“Until Elijah Comes: The Character (*demut*) of Elijah in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature

Methodological background on the study of biblical characters:

The proposed study is part of a genre of scholarship dedicated to examining representations of biblical characters in rabbinic literature. Thus, it seems appropriate to offer a preliminary examination of the Hebrew term *demut* – which may be translated into English variously as “character,” “image,” “likeness,” or “figure” – and the different ways in which this term is used in the scholarly literature.

In the scholarly literature, the term “*demut*” at times serves in a general nonspecific sense, like a hook upon which a name may be hung. Thus, for example, the title of the collection, *Abraham, Father of the Believers – His Image in Light of Interpretation Throughout the Ages*[[1]](#footnote-1) does not seek to indicate much beyond the fact that the various articles included in the volume deal with Abraham. In fact, it would have been possible to remove the words “his image” from the title, without altering its meaning.[[2]](#footnote-2) There is a specific meaning of the concept of a “character” (*demut*), however, when it is used in the context of literary scholarship. Indeed, the literary character is one of the foundation stones of literary fiction, discussed frequently in the scholarly literature, which attempts to illuminate the (direct and indirect) ways in which it is portrayed, its type (round or flat), the function that it fulfills in the literary text (primary or secondary), and more. These tools and similar ones are used by biblical scholars of literary inclination when discussing biblical characters.[[3]](#footnote-3)

In the context of figurative art, there is a different sense to this concept. The “image” in this context is a visual representation of something real.[[4]](#footnote-4) This is the earlier and more fundamental sense of the Hebrew term *demut*, as it appears in the Bible and in rabbinic literature: God creates man “in His form [*be-ṣalmo*], after His image [*ki-dmuto*]” [[5]](#footnote-5) as a figurative representation of Him.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The Mishnah relates that “Rabban Gamliel had ‘images’ of the various phases of the moon that he would show to uneducated witnesses and ask, ‘did you see a moon like this one or like this one?’”[[7]](#footnote-7) Joseph refrained from sinning with Potiphar’s wife when the “image of his father’s face” [*demut diyuqano shel aviv*] appeared to him. [[8]](#footnote-8) There are many other examples.[[9]](#footnote-9) This fundamental sense of the image (*demut*)expands to the textual plane when the author describes the external appearance of the object in literal fashion (e.g. in the ekphratic genre).[[10]](#footnote-10) So too, even beyond this literal description, when the author seeks to represent to his readers other dimensions of the object of his description: his personality, his biography, and so on.[[11]](#footnote-11) Thus, for example, Plutarch conceives the writing of the “Life of Alexander” as the painting of a portrait (fill in.).[[12]](#footnote-12)

Plutarch expresses his intention to write a text resembling figurative representation in the sense that he seeks to reveal with artistic tools a certain internal essence of the object of description, and also in the sense that he does not attempt to present to his readers everything that is known to him about Alexander and Caesar, but rather concentrates on that which seems central to him, “aspects of the individual’s soul”.

Between these two senses of the concept of *demut* – the “character” as a textual personality and the “image” as representation – there is an important difference with respect to the degree of consistency expected from the “figure”. This distinction has consequences concerning the way various scholars relate to biblical heroes.

One important feature of the literary character (*demut*) is consistency. Aristotle already includes this characteristic among the four aspects of literary character that he enumerates in the *Poetics*. He maintains that, “if one wishes to present an inconsistent character in an artistic representation, it must be consistent in its inconsistency.”[[13]](#footnote-13) The ‘character’, as a textual entity, mimics the concept of ‘personality’ found in extra-literary reality:[[14]](#footnote-14) Just as we presume a certain continuity between a person’s various behaviors in reality, so too the literary character entails the principle of consistency.[[15]](#footnote-15) The application of this principle to biblical heroes often raises difficulties, as in many instances the biblical text contains contradictory descriptions of its characters that are hard to contain within a single figure. Thus, for example, Shamai Glender points to the gap between two descriptions of Abraham: In describing Abraham’s departure from Haran, the Bible depicts “an exalted hero departing on his journey without hesitation, at a late stage in his life, to fulfill an incomparably difficult divine command.” Conversely, in the part of the story dealing with the descent of Abram and Sarai to Egypt, “we find a man afraid for his life and ready to purchase it for the price of a deception.”[[16]](#footnote-16)

