**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 children of Israel (v. 5). He sprinkles the blood of the bull and one of the goats in different places in the Temple 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 a number of essays from the Second Temple period[[2]](#footnote-2) and with the inquiry of how the Sages coped with this ritual.[[3]](#footnote-3) In the last-mentioned context, most discussions take up the question of how the Sages interpreted the word ’*azazel* and 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 in the Tannaitic literature about the disposition of the goat: thrown off the cliff and not just sent to the desert. As I will argue, there is a connection between this interpretation and the assertion that atonement does not depend on sending the goat away.

**The Biblical account**

As stated, Aaron sprinkles the blood of the bull and one of the goats in different places in the Temple and sends away the second goat, the scapegoat, to “’Azazel to the desert.” The purpose of sprinkling the blood is explained in v. 16:

In this way, he will make atonement for the Holy Place because of the impurity and the sins of the children of Israel, whatever their sins have been.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Indeed, as Jacob Milgrom has shown, in several places in the Bible, it is assumed that the impurity of the children of Israel defiles 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.[[5]](#footnote-5)

As for the scapegoat, the Torah commands Aaron to place his hands on its head, confess the sins of the people of Israel on it, and then send it away to the desert. 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.[[6]](#footnote-6) According to this, B. Levin[[7]](#footnote-7) argue that the confession does not contain a request for forgiveness but only a list of the transgressions that are transmitted to the goat. The confession, then, has no liturgical function.

It follows that the atonement ritual comprises two ceremonies: atonement for the Temple through the bull and one of the goats, and 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. The account in the Temple Scroll, for example, tracks that of the Bible, more or less[[8]](#footnote-8) :

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[[9]](#footnote-9):

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*).

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 the atonement is thus attained. Philo offers a similar depiction[[10]](#footnote-10):

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 medium of the scapegoat.

En passant, the pivotal role of the scapegoat in early Christianity is noteworthy, of course. Jesus was identified with the scapegoat[[11]](#footnote-11) or with the goat sacrificed on the altar.[[12]](#footnote-12) 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, the Mishna, Tractate Yoma, carries the Biblical perception forward and gives the scapegoat a central place in the atonement ritual. The Mishnaic account does follow the Biblical ritual, 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,[[13]](#footnote-13) the Tannaitic midrash on Leviticus, quotes a dispute between R. Shimon and R. Yehuda regarding atonement through the scapegoat:

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 refers to v. 10, which reads:

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, atonement 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[[14]](#footnote-14):

How long must it 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 Rabbi 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 Bible plays no liturgical role and atonement is not achieved through words. According to Rabbi Shimon, however, it is a liturgical confession, and not sending the goat to the desert, that causes atonement.

The reduced reference of sending the goat to the desert is also reflected in Mishnah Yoma 7, 3 that dealing with the question of who actually led the goat to the wilderness:

They handed it over to him who was to lead it away. All were fit to lead it away, but the priests made a fixed rule not to permit an Israelite to lead it away. Rabbi Yose said: it once happened that Arsela led it away, although he was an Israelite.

As scholars have has shown,[[15]](#footnote-15) the words:" **All were fit** to lead it away", here, as in other places,[[16]](#footnote-16) reflects a polemical position of the sages against the priests. The priests' insistence can be easily explained: this is an integral part of the atonement process and so a priest should send it away. Why, then, did the sagas think that even a stranger could fulfill this task? Bar-Ilan and Werman[[17]](#footnote-17) argued that this is part of the attempt to Increase the status of the sages, at the expense of the priests, a trend we found in other contexts as well.[[18]](#footnote-18) Werman explicitly claimed that the Pharisees also believed that the atonement is achieved by sending the goat. However, I believe this should be understood in light of the reinterpretation we saw above, which stated that the atonement is not depend on sending the goat.

This revolution appears to be the result of an attempt by the Sages to downscale the magical dimension of the scapegoat. As stated above, many scholars have commented on the resemblance between this ceremony and similar ceremonies known from the ancient East. In these rituals, which aim 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.[[19]](#footnote-19) 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 in the goal of distancing the Jewish practice from the magical meaning of the ceremony.

Indeed, the sage's attempt to downscale the magical dimension of the scapegoat, Is also reflected in other laws of the scapegoat. As in noted before,[[20]](#footnote-20) some pre-Tannaitic sources include clear expressions of the mythical perception of the ritual. For example, in the book of Enoch 1 10:1-4 ,`Azazel is a rebellious demon, whom God commanded to tie and cast into the desert under the rocks. `Azazel as demonic character also appears in Apocalypse of Abraham 13:6-14.[[21]](#footnote-21) In the Tannaitic sources, however, the word 'Azazel Interpreted in other ways. The midrash in Sifra[[22]](#footnote-22) interprets the word `Azazel: "a difficult place in the mountains".

In addition, as scholars have shown,[[23]](#footnote-23) the expression `Scapegoat` that apprise in Tannaitic sources reflects an interpretation of the word `Azazel as *'ez - azl'* (armic). These interpretations distance any mythical dimension from the ritual.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Another factor to bear in mind is the centrality of repentance and confession in Tannaitic thought. As many scholars have noted, in the late the 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.[[25]](#footnote-25) It stands to reason that R. Shimon's interpretation derives from this trend.

