril*, Glaphyr. p. 273.

On the whole, it seems most reasonable to concur with those who interpret the words "*for Azazel*" as meaning "to be an Azazel," or *carrier away*, a *bearer off* of the sins of the people.

The two goats of the Great Day of Expiation represent the *double* work of Christ in making Atonement for the sins of the world, and not only *dying*, but also *rising again* and living for ever, and thus showing that our sins are taken away and we are justified. He died for our sins, and rose again for our justification (Rom. iv. 25). He was crucified through weakness, but liveth by the power of God (2 Cor. xiii. 4). He was dead, and behold He liveth for evermore (Rev. i. 18). He was put to death in the flesh, and was quickened in the spirit (1 Pet. iii. 18). He bare our sins as our Sin-offering, and reconciled us to God. But He did something more than this, He also rose again and *carried them away*. As *Bengel* and *Matthew Henry* say, "The two he-goats prefigured Christ. The slain one was a type of Christ sacrificed for our sins; the other that was let go, was a type of Christ rising again for our justification, and the *living* surety of our forgiveness. As a single goat was insufficient for both purposes, two were used."

In looking at the goat on whose head Aaron laid both his hands, and confessed "over him the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, and all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat" (v. 21), and in following with our eyes the goat as he is sent into a land not inhabited, and goes forth into the wilderness and so disappears from the sight, we see God's mercy and love in Christ not only in forgiving our sins, but in *putting them away* (Heb. ix. 26), in blotting them out for ever, in abolishing "the whole body of sin" (Rom. vi. 6), in hiding our transgressions from His own eyes and ours, and

covering all our sins (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2; lxxxv. 2), so that He casts them behind His back and remembers them no more (Ps. xxix. 7. Isa. xxxviii. 17; xlv. 22). As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us (Ps. ciii. 12): they are cast into the depths of the sea (Micah vii. 19), so that "through our sins be sought for, they cannot be found" (Jer. 1. 20).

9. *And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the LORD's lot fell*] This goat is to be sacrificed first, before the other is let go. The death of the one goat precedes the dismissal of the other: Christ first bears our sins, and then He carries them away.

10. *The goat, on which the lot fell*] to be the scapegoat, or rather to be *Azazel* (or *carrier away*), shall be presented alive before the Lord, and be consecrated to God. Here is a refutation of the Rabbinical notion that *Azazel* is a name of the Evil One; see v. 8, and cp. *Theodoret*, Qu. 22. He was presented before the Lord, in order to make Atonement (*Cyril*, p. 373. Literally, *to cover*, i. e. to cover sins) with him (i. e. with the he-goat) and to send him for a carrier away (i. e. of sin) into the wilderness far from man's abode, and so that he might be seen no more. Here is another proof that this goat, as well as the other, is a type of Christ, Who alone (*avrbis*) "is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John ii. 2).

18. *shall go out*] in order to return again into the Most Holy Place. The manifold riches of the love of our Saviour Christ, both God and Man, in His *one act* of suffering on the Cross, and in redeeming the world by that one Sacrifice, could not be represented in any *one single type*; but required a large combination and rich variety of images to present even a dim shadow of its wonderful comprehensiveness (see above, i. 1), as was seen in the various sacrifices of this great Day of Atonement.

In like manner, His *one act* of entering with His own Blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies, once for all, at His Ascension, to make intercession for us, could not be represented by *one single entrance* of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies, which was a figure of the true, but required *several acts* of going into the Holy Place within the veil (see vv. 14, 15, and *Philo* in Leg. ad Caium, p. 1035, who says that the High Priest went in *thrice*; cp. *Bähr*, ii. 670), in order to represent, even in a faint shadow, the manifold benefits procured for the Church Universal, by Christ's Ascension into heaven.

21. *Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat*] Aaron shall lay *both his hands*, so as to make them *rest*, and *lean* on the head with hard pressure. This is the meaning of the word *samach*, here rendered *lay* (see Exod. xxix. 10. 15. 19. Lev. i. 4. Judg. xvi. 29. Amos v. 19. Ps. lxxxviii. 7. Cp. *Gesen.*, p. 590); and it intimates that the sins of the people were *laid* as a *burden* or *load* on the head of the goat, and rested upon the goat, who was charged with their weight, and carried them away into the desert.

This act was accompanied with a confession of all the iniquities of the people (the form of which may be seen in *Maimonides*, iv. 2), and "all their transgressions in all their sins; and he shall put them (literally, he shall *give* them) upon the head of the live goat."

Here was a figure of Christ, who was made sin for us (2 Cor. v. 21), and who bore our sins and carried our sorrows, and on whom the iniquity of us all was laid (Isa. liii. 4-11. 1 Pet. ii. 24. See above, on v. 8), and who carried them away into a far-off land, so that they are no more remembered against us.

