5 Ways Atonement Works (Even When the Text is Hard)

Your 18Forty Parsha Guide is a weekly newsletter exploring five major takeaways from the weekly parsha. Receive this newsletter every week in your inbox by subscribing here. Questions or feedback? Email Rivka Bennun Kay at Shabbosreads@18forty.org.

You stand in synagogue on Yom Kippur, chest pounding, mouth dry from fasting. The liturgy describes goats, lots, and a priest entering the Holy of Holies. Part of you wonders: Does any of this actually work? Can an ancient ritual cleanse something as stubborn as guilt? Can words and fasting really repair a fractured year?

The double parsha of Acharei Mot-Kedoshim makes this question unavoidable. We encounter the esoteric mechanics of the Yom Kippur service, then plunge immediately into the Holiness Code. This code contains some of the most culturally charged verses in Torah.

Here is the dual crisis: First, can atonement really function through ritual? Second, can we find atonement within a text whose landscape sometimes feels foreign to us? These five perspectives offer ways through these tensions.

1. The Scapegoat and the Psychology of Casting Off

Picture the scene. A goat stands before the High Priest, trembling. The priest places both hands on its head and pours out the sins of an entire nation in confession. Then the animal is led into the wilderness and pushed off a cliff. Your first reaction might be: This is primitive, even magical thinking. How can an animal carry human sin?

The verse states this vividly. Vayikra 16:21-22 describes how the goat "shall carry upon it all their iniquities to a land cut off." Ramban on Vayikra 16:8 interprets this to mean the ritual genuinely interacts with spiritual forces, weakening what he calls the "accuser." In his reading, the transfer is a genuine transaction.

But here is what's interesting. René Girard, the anthropologist and philosopher, spent his career studying how societies manage collective violence. In his book *Violence and the Sacred*, Girard argues that human communities survive by projecting internal chaos onto a scapegoat. Without this outlet, communities tear themselves apart. Every society does this. The difference is whether the scapegoat is a person or a symbol.

The genius of the Yom Kippur ritual is redirection. We acknowledge the human need to externalize guilt. We ritualize it. We channel it toward an animal rather than toward marginalized people, political enemies, or our own family members. Rabbi Dovid'l Weinberg emphasizes that external modalities shift internal states. We cannot merely think our way out of guilt. We must physically enact its removal to experience the cleansing the text promises.

Modern psychology confirms that humans naturally project unwanted traits onto others. The *sa'ir laAzazel* ritual acknowledges this tendency and provides a controlled release valve. This is ritualized psychology, ancient wisdom about how humans actually process shame. Atonement, in this first sense, means externalizing what we cannot simply think away. Without such a mechanism, we inevitably scapegoat each other.

2. Blood, Life, and the Limits of Consumption

The Torah pivots abruptly from the choreography of Yom Kippur to an arresting prohibition: the ban on consuming blood. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls" (Vayikra 17:11). The text insists on repetition. Blood may not be eaten. Not by Israelites, not by strangers. Something essential is at stake.

At first glance, this law feels distant from our moral intuitions. We do not crave blood. We do not struggle with vampiric temptation. Why elevate this prohibition to such prominence, framing it as a matter of life and atonement?

Ramban on Vayikra 17:11 suggests that blood carries the animating force of life itself. To ingest it is not merely to eat improperly, but to absorb vitality in a way that blurs the boundary between creature and Creator. Life belongs to God. Humans may benefit from animals, but only by acknowledging limits. The altar receives the blood precisely because it symbolizes returning life to its source.

There is a deeper intuition here about consumption. Modern culture trains us to believe that whatever exists is available for use. Data, bodies, attention, labor, even trauma become raw material. If something can be extracted, optimized, or monetized, we assume it should be. The Torah introduces a counterethic: Not everything that can be consumed should be. Some things are sacred precisely because they are withheld.

The anthropologist Mary Douglas, whom we encountered earlier, notes that dietary laws are rarely about hygiene. They are about teaching societies how to draw moral lines around power. Blood represents ultimate power: the power over life and death. By refusing to consume it, the Torah trains restraint at the point where domination would be easiest.

This reframes atonement directly. If sin is overreach—claiming authority over life that belongs only to God—then atonement works by reversing that motion. Where sin reaches in and takes, atonement steps back and returns. The blood poured on the altar is not symbolic hygiene; it is the enactment of relinquishment, the physical rehearsal of giving back what was never ours. We fast on Yom Kippur not only to afflict ourselves, but to practice, for one full day, not taking. That practice is itself the repair.

3. Holiness as a System of Boundaries

"You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy." Vayikra 19:2 announces this command without much explanation. What does holiness even mean? Rashi on Vayikra 19:2 offers a striking interpretation: "You shall be separated." Holiness is a discipline of distinction.

Dr. Moshe Koppel argues that Jewish law operates as a distinct system with its own internal logic. It does not map perfectly onto Western universalism. "Being good" in the generic sense differs from "being holy" in the Jewish sense. Holiness requires specific disciplines of restraint that define the collective.