There are those who conclude that the Bible does not present a single character, but rather a composite of various characters,[[17]](#footnote-17) or that considerations other than consistency of character were of highest concern to the redactors of the different traditions about biblical characters.[[18]](#footnote-18)

In contrast, those who view the literary character (*demut*) as representing an extra-textual entity relate to contradictions like these in a more forgiving fashion. Yair Zakovitch, for example, begins the introduction to this book on David as follows:

Three thousand years ago, David the son of Jesse ruled over Israel and Judah in Jerusalem. Despite the distance in time, despite the twists of fate that David’s people, his land and his city had undergone – and perhaps precisely because of all these – every Jew, indeed every student of Western culture, carries with him the image of David. Every person has his own David: an anonymous shepherd boy from Bethlehem in Judea; a brave youth who rose up without arms against Goliath, the Philistine giant; the groom of Saul, the first King; the lover of many women; the father of many children who received no pleasure from them; and, at the national level, a fearless hero; a great conqueror: founder of an empire that made Jerusalem, the city which he already had built, the capital of his kingdom. David, also remembered fondly as a gifted musician; as the poet of the Psalms; as the founder of the Jerusalem cult; and, also, as father of the Royal House, a lineage which merited an eternal covenant; out of which, as well, he would be the father of the Messiah yet to come.

Each of these images is based on the Bible; each and every generation reworked the biblical materials and created from them its own literary character; painters and sculptors, poets and storytellers, musicians and dramaturges, sought out the image of the ancient king whose life is imprinted on the very first seal, and found in it timeless foundations appropriate for their own day and even for days to come.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Of note in this introductory passage is the visual metaphor of the literary text as a picture, a representation of an extra-textual entity, which comfortably contains a multiplicity of representations and presumes a measure of subjectivity and author choice with respect to the manner of representation: “to each his own David”.[[20]](#footnote-20)

In light of everything said here, the title of the proposed scholarly investigation, “The Character (*demut*) of Elijah the Prophet in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature,” holds within it several possible understandings: in its most general sense, this title indicates only that the sources and subjects discussed have in common the fact that they are all connected to Elijah. In a second sense, Elijah is a literary entity in a specific text. The concept of a “literary character” in this sense suggests a measure of unity or consistency of the character within one text, but does not suppose similar consistency in relation to other texts. In a third sense, the title indicates an attempt to identify the way or ways in which Elijah is depicted in rabbinic literature, based upon the assumption that author, narrator or redactor of the text made a choice regarding how to depict this picture, since a representation is not, of course, identical with its source. The “source” in such a case is the sum of earlier texts that stood before the narrator, sage, homilist, or redactor: in the first instance, the Bible, but also post-biblical sources that he utilizes, or chooses not to utilize, in painting a picture of Elijah in accordance with own perspective and preferences. I do not claim preference for one understanding among these three. Rather, I wish to turn the concept of the “literary character” (*demut*) from an assumption that is taken for granted into a *research question*: Do the sources discussed here present us with a “character” of Elijah, and if so, in what sense? Is there an attempt to sketch a personality with certain contours? Is there consistency among the traits attributed to it? Is it possible to identify different orientations or different portrayals of Elijah in the different sources? There is indeed basis to ask these questions regarding other biblical heroes, but regarding Elijah they have additional force: In contrast to other characters, Elijah is understood in rabbinic literature not only as an historical figure from the period of the Israelite kings, but also as one who continues to exist in the present, and who will return and act again in the future. If we presume that there is a single literary character before us who should be expected to maintain the principle of consistency, the question emerges: is the eschatological Elijah expected to return and act in the same ways, and according to the same principles, as the historical Elijah?[[21]](#footnote-21) In other words: Did the Sages expect the return of Elijah the zealot, who decrees droughts, and who slaughters the prophets of Baal? This question will be addressed, inter alia, in a chapter dealing with expectations of the ‘returning’ Elijah. Posed from the opposite direction: Is it possible that the manner in which the literary character of the historical Elijah is presented in specific sources is influenced by the presumption that his activity in the past should serve as a precedent for his future activity? An apparently conspicuous example of inconsistency will be discussed in a chapter dealing with the criticisms of Elijah. The Mekhilta of Rabbi Ishmael presents Elijah as one who had been deposed from his role as a prophet. On its face, this dismissal is not congruent with the expectation of his future return.

