**The Scapegoat Ritual—Between Biblical and Tannaitic Law**

**Introduction**

In Leviticus 16, Aaron is commanded to bring one bull to atone for himself and for his household (v. 3), and two goats to atone for the congregation of the People Israel (v. 5). He sprinkles the blood of the bull and of one of the goats in different places in the Tent of Meeting and sends the second goat, the scapegoat, to “’Azazel to the desert.” The scapegoat ritual is discussed extensively in the research community, mainly due to its similarity to ancient pagan rituals.[[1]](#footnote-1) A number of scholars have also dealt with the nature of ’Azazel as described in several essays from the Second Temple period[[2]](#footnote-2) and with the question of how the Sages coped with this ritual.[[3]](#footnote-3) In the latter context, most discussions ask how the Sages interpreted the word ’*azazel* and probe the homiletic reference of the Tannaim to this ritual. Not enough attention, however, has been paid to the Tannaitic halakhic interpretation of this ritual and the relationship between Tannaitic law and the Biblical text. In this article, I will present this interpretation, which states that atonement is attained not by sending the goat away but through the confession performed on it. I will also discuss the novelty that the Tannaitic literature introduces about the disposition of the goat - having it thrown from a cliff and not just sent into the desert.

**The Biblical Account**

As stated, Aaron sprinkles the blood of the bull and one of the goats in different places in the Tent of Meeting and sends away the second goat, the scapegoat, to “’Azazel to the desert.” The purpose of sprinkling the blood is explained in v. 16:[[4]](#footnote-4)

וְכִפֶּר עַל הַקֹּדֶשׁ מִטֻּמְאֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִפִּשְׁעֵיהֶם לְכָל חַטֹּאתָם וְכֵן יַעֲשֶׂה לְאֹהֶל מוֹעֵד הַשֹּׁכֵן אִתָּם בְּתוֹךְ טֻמְאֹתָם.

And he shall atone for the holy place, because of the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins; and so shall he do for the tent of meeting, that abides with them in the midst of their uncleannesses.[[5]](#footnote-5) [JVP המקור לפי גירסת ה-]

Indeed, as Milgrom has shown, in several places in the Bible, it is assumed that the Israelites’ impurity defiles the “holy place,” meaning the tabernacle, even though the impurity does not come in direct contact with it, and that the way to atone for this impurity is through the blood of the sin-offering.[[6]](#footnote-6)

As for the scapegoat, the Torah commands Aaron to place his hands on its head, confess the Israelites’ sins on it, and then send it away to the desert.[[7]](#footnote-7) The assumption accepted by most scholars is that, by this confession, Aaron transfers the sins of the people to the goat and sends the sins to the desert.[[8]](#footnote-8) A second possible way of explaining the scapegoat’s role, however, is that after Aaron atones for the “holy place,” he transmits the defilement that he has removed to the scapegoat, through the medium of the confession, and sends the goat away.[[9]](#footnote-9) The first option seems the more probable. Based on this assumption, B. Levine[[10]](#footnote-10) argues that the confession contains not a request for forgiveness but only a list of the transgressions that are transferred to the goat. Milgrom[[11]](#footnote-11) also finds it noteworthy that in biblical sacrifices, one hand is customarily placed on the head of the animal,[[12]](#footnote-12) whereas in the case of the scapegoat, the priest lays both his hands upon the goat and confesses. This two-handed action is a function of transferring something from one to the other, as occurs in Moses’ transfer of national leadership to Joshua (Deuteronomy 14:9). The confession of sacrifice in Leviticus 16, then, has nothing to do with repentance or with expressing feelings of guilt and submission.[[13]](#footnote-13)

It follows that the atonement ritual comprises two ceremonies: first, atonement for the Tent of Meeting through the bull and one of the goats, and second, atonement for the people through the scapegoat.