Jonathan Haidt's research in moral psychology, particularly in *The Righteous Mind*, illuminates this further. Haidt identifies "Sanctity/Degradation" as one of several innate moral foundations. Many contemporary Westerners have atrophied this particular "taste bud," viewing morality primarily through the lens of harm and care. If no one is hurt, how can something be wrong? The Torah's Holiness Code demands we exercise a different moral muscle: restraint for the sake of higher order. Discipline even when no obvious damage is visible.

Ramban on Vayikra 19:2 adds complexity. One can technically keep all the laws and still be a *naval birshut haTorah*, a scoundrel with the permission of the Torah. Someone who eats only kosher food but gorges disgustingly. Someone who speaks no forbidden speech but gossips constantly within permitted bounds. Holiness requires moving beyond the letter of the law to its spirit.

In a culture where "permitted equals beneficial," the Holiness Code introduces a radical counterproposal. We find meaning through self-limitation. This connects directly to our question of atonement's efficacy. Atonement involves re-accepting the boundaries that constitute us as a people, making the annual reset both possible and meaningful.

4. The Architecture of Rebuke and Repair

"You shall not hate your brother in your heart. You shall surely rebuke your fellow." Vayikra 19:17 links these two commands in a single verse. The connection is intentional. Silence breeds resentment. Unspoken grievances metastasize into hatred. The Torah prescribes rebuke as medicine for the soul, serving repair rather than punishment.

David Bashevkin describes what he calls the "community of failure." Estrangement often stems from accumulated small silences: the inability to communicate hurt, the fear of awkward conversations. Teshuva, in this model, functions as relational repair. Speaking what has festered.

Amy Edmondson, a Harvard Business School professor, has researched what she calls "psychological safety" in organizational culture. Her insight in *The Fearless Organization* applies directly to this verse. Rebuke is impossible if the relationship lacks safety. Correction without love becomes aggression. The Torah links "do not hate" with "rebuke" because the sequence matters. You must first establish that you care before you can risk correction.

Sefer HaChinuch explains the purpose of rebuke as peace-making. The goal is removing the hatred in the heart that festers when we stay silent about grievances. Notice the counterintuitive logic. Speaking up repairs. Keeping quiet destroys.

We live in a culture oscillating between public shaming and total excision. The Torah proposes a third option: private, constructive engagement that seeks to repair the relationship rather than destroy the person. The verse warns that if we rebuke poorly, or stay silent entirely, we bear the sin of the broken relationship. True rebuke is an act of intimacy that proves we care enough to risk awkwardness. The community atones together by refusing to let resentment fester into permanent rupture.

5. The Moloch of Modern Perfectionism

Vayikra 18:21 prohibits giving one's offspring to Moloch, an ancient cult that practiced child sacrifice. We recoil at this. What could be more distant from contemporary sensibilities?

Sforno on Vayikra 18:21 offers an interpretation that reaches across centuries. Moloch worship involved delivering children to a foreign power or ideology in order to secure their future. Parents sacrificed their children to gain prosperity, betting a child's life on a better harvest.

Bari Mitzmann describes the immense weight of curated perfection in our digital age. We sacrifice mental health and authentic development on the altar of image. Parents push children toward achievements that erode their souls while building their resumes.

Michael Sandel, the political philosopher, argues in *The Tyranny of Merit* that meritocracy has become our dominant religion. We believe success indicates virtue. We sacrifice our children's wellbeing for the salvation of elite admission. Their stress becomes acceptable collateral damage in the pursuit of prestige.

Here is the uncomfortable parallel. We would never literally sacrifice a child on a bronze altar. Yet we routinely sacrifice children's spiritual and emotional health for prestige. Moloch is the god of future outcomes purchased at the cost of present holiness.

This brings us back to where we began. Does atonement work if we continue worshiping Moloch? The scapegoat from our first section can carry away sins, but ongoing idolatry undermines the reset. Holiness requires boundaries, including boundaries on the ambitions we project onto our children. Relinquishment restores what overreach has taken. Rebuke, as we explored, requires us to name what we are doing honestly. And perhaps the deepest *toevah* is treating our children as means to our ends rather than as souls entrusted to our care.

The insights of this parsha converge here. Atonement mechanisms function when we use them honestly. Boundaries constitute holiness when we accept them as identity rather than burden. Rebuke repairs relationships when offered in love. Yet all of this collapses if we sacrifice the human on the altar of acceptable idols. We defeat Moloch by prioritizing souls over resumes, connection over status, presence over future security. This is the atonement that actually works.

Questions for Reflection

1. **When have you experienced a restriction or boundary that actually deepened your sense of meaning rather than limiting it?**
2. **What is the modern Moloch in your own life, the external pressure that demands the biggest sacrifice from you or your family?**
3. **How do you distinguish between rebuke that repairs and judgment that separates, especially when engaging with people who see the world differently?**

This project is made possible with support from the Simchat Torah Challenge and UJA-Federation of New York. Learn more about the Simchat Torah Challenge and get involved at their website.