Another theoretical perspective tied to the concept of the literary “character” is the question of how, and in what sense, the character “exists”. On this issue there are a variety of views, ranging from realist conceptions which see in literary characters an imitation of human beings, and thus sometimes discuss them in a manner detached from the linguistic makeup of text, to purist or semiotic approaches which view the literary characters only as “words”, part and parcel of the linguistic makeup of the text.[[22]](#footnote-22) The heroes of the Bible are presented in the Bible itself and in rabbinic literature as historical figures.[[23]](#footnote-23) Without entering into a discussion about the historicity of the Bible, it can be said that these characters exist outside the biblical text, in the consciousness of those who have read the Bible, interpreting, retelling, and discussing these characters over the generations. In other words, these literary characters exist in Jewish “collective memory,” and also in the collective memories of other groups that view the Bible as a sacred text, including Christianity and, to a certain extent, Islam.

“Collective memory” has become a key concept among scholars treating the relationship between history and society. The French-Jewish sociologist Maurice Halbwachs claims that collective memory is not just a metaphor but rather a social reality that is transmitted and sustained by the conscious efforts of the group and its institutions.[[24]](#footnote-24) Important studies on Jewish historical memory have been written under the influence of Halbwachs’ approach, the most distinguished of which include *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, by the historian Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi,[[25]](#footnote-25) and the article, “Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness,” by the historian Amos Funkenstein, which was written as a response to Yerushalmi’s book.[[26]](#footnote-26) In the context of discussions of collective memory, significant attention has been given to historical figures, as scholars considered the dynamics shaping changes in the ways various characters are conceived and presented.[[27]](#footnote-27) In his book, *Moses the Egyptian,* the historian and Egyptologist Jan Assmann, applying the concept of collective memory to a biblical character, coined the term “mnemo-history”, which refers to historical study concerned not with the past in-and-of-itself, but rather to the past as it was remembered over the generations.[[28]](#footnote-28) On the basis of this conceptualization, other studies have also been published dealing with biblical characters as they have been “recollected”.[[29]](#footnote-29) Ahad ha-Am, independent of this conceptualization, already claimed that “the real great men of history, the men, that is, who have become forces in the life of humanity, are not actual, concrete persons who existed in a certain age. There is not a single great man in history of whom the popular fancy has not drawn a picture entirely different from the actual man; and it is this imaginary conception, created by the masses to suit their needs and their inclinations, that is the real great man, exerting an influence which abides in some cases for thousands of years—this, and not the concrete original, who lived a short time in the actual world…”[[30]](#footnote-30)

The French historian Pierre Nora further developed Halbwachs’ insights. Nora coined the term “realms of memory,” and pointed to the function of real or symbolic objects, like monuments, textbooks, memorial ceremonies, and so on, for the formation and preservation of a group’s collective memory. Following Nora, some scholars have claims that biblical characters, too, are “realms of memory”.[[31]](#footnote-31)

As has been noted, biblical characters have continued to exist in the consciousness of the Bible’s readers over the generations, as postbiblical texts narrating the stories of these characters refract them through different aspects of collective memory, sometimes reshaping them altogether. One of the goals of this project is to examine the place, or the various places, that Elijah occupies in the rabbinic collective memory, and the manner in which this memory is formed. In this sense, Elijah is no different from other biblical characters. However, the view of Elijah as one who never died, but instead rose heavenward in a whirlwind and will return at the end of days, grants Elijah, at least theoretically, an extra level of “existence”. This added dimension finds expression, inter alia, in the Talmudic stories in which Elijah is revealed to the Sages or assists them in difficult circumstances; and in the depiction of him in later literature as being present at religious rituals, such as circumcisions and the night of the Passover Seder. I intend to examine the different ways in which Elijah’s “existence” is conceived. In what sense, if at all, is he conceived of as being contemporaneously present? The initial impression that emerges from a preliminary reading of the sources (which I intend to examine further in an orderly and thorough fashion) is that, in the Talmuds and works of Midrash, Elijah is conceived of as a contemporaneous presence to a far greater extent than in Tannaitic literature. An investigation of the significance of this difference is a desideratum.