**Sources from the Second Temple Period**

The importance of the scapegoat ritual is also reflected in sources from the Second Temple period. In the next discussion, I address not how each source understood the exact meaning of the ceremony, a topic that has been discussed at length,[[14]](#footnote-14) but only the appearance of the scapegoat in these sources as an important part of the ceremony. The account in the Temple Scroll, for example, tracks that of the Bible, more or less[[15]](#footnote-15) :

ובא אל השעיר החי והתודה על רואשו את כול עוונות בני ישראל עם כול אשמתמה לכל חטאתמה ונתנמה על רואש השעיר ושלחו לעזזאל המדבר ביד איש עיתי ונשא השעיר את כל עוונות

And [he] will go to the living he-goat and confess over its head all the sins of the children of Israel with all their guilt together with all their sins; and he shall place them upon the head of the he-goat and shall send it to ’Azazel to the desert, from the hand of man indicated. And the he-goat will take with itself all the sins.

In their account of the Day of Atonement ritual, both Philo and Josephus mention and even emphasize the atonement that is achieved through the scapegoat. Josephus says[[16]](#footnote-16):

On the tenth of the same lunar month, they fast until evening; on this day they sacrifice a bull, two rams, seven lambs, and a kid as a sin-offering. These aside, they offer two kids, of which one is sent alive to the wilderness beyond the frontiers, being intended to avert by expiation (*apotropiasmós*).

Several scholars have pointed out that Josephus uses the term *apotropiasmós*, a rare lexeme that has been interpreted as a preventive force that repels an evil influence, sometimes by means of an offering.[[17]](#footnote-17) Feldman, however, emphasizes the similarity between Josephus' words and the Septuagint, which translates “Azazel” as *apopompaios*, a sending-away. Notably, Josephus does not explain why the sin-offering must be sacrificed. Turning his attention to the scapegoat, however, he elaborates on how the animal is sent away and atonement is thus attained.

Philo offers a similar depiction[[18]](#footnote-18):

The one on whom the lot fell was to be sacrificed to God, the other was to be sent out into a trackless and desolate wilderness, bearing on its back the curses which had lain upon the transgressors, who have now been purified by conversion to a better life and through their new obedience have washed away their old disobedience of the law.

Thus, Philo also emphasizes the atonement, in addition to repentance and the obviation of sins, that is attained through the scapegoat ritual.

The pivotal role of the scapegoat in early Christianity is also noteworthy, of course. In several sources, Jesus is identified with the scapegoat, as in, for example, the Epistle of Barnabas [[19]](#footnote-19):

And do ye all spit upon it and goad it, and place scarlet wool about its head, and so let it be cast into the wilderness. And when it is so done, he that taketh the goat into the wilderness leadeth it, and taketh off the wool, and putteth it upon the branch which is called Rachia, the same whereof we are wont to eat the shoots when we find them in the country. Of this briar alone is the fruit thus sweet.

In other sources, Jesus is identified with the goat sacrificed on the altar.[[20]](#footnote-20) Either way, these Christian traditions, written in temporal proximity to the destruction of the Temple, indicate the importance of the scapegoat ritual in the Second Temple period.

**Tannaitic** **Sources**

At first glance, Mishna Tractate Yoma[[21]](#footnote-21) carries the Biblical perception forward and gives the scapegoat a central place in the atonement ritual. The Mishnaic account does follow the Biblical ritual,[[22]](#footnote-22) despite certain changes, and describes in detail both the blood service (5:3–5) and the scapegoat ritual (6:1–8).

A closer study of the Tannaitic literature, however, reveals a real revolution in attention to the role of the scapegoat. Sifra,[[23]](#footnote-23) the Tannaitic midrash on Leviticus, quotes a dispute between R. Shimon and R. Yehuda regarding atonement through the scapegoat:

עד אמתי הוא זקוק לו להיות חי, לכפר עד שיכפר? תל' לו' "וכלה מכפר את הקדש את אהל מועד ואת המזבח" (טז, כ) דברי ר' יהודה. ר' שמעון או': "לכפר עליו" (טז, י) כפרה שהיא בגופו.

How long must it be kept alive? Until “When he has finished purging the Shrine, the Tent of Meeting, and the altar" (v. 20). These are the words of R. Yehuda. R. Shimon says: "to make atonement over it," atonement through its body.