Indeed, R. Shimon's method seems to be the basis for Tannaitic innovations in relating to the two other confessions of the High Priest, which appear in the description of the worship service in Mishna Yoma.[[26]](#footnote-26) 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. The midrash in Sifra[[27]](#footnote-27) explains that the intention is to attain atonement by making two confessions upon the bull's head.[[28]](#footnote-28) A closer look at the Tannaitic sources shows that 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 away the goat. 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:

For intentional transgressions of the laws of impurity in connection with the Temple and the holy food, the goat offered inside the Day of Atonement brings atonement. For other transgressions of the Torah, light and grave, intentional and unintentional, known and unknown, positive and negative, those punishable by *kareth* and those punishable by death imposed by the court, for all these the scapegoat brings atonement. [The scapegoat] brings atonement to Israelites, priests, and the anointed High Priest alike. What [then] is the difference between Israelites, priests, and the anointed High Priest? [None], save that the bullock [offered on the Day of Atonement] brings atonement to the priests for transgressing the laws of impurity in connection with the Temple and the holy food.

R. Shimon says: “Just as the blood of the goat that is offered within [the Holy of Holies] brings atonement to the Israelites, so does the blood of the bullock [offered on the Day of Atonement] bring atonement to the priests; *and just as the confession of sins pronounced over the scapegoat* brings atonement to the Israelites, so *the confession pronounced over the bullock* brings atonement to the priests (italics added).

The first opinion in the Mishna appears anonymous, but this controversy also seems to recur in Sifra Ahare Mot, 8:8, 83 b, where the debaters are identified explicitly as R. Yehuda and R. Shimon. In fact, however, there are two different disputes here: One concerns the relation between the priestly atonement and that of the people; the other concerns the way other sins are atoned for: through the scapegoat or through the confessions. The first opinion does link atonement to this deportation. 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, one must explain that the sentence in the Mishna—“for all these the scapegoat brings atonement”—does not explain how the scapegoat brings atonement.

Either way, R. Shimon, in the last part of the Mishna, states in so many words that sending the goat into the desert does not cause atonement per se.

The emphasis is on the confessions.

**The role of the scapegoat**

In addition to what we have seen so far, one must pay attention to the innovation created by the Tannaim as to the form in which the goat must be sent. The Biblical description (vv. 21–22) makes it clear: the goat sent into the wilderness: "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. Neither do Philo’s and Josephus’ accounts of the ritual, quoted above, allude to such an outcome.[[29]](#footnote-29) According to the Mishna in Yoma, however, the goat is thrown off a cliff and killed:

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 half 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.”[[30]](#footnote-30)

How should one explain the Tannaitic imperative of killing the goat? A number of scholars,[[31]](#footnote-31) who assumed that this change was already made during the Second Temple period, suggested that expanded of the population in Palestine during the Temple period, caused this change: The people or the priests have been afraid that the goat would return to the settlement and therefore they preferred to kill him. The problem with this suggestion is that as we have seen, there is no evidence that in the Temple period the goat was thrown off the cliff.

Instead, I want to offer two other options to explain this matter:

1. One option is that this imperative stems from the assumption that the goat does atone for sins. As a result, it was assumed the animal must die and the people's sins with it.

The problem with this explanation is that this reinterpretation of the terms seems to be contrary to the trend we have discussed throughout, where the Tannaim underestimated the importance of the scapegoat. It can nevertheless be explained if will assume that their are two different approaches to the scapegoat ritual in the Tannaitic literature. Indeed , from the Tosefta Yoma 3:14[[32]](#footnote-32) It is proven that already in the first generations of the Tannaim It was assumed that the goat was thrown off the cliff. R` Eliezer is asked their a number of questions about scapegoat and the last of them is: "threw him and he didn't die, should he go down and kill him?". This ritual was, therefore, well-known in Rabbi Eliezer's generation, And it may be that during this period, near the destruction of the temple, the scapegoat ritual was still seen as a main cause of atonement.

In contrast, both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon are sages from Usha period, and it could be argued that the interpretive revolution that emphasized the confessions actually took place during their time.

2. Even if the mentioned thesis is turns out to be true, it is still necessary to explain the following: If, according to the Tannaim, from Usha period, the atonement is not dependent on sending away the goat, why should it be sent at all and what is the function of the ritual?

As shown above, according to the Tannaim, atonement depends instead on the confessions. This revolution, I argue, redefines the role of the scapegoat. From then, it is used not for atonement but rather *to prove* that atonement has indeed been achieved. This is precisely why it should be thrown off the cliff. If it dies as a result, it is a sign that the sins have been *erased*.

Indeed, in the Day of Atonement service according to the Mishna and parallel sources, there are several rituals that are meant to prove that the atonement has been achieved. So 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.

Indeed, the *baraita* in Babylonian Talmud 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,[[33]](#footnote-33) the hurling of the goat from the cliff is mentioned in a similar context:

As long as Simeon the Tzaddik was alive, before [the goat] reached halfway down the scape it was destroyed limb by limb. After the death of Simeon the Tzaddik, 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. By so ruling, they diminished the power of the ritual. Contrastingly, they intensified the ritual by determining that the goat should be killed and not only sent. As I suggested, it turns out to be two revolutions created at created in two different periods of the Tannaim. Despite this, I argued that because that the Sages from the Usha period claimed that sending the goat away does not bring atonement, the ritual had to be repurposed and, since then, it has served as proof that atonement has indeed been achieved—making it necessary to kill the scapegoat.

This research relates to a question that has occupied a number of scullers over the past few decades: the historical question of the descriptions in the Mishnah.[[34]](#footnote-34) As for the scapegoat, It seems to be clear: the Mishnah is not describing the actual rituals as they were performed in the Temple. The ceremony described therein is based on a combination of interpretation, ideology, and shards of historical tradition.
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