The figure of Elijah will be examined in the context of subjects that are central to the world of the Sages, including: eschatology and messianism; halakhah and legal decision-making; the phenomenon of prophecy and the question of its continued existence in the postbiblical age; political and religious fanaticism; attitudes toward history; pietism and asceticism; and attitudes toward “holy men”. This list proceeds from a starting assumption which I will attempt to confirm in the study: namely, that the figure of Elijah does not function merely as a marginal character from the world of folklore; rather, it serves as a figure through which, by means of interpretation and reinterpretation, the Sages struggle with questions central to their world.

A chapter in this study will be devoted to examining the expectations of Elijah upon his future return. A key source regarding this subject is the final Mishnah in tractate *Eduyyot*, which cites are a variety of opinions concerning the future activity of Elijah. In addition to attempting to evaluate the intellectual foundations and interpretive basis of each of these views, I will investigate whether there is a shared orientation which could be described as the position of the Mishnah itself (or its redactors) in relation to hopes concerning Elijah. Is it possible to describe the contours of a single “character” (*demut*)? And should one view the collection of opinions in the Mishnah as part of a specific, local conversation, or rather as an attempt to present a more general position reflecting the eschatological orientation of its editors? This investigation will be based, inter alia, on a comparison between the discussion in this Mishnah and its parallel in the Tosefta. The discussion of Tannaitic sources will form the basis for an examination of the development of different orientations regarding the expectations of Elijah expressed in the Babylonian Talmud, the Jerusalem Talmud, and the aggadic Midrashim.

Alongside the expectation of a future return of Elijah the Prophet and the hopes surrounding this return, Talmudic and Midrashic literature also contains within it a critical attitude toward Elijah. It is claimed against him that “he did not demand the honor of the son,”[[32]](#footnote-32) that is to say, the honor of Israel; that he libeled Israel,[[33]](#footnote-33) that he caused jealousy against Israel;[[34]](#footnote-34) and more. A chapter in this study will be devoted to the examination of the development and growth of this critical line. In this chapter, I will attempt to determine the interpretive foundations upon which the criticism of Elijah is based, the historical context in which this criticism sprouted, the motivations behind it, and the ideological trends to which it gives expression.

As part of the proposed study, I intend to expand upon the discussion in my article and to treat the whole complex of sources in which Elijah is mentioned in the context of discussions regarding “kingship”, both under foreign and Jewish rule.

Another example of my methodological approach is presented in an unpublished paper (attached) entitled, “The *Halakhah* of Elijah: Heavenly Knowledge, Hasidism, and Danger”. The wider context in which this article belongs is the examination of the manner in which the character of Elijah the Prophet is presented in rabbinic literature in relation to the treatment of halakhic matters. In the scholarly literature, it is common to consider this topic from the perspective of the tension between the halachic discourse of the Sages, on one hand, and other sources of knowledge and authority, on the other, as well as the question of the legitimacy of any involvement of “supernal powers” in this conversation. This article discusses a story in the Babylonian Talmud (*Berakhot* 3a), in which Elijah is depicted as teaching Rabbi Yosi several *halakhot*—a possibility regarding which the story does not express any reservations. In the article, I investigate why the story presents the *halakhah* as having been acquired by means of the “revelation of Elijah”. What sort of halachic knowledge does Elijah mediate, to whom and for what reason? On the basis of philological considerations and an examination of the redaction process of the Talmudic text, I attempt to determine the original context in which the story emerged, and the considerations which led the editors of this *sugiyah* to place it in a different context. These considerations are connected to the unique character of the “*halakhah* of Elijah”. The reading proposed in this article presents an alternative to accepted scholarly views regarding the conception of Elijah as a force external to halachic discourse, as well as regarding the “pious teaching” to which many of the Talmudic stories of revelations from Elijah are related. I see this article as an example of the need for a renewed examination of the place of Elijah in relation to halachic discourse in Talmudic and Midrashic literature. Within the framework of the proposed research, I wish to treat the whole complex of sources relevant to this subject.

Explanation for repeated application:

A previous proposal that I submitted was rejected by the committee. The application number for the rejected proposal is: 1652/16.

In this proposal, I have rectified the deficiencies pointed out by the committee. In the previous version of this proposal, I suggested producing a critical edition of all the passages in Talmudic and Midrashic literature in which Elijah is mentioned. This critical edition would have served as a textual basis for literary-theoretical study. This element of the proposal was rejected by the committee on the grounds that they did not see a purpose in producing an edition that is not focused on a specific work. In light of this feedback, I removed the critical edition from the present proposal. It no longer appears either in the proposal’s title or in the research program.