The Midrash then references v. 10, which reads:

וְהַשָּׂעִיר אֲשֶׁר עָלָה עָלָיו הַגּוֹרָל לַעֲזָאזֵל יָעֳמַד חַי לִפְנֵי ה' לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו לְשַׁלַּח אֹתוֹ לַעֲזָאזֵל הַמִּדְבָּרָה.

The goat designated by lot for ’Azazel shall be left standing alive before the LORD, to make atonement over it and to send it off to the wilderness for ’Azazel.

The simple interpretation of this verse is that the goat makes atonement, “to make atonement over it," by being sent away. However, both R. Yehuda and R. Shimon divide the verse in two, so that atonement is not dependent on sending and, if the goat dies before it is sent, is not impaired. According to R. Yehuda, what matters is that the goat must be alive when the High Priest sprinkles the blood. R. Shimon’s reasoning, which seems to be the common Tannaitic method, is expressed more clearly in Tosefta Yoma 3[[24]](#footnote-24):

עד מתי יהא זקוק להיות חי? עד "וכלה מכפר את הקדש" (טז, כ) וגו' דברי ר' יהודה. ר' שמעון אומ' עד שעת וידוי.

How long must [the goat] be kept alive? Until “When he has finished purging the Shrine,” these are the words of R. Yehuda. R. Shimon says, “Until the time of the confession.”

Here the text explicitly states that, according to R. Shimon, atonement via the scapegoat is dependent on the confession mentioned in v. 21.

This seems to be a reinterpretation. As stated above, the plain meaning of v. 21 is that, by means of the confession, Aaron transfers the sins of the people to the goat and sends them into the desert. The confession in the Biblical account plays the technical role of transferring sins from place to place; atonement is not achieved through words. According to R. Shimon, however, it is the liturgical confession, and not sending the goat to the desert, that allows atonement to occur.

R. Shimon's method seems to be the basis for Tannaitic innovations involving the two other confessions of the High Priest, which appear in the description of the worship service in Mishna Yoma.[[25]](#footnote-25) The sentence “Aaron shall offer (והקריב"") his own bull for the sin-offering and make atonement for himself and for his household" appears twice, in v. 6 and v. 11, even before the slaughter of the bull is described. Commentators and scholars have suggested several ways of resolving the ostensible contradiction created by this verse. [ניסוח לאישורכך] Some[[26]](#footnote-26) propose that the word "והקריב" in the verse denotes not “sacrifice” but rather bringing the sacrifice to the place of its slaughter (as the midrash also assumes). However, they interpret the phrase “and make atonement for himself and for his household” as denoting the future: the beast should be brought in order to atone through it later through its blood. Other scholars[[27]](#footnote-27) interpret vv. 6–10 as forming a self-contained and separate unit that does describe the sacrifice of the sin offering, whereas vv. 11–12 present a different description, contrary to the first. According to this argument, while vv. 6 and 5 indicate that the bull and the goat are sacrificed on the outer altar before the entrance to the Holy Place, v. 11ff indicates that the blood is sprinkled into the Holy of Holies.

The midrash in Sifra[[28]](#footnote-28) solves this problem in a novel way, explaining that the intention is to attain atonement by making two confessions upon the bull’s head. These two confessions, in addition to a confession on the scapegoat, recur in Mishnah Yoma (3:9; 4:2). Some scholars[[29]](#footnote-29) address themselves the addition of these confessions and explain it as a liturgical addition to the atonement through sacrifice. A closer look at the Tannaitic sources, however, shows that, in fact, the main atonement of Yom Kippur, according to the Tannaim, is through these three confessions and not by sprinkling the blood of the sacrifice, let alone by sending the goat into the desert. As we have seen, atonement, according to both R. Yehuda and R. Shimon, does not depend on sending the goat away. As for sprinkling the blood, several sources, e.g., Mishna Shevuot 1, state explicitly that the blood atones only for the sin of entering the Temple in a state of impurity. Atonement for other sins depends, according to R. Shimon, on the confessions:

על זדון טומאת מקדש וקדשיו שעיר הנעשה בפנים יום הכפורים מכפר. ועל שאר עבירות שבתורה הקלות והחמורות הזדונות והשגגות הודע ולא הודע עשה ולא תעשה כריתות ומיתות בית דין שעיר המשתלח מכפר.

