Thank you for your instructive comments and insights. They have given me much food for thought.

I agree that the subject of the genealogical method was not sufficiently developed in the article and was therefore somewhat unclear. I had no intention of presenting a comprehensive timeline of all the sources on obedience and disobedience in Jewish culture from the Old Testament to the present day. It would, of course, be impossible to present a complete genealogy of this topic in one article. It would appear that my explanation did not make this sufficiently explicit.

I have now clarified and emphasized in the article that the issue of obedience and disobedience arose on the cultural agenda during the pandemic, which is why it is an interesting issue to examine genealogically even without establishing a causal connection to the cultural present. I have also explicitly stated that the article presents a preliminary genealogy alone, based on a limited number of cultural patterns that appear in the foundational biblical texts with the understanding that the Jewish cultural past is comprised of many other sources. The present article has no intention of examining present-day Israeli society and the only mentions of present-day reality appear in the introduction and conclusion to indicate that the social phenomena that arose as a consequence of the pandemic led me to examine the cultural past.

The updated version of the article also emphasizes that genealogy does not necessarily always examine processes and can sometimes only point to conceptual roots in the culture. Therefore, a genealogist must be careful not to present these conceptual roots in a causal context with regard to the present, but to illuminate the subject and bring it into the present by the very act of exposing and presenting it. In “On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life” (1980), Nietzsche claims that the observation of the past is essential for us as individuals and as a society. I have now expanded the explanation of the methodology based on Nietzsche and Foucault. The genealogical method used in the article relies on the Nietzschean conception, which is based on a reflection on customs, thoughts, and behaviors (Blondel 1994, 309–310). In my understanding, Nietzsche’s genealogy is a hermeneutic strategy that requires careful attention to our historical traces and not necessarily to processes (Conway 1994, 321–328). It is a criticism wherein the critic establishes their own criteria. For example, Nietzsche examines the values of morality and culture based on the standards he presents, such as the will to power (Rusinek 2004, 423).

Of course, the narratives and constructs examined in the article are not necessarily ahistorical and there is no attempt to argue this, even if it were possible. The purpose of the article, which I have refined based on your instructive comments, is to present contradictory themes on the subject of obedience and disobedience in the biblical sources of culture while relying on the works of Fromm, Shoham, Hazony, Rotenberg, and others. Cultural analysis here refers to the secular interpretation of the biblical text as a foundational text in Jewish culture.

Beyond the exposure of the cultural constructs present in the biblical text, the article asks a related question—are the ostensibly contradictory constructs of obedience and disobedience in fact in dialogue within a dialectical context and arise as a conflict, or are they two sides of the same issue because dialectical understanding has the function of presenting two contradictory sides within one greater truth. I hope that I have now explained, both in this response and in the expanded methodology section in the body of the article, my purpose in presenting a limited genealogy that looks at biblical roots alone, rather than a broad, procedural genealogy attempting to explain Israeli society today. I have also sharpened my conclusion to focus on this limited biblical genealogy with no connection to contemporary Israeli society. As you rightly pointed out, there was a lack of coherence between the introduction and the conclusion.

I take this opportunity to reiterate my sincere gratitude for your time and informed insight.