A second criticism expressed by the committee was the lack of clarity with respect to the project’s expected findings. In the present version of the proposal I have expanded the discussion about the theoretical background on which the research is based, and I have also detailed the expected findings in an expanded fashion. In effect, this proposal is completely different to the one I submitted previously.

1. *The Faith of Abraham: In the Light of Interpretation Throughout the Ages*, M. Halamish, H. Kasher, Yohanan Silman, editors (Ramat Gan, 2002). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Indeed, the word "image" (*demut*) is frequently omitted in English translations of the titles of books and articles. Thus, for example, the title of the collection mentioned above is rendered into English as: *The Faith of Abraham: In the Light of Interpretation throughout the Ages*. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See, for example, (fill in). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. In a chapter entitled, "‘Fictionality and Representation of Reality in Literature," Menachem Brinker writes: “In relation to literature, the purely imaginary is rare in works of visual art. Indeed, behind generic terms like ‘woman,’ ‘still life,’ ‘doctors,’ war,’ real models usually hide, which the painter employed, at least as a starting point. These are the ‘doctors’ that Rembrandt saw; the ‘soldiers’ that Goya saw. Thus, frequently, even when a painter’s or sculptor’s works have a generic subject, one may view them as the representation of some actual particular example as well.” (M. Brinker, *Representation and Meaning in Fictional Work* , Tel Aviv 1980, p. 119). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Genesis 1:25-26. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See S.I. Friedman, “How Much Anthropomorphism? Allowing the *Aggada* to Speak for Itself”, *Sidra* (2007) 22: 89-152; for a full examination of the concept of the iconic in the divine form and its consequences, see Lorberbaum, *In God’s Image: Myth, Theology, and Law in Classical Judaism*. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. M. Rosh ha-Shanah 2:8. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Tanhuma, *vayeshev*, 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. From the perspective of the history of the Hebrew language, earlier layers of the sense of the term “*demut*” are “form, appearance, image, structure” (A. Even Shoshan, *A New Dictionary*, Jerusalem, 1997, p. 313). Only in Modern Hebrew do we find the sense of “a type, a person of certain qualities, the hero of a work of art” (ibid.). In the Ben Yehudah Dictionary, this second sense does not appear. Ben Yehudah suggests the meanings: 1) a shape resembling another shape. 2) something that resembles something else (volume 2, pp. 957-958). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See (fill in). A. Holtzman, “The Poetry of Sculptures and Paintings – Ekphrasis in Modern Hebrew Poetry,” *Jerusalem Studies in Hebrew Literature* 15 (1995), pp. 247-252, and the references there. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. On the painting of a portrait as a metaphor for the writing of a biography, see H. Lee, *Biography – A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford, 2009, pp. 2-4. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Plutarch cites the well-known statement that he attributes to Simonides of Ceos (fill in). For additional comparisons between the writing of biography and portraiture in Plutarch, see T. Hägg, *The Art of Biography in Antiquity*, Cambridge, 2012, pp. 271-272. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Aristotle, *Poetics* (fill in). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Y. Even counts “manner” or “personality” as one of three areas in which literary character is revealed (*The Literary Character*, pp. 23-24). He defines “the meaning of the word ‘character’ (*demut*) here [as] the sum of the elements of personality, which are more or less fixed, and which are found equally in fictional and non-fictional persons. This concept is identical, for the most part, with the psychological concept of ‘personality’ or ‘character’” (Y. Even, “The Theory of Character (*demut*) in Literature,” p. 2). In his book on Elijah, Garsiel suggests a psychological evaluation of the prophet’s personality. See M. Garsiel, *From Earth to Heaven – A Literary Study of the Elijah Stories in the Book of Kings*, Bethesda, 2014, pp. 17-21. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Over the course of the 20th century, however, there has been a reduction in adherence to the principle of consistency with respect to literary characters. This has come alongside an erosion of the status of the ‘character’ more generally. (See, for example, S. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics,* Tel Aviv, 1984, pp. 35-37).This does not negate the efforts of various scholars to find consistency in the description of biblical characters. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. S. Gelander, *Art and Idea in Biblical Narrative*, p. 61. Regarding the difference between the character of Joseph as depicted in the stories of Genesis as compared to other sections of the Bible, Kugel writes (fill in): [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. For example, Freud claimed that the biblical Moses was a composite of two different leaders with the same name, one Egyptian and the other Midianite. (S. Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, Tel Aviv, 1979 page 55). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. S. Gelander, *Art and Idea in Biblical Narrative*, p. 61-72. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Y. Zakovitch, *David*, p.9. On the presentation of biblical characters as "multifaceted" or as "many-faced" see Y. Zakovitch, “From the Oral to the Written Story in the Bible: Outline for Discussion,” *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore* (1991), p. 40; A. Shinan, “On the figure of King David in Rabbinic Literature,” appendix to Y. Zakovitch, *David: from Shepherd to Messiah*, p. 181. D. Ravid, *Joab Son of Zeruiah: Controversial Hero*, Tel Aviv, 1990, p. 11. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. This is also the implicit assumption in titles of studies concerning biblical characters including the term "portrait," such as: (fill in). However, there exists a way to include contradictory descriptions and characterizations of biblical heroes for all those who interpret the concept of the “character" (*demut*) as a textual entity: namely, by presenting the character as complex and multifaceted. (Bar Efrat, *The Art of the Biblical Story*, pp. 73-74; Fishloeb, *The Curls of Samson*, p. 220). Auerbach saw a mimetic principle in the characterization of biblical heroes as complex and developing characters: "Abraham, Jacob, and even Moses make a real impression, closer and more historical than characters from the world of Homer… because the chaotic variegation, the contradictory claims, and the many obstacles of internal and external events in these authentic chronicles are not erased in the description of biblical heroes, rather they are maintained in their fullness” (E. Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*,Jerusalem, 1961, p. 16). However, this conceptualization does not negate the fundamental claim regarding the unity of the character (*demut*), though it is difficult to establish precisely when one crosses the line from portrayal of a complex figure with many contradictions to the abandonment of the concept of a literary character. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Segal, in his book on Elijah, points to a significant difference between the biblical Elijah and the literary character of Elijah as portrayed in rabbinic literature (fill in). [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. The question is presented in this manner in relation to literary character in a section entitled, "Can characters be real?" (Fill in).