אחד ישראלים ואחד כהנים ואחד כהן משיח. מה בין ישראלים לכהנים לכהן משיח? אלא שדם הפר מכפר על הכהנים על טומאת מקדש וקדשיו. ר' שמעון אומר: כשם שדם השעיר הנעשה בפנים מכפר על ישראל כך דם הפר מכפר על הכהנים. כשם שווידויו של שעיר המשתלח מכפר על ישראל כך וידויו של פר מכפר על הכהנים.

For uncleanness that befalls the Temple and its sacred implements through wantonness, atonement is made by a goat whose blood is sprinkled within [the Holy of Holies] on the Day of Atonement.[[30]](#footnote-30) For all other transgressions spoken of in the Law, venial or grave, wanton or unwitting, conscious or unconscious, sins of omission or of commission, sins punishable by extirpation or by death at the hands of the court, the scapegoat makes atonement.

[This makes atonement] alike whether they are Israelites, priests, or the anointed priest. Wherein do Israelites differ from priests and the anointed priest? Only in that the blood of the bullock makes atonement for the priests for uncleanness that befalls the Temple and its sacred implements.

R. Shimon says: As the blood of the goat that is sprinkled within [the Holy of Holies] makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests; and as the confession of sin recited over the scapegoat makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the confession of sin recited over the bullock make atonement for the priests.

The first opinion in the Mishna appears anonymous, but this controversy also seems to recur in Sifra Ahare Mot, 8:8, 83b, where the debaters are identified explicitly as R. Yehuda and R. Shimon. However, at issue here are two different disputes, one concerning the relation between the priestly atonement and that of the people, and the other relating to the way other sins are atoned for: through the scapegoat or through the confessions. The first opinion does link atonement to this banishment. As we have seen, however, even R. Yehuda admits that the death of the scapegoat before it is sent into the desert does not delay atonement. In view of this, it can be concluded that the passage in the Mishna—“for all these the scapegoat brings atonement”—does not explain how the scapegoat brings atonement.

Regardless, R. Shimon, in the last part of the Mishna, states that sending the goat into the desert does not create atonement per se. The emphasis, rather, is on the act of confession.

The diminished emphasis on sending the goat to the desert is also reflected in Mishna Yoma 6: 3, which asks who actually led the goat into the wilderness:

מסרו למי שהוליכו. הכל כשרים להוליכו אלא שעשו הכהנים גדולים קבע ולא היו מניחין את ישראל להוליכו. אמר רבי יוסי: מעשה והוליכו עד-שאלא מציפורין וישראל היה.

They delivered it to him that should lead it away. All were fit to lead it away, but the priests had established the custom not to suffer an Israelite to lead it away. R. Jose said: it once happened that Arsela of Sepphoris led it away, and he was an Israelite.

As scholars have shown,[[31]](#footnote-31) the phrase “*all were fit* to lead it away” reflects here, as elsewhere, a polemical stance taken by the Sages against the priests. The priests’ insistence on their own role can be explained easily: Given that this is an integral part of the atonement process, it is a priest who should send the goat away. Why did the Sages believe that even a foreigner could carry out this important task? Bar-Ilan and Werman[[32]](#footnote-32) explain it as part of an attempt to raise the status of the Sages at the expense of the priests, a trend found in other contexts as well.[[33]](#footnote-33) Werman argues that the Pharisees, too, believed atonement is achieved by sending the goat. I believe, however, that this passage should be understood in view of the reinterpretation shown above, according to which atonement is not dependent upon sending the goat. It should be emphasized that although the Mishna here seems to preserve a historical tradition relating to a priesthood-Pharisee struggle,[[34]](#footnote-34) the formula “*all are fit* to lead it away” reflects a Tannaitic law[[35]](#footnote-35) that is appropriate to the overall conception of atonement on the Day of Atonement.