## EVENTS OF ANTITYPE NOT CONSECUTIVE

In the study of the services of the Day of Atonement, more or less confusion has been caused by an endeavour to find an antitypical fulfilment of the various features of the service in consecutive order. This is not necessary. Although of necessity separately represented in the type, Christ fulfils the whole in one glorious accomplishment. Christ glorified God, saved man, and destroyed Satan, by "one act of righteousness" (Rom. 5:13 R.V.), on Calvary's cross. The objection that Christ did not have the sins of men placed upon Him after his death, but before (as on the second goat, after the first had been slain), is thus not a valid one.

### THE BURNT-OFFERING

That the services did not represent a number of consecutive acts upon the part of Christ, but rather a combination of accomplishments in one great act, is proven by the fact that after the blood of the slain goat had been presented, **after** sins had been placed on the head of the live goat, and **after** the live goat was sent off to the wilderness, Aaron was instructed to offer the burnt-offering. "And Aaron shall come into the tabernacle of the congregation, and shall put off the linen

garments, which he put on when he went into the holy place, and shall leave them there: and he shall wash his flesh with water in a holy place (R.V.), and put on his garments, and come forth, and offer his burnt-offering, and the burnt-offering of the people, and make an atonement for himself, and for the people." Lev. 16:23, 24.

### "MAKE ATONEMENT"

The expression, "make an atonement," occurs fifteen times in this chapter, and here, in verse 24, it is applied to the presentation of the burnt-offering no less than to other portions of the service. The burnt-offering, then, represents some aspect of the great antitypical atonement. It is part of a great combination, and not just one item of a consecutive series. It follows then that the same must be true of other divisions of the service.

If the idea of successive events must be adhered to, the question arises, **Will Christ offer Himself as a burnt-offering after the dismissal of the so-called antitypical "scapegoat"?**

### "WELL PLEASING TO GOD"

In the sin-offering we see Christ "made to be sin for us, who knew no sin." 2 Cor. 5:21. It must always be remembered, however, that while God, for our sakes, **treated** Christ as though He were the very embodiment of sin, He never **regarded** Him as such. The burnt-offering represents Christ, in all his sinless perfection, offering Himself "without spot to God." The burnt-offering was a "sweet savour" offering. (Lev. 1:9), "acceptable," or "well pleasing to God." v. 4, cp. Rom. 12:1 R.V. margin.

The Father **regarded** the Son with infinite satisfaction at the cross, even while the Son was "made a curse" for us. Gal. 3:13. At no time was Christ more dear to the heart of God, than when He willingly "laid down his life" for our lost race. John 10:17.

### THE ENTRY INTO THE SANCTUARY

As for the entry of the high priest into the holiest of all, that did indeed represent Christ's entry into the presence of God for us; but it must be borne in mind that Christ's access to God in our behalf was actually accomplished at the cross.

Christ's ministry is in certain respects in striking contrast with the ministry of the earthly high priests. Aaron had only restricted and momentary access to the most holy place, whereas Christ has permanent access. Those priests **stood** in their ministry, because their work was never finished, "offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins." Heb. 10:11. But "**this Priest**, on the contrary, after offering for sins a single sacrifice of perpetual efficacy, **took His seat** at God's right hand." v. 12, Weymouth.

The **earthly** priests entered in with blood. **Our heavenly Priest** entered in by his blood. When once the blood was shed, there remained nothing more to be done but to enter in. He did not have to do something **with** the blood in order to be able to enter in. The atoning work was **finished**, at the cross. Christ's present work is the **Work of Salvation**, and this is the **Day of Salvation**.



“Then doubt not thy welcome, since God  
hath declared

There remaineth no more to be done;  
That once in the end of the world He  
appeared,

And completed the work He begun.”

How is it with you, reader? Is the  
question of the atonement nothing more  
than a theoretical disquisition with you?  
Or have you been personally “reconciled  
to God by the death of his Son”?

W. W. FLETCHER. (1933)  
Revised by K.M. (1986)

Other booklets available:—

‘Under Law to Christ’

‘The 2300 Days’

‘The 144,000 and the Seal of God’

‘The Atonement and the Work of  
Salvation’

‘The Sanctuary and the Christian  
Dispensation’

‘The CHIEF POINT in the Letter to  
the Hebrews’

‘The Heavenly Significance of the  
Earthly Sanctuary’

‘The Doctrine of the Investigative  
Judgment’

‘The Testimony of Jesus’

‘A Reply to Articles Published’

WEGWEISER RESEARCH LIBRARY  
and  
INFORMATION SERVICE,  
Bo-Bo Valley, via Ulong,  
N.S.W. 2450. AUSTRALIA