S. Rimmon-Kenan presents the question of the existence of the literary character under the title, "People or words?" She presents the understanding of Madrick belonging to the “purist” approach – according to which “literary characters have no existence. Rather, since they are a component of the fantasies in which they are embedded, and of the events that motivate them, any attempt to remove them from their context and to treat them as if they are real people is based on an emotional misunderstanding of the nature of literature" – as opposed to the "realist" approach according to which "in the course of action, literary characters achieve an independent status, detached from the events which they are placed, as there are good reasons to treat them at a certain distance from the context in which they appear" (Rimmon-Kenan, *The Poetics*, p.37). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. To the exclusion, perhaps, of Job, who, according to some views "was a parable". And, perhaps, also (missing). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. (fill in the citation to his book) [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. (fill in) [Seattle, 1982.] [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. A. Funkenstein, “Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness,” *History and Memory*, 1: 5-26. On the prominent place of these studies in the investigation of Jewish memory, see G. Meron,” Memory, Historiography and in Between: Thirty Years since *Zakhor,*” *Zion* 78, 2013, pp. 107-121; and A. Raz-Krakotzkin, “Between Exile and History: The Fundamental Tension of Modern Jewish Historiography in the wake of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi,” *Zehuyot* 1 (2012) pp. 87-99. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Thus, for example, Schwartz discusses changes in the depiction of the character of Abraham Lincoln (fill in). [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. J. Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian* [: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism], Cambridge MA, 1997, pp. 8-9. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. See Assman’s book in the previous note, and others (fill in). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Ahad ha-Am, *Moses*, *Ahad ha-Am*: *Collected Writings*, Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, 1947, p. 342, cited by Zakovitch, *The Life of Samson*, p. 12. See also B.Z. Dinur to the effect that “legends concerning a figure’s ‘personality’ are in all times and circumstances -- in my view, without exception -- an integral portion of his historical character" (B.Z. Dinur, “Personality in its Time: in General History and in Jewish History" *Personality in its Time: Lectures delivered at the 8th Conference for Historical Study*, Jerusalem, 1964, p. 9-10). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. (fill in). [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Mekhilta de-Rabi Ishmael, *Pisha* A, Horowitz-Rabin ed., p. 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah, 1:6, Dunsky ed., p.32. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Shir ha-Shirim Zuta, 8:6, Buber ed., p. 36. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)