**Rabbi Yehuda’s Approach and Mishna Yoma**

Study of the Sifra and the Mishnaic tractate Shevuot, Chapter 1 reveals that this method of atonement reflects the approach of R. Shimon. A quite different approach is that of R. Yehuda, who considers atonement wholly dependent on the blood rituals and, as we have seen, what matters is that the goat remains alive as the High Priest sprinkles the blood. While, even according to R. Yehuda,, throwing the goat from the cliff is not critical, according to R. Yehuda, the confessions also lack great import and do not delay atonement. In Mishna Yoma, however, the confessions are central in the atonement ceremony.

The first and second confessions relate to the sins of the priests:

סומך שתי ידיו עליו ומתודה וכך היה אומר אנא השם עויתי פשעתי חטאתי לפניך **אני וביתי** אנא השם כפר נא לעונות ולפשעים ולחטאים שעויתי ושפשעתי ושחטאתי לפניך **אני וביתי**

And he set both his hands upon it and made confession. And thus he used to say: “O, God, I have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before thee**,** *I and my house*. O God, forgive the iniquity, the transgressions, and sins that I have committed and transgressed and sinned before thee, *I and my house.”*

**(**Mishna Yoma 3:8**)**

וסומך שתי ידיו עליו ומתודה וכך היה אומר אנא השם עויתי פשעתי חטאתי לפניך **אני וביתי ובני אהרן עם קדושך** אנא השם כפר נא לעונות ולפשעים ולחטאים שעויתי ושפשעתי ושחטאתי לפניך **אני וביתי ובני אהרן עם קדושך**

And he set both his hands upon it and made confession. And thus he used to say: "O, God, I have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before thee**,** *I and my house* *and the children of Aaron, the holy people.* O God, forgive the iniquity, the transgressions, and sins that I have committed and transgressed and sinned before thee, *I and my house* *and the children of Aaron.*

**(**Mishna Yoma **4:2)**

The third confession, according to Mishna Yoma,[[36]](#footnote-36) is of the sins of the People Israel:

וסומך שתי ידיו עליו ומתוודה וכך היה אומר אנא השם עוו פשעו חטאו לפניך עמך בית ישראל אנא בשם כפר נא לעונות ולפשעים ולחטאים שעוו ושפשעו ושחטאו לפניך עמך בית ישראל

And he set both his hands upon it and confessed. And thus he used to say: "O, God, *thy people, the House of Israel*, have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before thee**.** O God, forgive the iniquity, the transgressions, and sins that *thy people, the House of Israel*, have committed and transgressed and sinned before thee.

All of the foregoing accords with R. Shimon’s method in Mishna Shevuot 1. The first method in that location claims that the priests and the People Israel achieve atonement together through the scapegoat. In Sifra Ahare Mot, 8:8 83b, this method is explicitly attributed to R. Yehuda.[[37]](#footnote-37) R. Shimon, however, takes issue with this method. In his opinion, the priests and the People Israel atone separately by means of the different confessions:

As the blood of the goat that is sprinkled within [the Holy of Holies] makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock make atonement for the priests; and as the confession of sin recited over the scapegoat makes atonement for the Israelites, so does the confession of sin recited over the bullock make atonement for the priests.

It turns out that the first opinion in Mishna Shevuot, which represents the method of R. Yehuda, does not accept the existence of the three confessions, or at least, with the wording of the confessions that appears in Mishna Yoma. It seems, then, that R. Shimon's method is the more common one in Tannaitic literature.

**The Reasons for the Reinterpretation by the Tannaim**

This reinterpretation appears to be the result of an attempt by the Sages to reduce the magical dimension of the scapegoat. A well-known baraita grapples with the difficulty the Sages faced in reference to the scapegoat ritual[[38]](#footnote-38):

תנו רבנן..."ואת חקתי תשמרו" (ויקרא יח, 4) - דברים שהשטן ואומות העולם משיבים עליהן, ואלו הן: אכילת חזיר, ולבישת שעטנז, וחליצת יבמה, וטהרת מצורע, ושעיר המשתלח. ושמא תאמר מעשה תוהו הם? תלמוד לומר "אני ה'" - אני ה' חקקתיו, ואין לך רשות להרהר בהן.

“And you shall keep my statutes” [Lev 18:4]— matters that Satan and the nations of the world challenge: eating pork; *shatnez* [wearing diverse cloths]; *ḥalitza* for the *yevama* [releasing a woman from a levirate marriage]; purification of the leper; and the scapegoat. And lest you say, are these meaningless acts? the verse states: “I am the Lord”: I decreed these and you have no right to doubt them.

As Weinfeld[[39]](#footnote-39) notes, this midrash appears to express the difficulty that the Tannaimfelt toward this ceremony.

As stated above, many scholars have commented on the resemblance of this ceremony to similar ceremonies known from the Ancient East. In these rituals, meant to protect society from forces of impurity, sin, and evil, sins are placed on objects or animals and sent outside the boundaries of the settlement. Most scholars agree, however, that in the Biblical ritual, the pagan dimensions of the ceremony are blurred.[[40]](#footnote-40) The goat is not a sacrifice and ’Azazel is not a specific figure who has an active role to play, such as accepting the goat or attacking it. Nevertheless, the Biblical ritual and the pagan rituals do have similarities and, as I suggested, R. Shimon’s focus on the confession may originate from the goal of distancing Jewish practice from the magical meaning of the ceremony.

The Sages’ attempt to reduce the magical dimension of the scapegoat ritual is reflected in additional laws related to the scapegoat. As noted above,[[41]](#footnote-41) some pre-Tannaitic sources include clear expressions of the mythical perception of the ritual. In Enoch 1 10:1-4, for example, ‘Azazel is a rebellious demon whom God commands to have tied and cast into the desert beneath the rocks. ‘Azazel as a demonic character also appears in Apocalypse of Abraham 13:6-14.[[42]](#footnote-42)

In the Tannaitic sources, however, the word ‘Azazel is interpreted in other ways. The midrash in Sifra[[43]](#footnote-43) construes it as “a difficult place in the mountains.” In addition, as scholars have shown,[[44]](#footnote-44) the term *scapegoat* that appears in Tannaitic sources reflects a deconstruction of the word *‘Azazel* as *ez azl'* (Aramaic—“a goat has gone”). [הוספתי—לאישורכם] These interpretations cleanse the ritual of any magical dimension.

Some scholars, however, have alluded to the baraita in Babylonian Talmud (BT) Yoma 67b—""תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: עזאזל - שמכפר על מעשה עוזא Those of the house of R. Ishmael taught: “‘Azazel is so called because it atones for the actions of Uzza and Azael.” M. Kahana[[45]](#footnote-45) sees this as an expression of the demonic conception of ‘Azazel in R. Ishmael’s school, as opposed to R. Akiva’s school as it appears in the Sifra. Kahana also quotes the *Mekhilta de-Miluim*, a midrashic work attributed to R. Ishmael’s school, in which it is stated in the context of the offering of the “days of *miluim*”:

Moses told Aaron: Aaron, my brother ... you have to give into the mouth of a devil, to send a *doron* [gift or offering] [הוספתי] before you enter the temple....[[46]](#footnote-46)

Notably, however, in the baraita in BT Yoma 67b, the offering is intended not for any individual but solely for the one who atones for the act of “Uza.” In addition, addressing himself to the *Mekhilta de-Miluim,* Shammah[[47]](#footnote-47) notes that it is not said in this work that the *doron* is delivered to the devil; instead, the *doron* given to God closes the devil’s mouth.

Another factor to bear in mind is the centrality of repentance and confession in Tannaitic thought. As many scholars have noted, in the late Second Temple period and after the destruction of the Temple, repentance and confession became increasingly central in achieving atonement, in addition to and instead of sacrifices.[[48]](#footnote-48) The theme of repentance is saliently present in the Book of Jubilees[[49]](#footnote-49) and recurs in several sources in the Qumran literature,[[50]](#footnote-50) other sources from the Second Temple period, and early Christian literature.[[51]](#footnote-51)

More specifically, we find confession in these sources as part of the atonement process. In a Yom Kippur liturgical fragment from Cave 4, the following appears[[52]](#footnote-52):

תפלה ליום כפורי זכורה אדוני מועד רחמיך ועת שוב....ואתה ידעת הנסתרות והנגל[ות [י]דעת יצרנו...[קומנ]ו ושוכבנו"

A prayer for the Day of Atonement: Remember, O Lord, the occasion of Your mercy and the time for repentance ... and You know the secret things and the revealed things.

On Yom Kippur, Philo writes, “the soul comes in supplication to God"[[53]](#footnote-53) and apologizes for its intentional and inadvertent sins. [[54]](#footnote-54)nceptiorpeve noted that this ha Scholars intensified after the destruction of the Second Temple, owed to the Sages. Thus, for example, Tosefta Yoma[[55]](#footnote-55) indicates the obligation to confess several times during the Yom Kippur prayers.[[56]](#footnote-56) It stands to reason that R. Shimon's interpretation derives from this trend.

**The Role of the Scapegoat**

In addition to what we have seen so far, one must pay attention to the Tannaitic innovation with respect to the form in which the goat must be sent. The Biblical account (vv. 21–22) makes it clear: the scapegoat "shall be sent off to the wilderness through a designated man ... and […] shall be set free in the wilderness.” The account says nothing about any physical harm befalling the goat, as in many ancient ceremonies practiced throughout the Ancient Near East.[[57]](#footnote-61)In all these sources, it is emphasized that one of the animals was sent alive outside the settlement area and not killed. Neither do Philo’s ("of which one is sent alive to the wilderness"), Josephus’ (“the other was to be sent out into a trackless and desolate wilderness”), and the Temple Scroll ("and shall send it to ’Azazel to the desert") accounts of the ritual, quoted above, allude to such an outcome. [[58]](#footnote-62) This also applies to the description in the Epistle of Barnabas, mentioned above (“and so let it be cast into the wilderness”).[[59]](#footnote-63)

According to Mishna Yoma, however, the goat is thrown off a cliff and killed:

מה היה עושה חולק לשון של זהורית חציו קשר בסלע וחציו קשר בין שתי קרניו ודחפו לאחוריו והוא מתגלגל ויורד ולא היה מגיע לחצי ההר עד שנעשה אברים אברים.

What did he do? He divided the thread of crimson wool and tied one half to the rock, the other half between its horns, and pushed it from behind, and it went rolling down and before it had reached halfway down the hill, it was destroyed limb by limb.

This denouement recurs in Sifra, the Tannaitic midrash, which interprets the word ‘*azazel* as “a difficult place in the mountains.”[[60]](#footnote-64)

How should one explain the Tannaitic imperative of killing the goat? Several scholars[[61]](#footnote-65) who assume that this change was already made during the Second Temple period suggest that expansion of the population in Palestine during the Temple period caused this change: The people, or the priests, were afraid that the goat would return to the populated settlement and therefore preferred to kill it. The problem with this suggestion is that, as we have seen, there is no evidence that during the Temple period the goat was thrown from the cliff.

I wish to offer another explanation. First, it should be noted that also in the Near East pagan ceremony of banishing the scapegoat , the animal figure that was sent out was not killed, but in scapegoat rituals from Ancient Greece, we do find expulsions that involve killing the scapegoat. Bremmer[[62]](#footnote-66) showed that in Massilia, according to Petronius, the scapegoat was expelled from the city (fr. I), but, according to later scholia (on Statius *Theb.* 10.793), it was stoned to death. In Athens, scapegoats were expelled across the border in historical times but the scapegoat in the aetiological myth was killed. Finally, the scapegoats in the romance of lamboulos were placed in boats explicitly described as seaworthy (Diod. Sic. 2.55-3).

Bremmer and Hughes claim that the later lexicographers and scholiasts added the element of killing, whereas the earlier contemporaneous sources speak only of expulsion. If so, it may be argued that the description of the ceremony in the Mishna was influenced by accounts of similar ceremonies prevalent in Roman culture in the first centuries CE. Indeed, it is noteworthy that Tosefta Yoma 3:14[[63]](#footnote-67) proves that, already in the first generations of Tannaim, the goat is assumed to have been thrown from the cliff. In this source. R. Eliezer is asked several questions about the scapegoat, the last of which is:

דחאו ולא מת ירד אחריו וימיתנו ?

[If he] pushed [the goat] down and it didn't die, should he go down and kill it?

Thus, the ritual that included killing the goat was well known in R. Eliezer's generation.

It should also be noted that both R. Yehuda and R. Shimon were sages of the Usha period, a time when, arguably, the interpretive revolution that emphasized the confessions took place. In contrast, during the period approximating that of the destruction of the Temple, the scapegoat ritual was still seen as a main precipitant of atonement. As a result, perhaps also under the influence of Roman writers, it was assumed that the animal must die, thereby atoning for the people's sins, similar to other sacrifices that are always slaughtered in the course of worship.

According to this explanation, two different approaches to the scapegoat ritual are found in the Tannaitic literature. One, the earlier of the two, intensifies atonement through the goat; the other actually diminishes the importance of the ceremony of the goat’s expulsion. According to this proposal, the sages of the Usha generation “inherited” the ritual of killing the goat and were “forced” to accept and incorporate it into the general description of the atonement on Yom Kippur.

Even if this hypothesis proves itself true, it is still necessary to explain the function of the ritual according to the Tannaim of the Usha period.

As shown above, according to the Tannaim, atonement depends on confession. This revolution, I argue, redefines the role of the scapegoat. I suggest that from then on, it is used not for atonement but rather *to prove* (“omen”) that atonement has indeed been achieved. This is precisely why the goat should be thrown from the cliff. If it dies as a result, it is a sign that the sins have been erased.

Indeed, the Day of Atonement service according to the Mishna and parallel sources invokes several rituals to prove that atonement has been achieved. How should one understand, for example, the role of the thread of crimson wool, mentioned in Mishna Yoma 6, which was supposed to turn red after the goat was thrown off the cliff? Many scholars have noted the similarities between the Mishnaic description of the ritual and ancient Syro-Anatolian customs, along with the fact that this is not mentioned in the Bible.[[64]](#footnote-68) Ayali-Darshan recently claimed that the crimson thread in the Mishna symbolizes the malevolence that is “loaded” onto the scapegoat bound for “Azazel.” In contrast, I believe that its role in the Mishna is to prove that atonement has indeed been achieved.[[65]](#footnote-69)

The baraita in BT Yoma 39a reports:

Forty years before the destruction of the Temple, the lot for God did not turn up in the right hand, the strip of crimson did not turn white, and the westernmost lamp did not burn.

In a parallel baraita in Palestinian Talmud 6,[[66]](#footnote-70) the hurling of the goat from the cliff is mentioned in a similar context:

As long as Simeon the Just was alive, before [the goat] reached halfway down the scape it was destroyed limb by limb. After the death of Simeon the Just, it would flee into the wilderness and the Serkin would eat it.

Therefore, the death of the goat symbolizes the obliteration of sins before God. When the goat is not killed and escapes, it symbolizes the fact that the atonement of the people has not been achieved.

**Conclusion**

Two interpretive revolutions appear in the Tannaitic literature regarding the scapegoat. First, the Tannaim, following R. Shimon, argued that it is not the sending of the goat that causes atonement but rather the confession placed upon it. In so ruling, they diminished the power of the ritual. Contrastingly, they intensified the ritual by determining that the not only be sent but also killed. I suggested that these two revolutions came about during two different periods in the Tannaitic era. Nevertheless, I argued, that since the sages of the Usha period claimed that sending the goat away does not bring atonement, the ritual had to be repurposed and, from that time on, it served as proof that atonement had indeed been achieved, making it necessary to kill the scapegoat.

This study relates to a question that has occupied a number of scholars over the past few decades – the historicity of descriptions reported in the Mishna.[[67]](#footnote-71) In the past, scholars assumed that the descriptions of the Temple in the Mishna reflect the reality of the Second Temple period. However, many scholars today assert that a considerable number of these descriptions were created by sages who lived after the destruction of the Temple. With respect to the scapegoat, the matter seems to be clear: the Mishna is not describing the actual rituals as they were performed in the Temple. Rather, the ceremony described in that source is based on a combination of interpretation, ideology, and shards of historical tradition.
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