
For many years comparative thematics was the principal method of comparative literature until formalism and structuralism emerged as the key terms of avant-garde scholarship. Now, in an era when these very terms are relegated to the backyard of the academy by trendier directions, thematic analysis is enjoying a modest rejuvenation.¹ Within this re-emerging paradigm Yoav Elstein and Avidov Lipsker have launched a very ambitious project known as “The Thematological Encyclopedia of Jewish Literature.” They have outlined their methodology in two programmatic essays,² and together and separately published several case studies.³ Yoav Elstein has also guest-edited volume 30 of *Criticism and Interpretation* (1994) which includes several thematological essays by diverse hands.

Rella Kushelevsky is a team member of the “Thematological Encyclopedia” project and her study, *Moses and the Angel of Death*, is a systematic and comprehensive exposition of its method. The theological centrality of Moses’ death, the long literary history of the story, and its multiple textual representations enable Kushelevsky to test the basic assumptions of this method and to explore its potential for the study of Jewish literature in a way not perf-


mitted by other themes, whose position in tradition is more limited. Themato-
logical research takes a historical-holistic conception of Jewish literature
in which written texts—biblical, talmudic-midrashic, and medieval—serve
as thematic stabilizers. Consequently, in contrast to the high textual fluidity
in general folklore, Jewish tradition enjoys great homogeneity. This literary
condition allows for dialectics between a meta-historical overview of a theme
and a historical-chronological approach that deploys versions along a diach-
ronic axis. The method's analytical tools and terms are taken from the the-
saurus of folklore and literary criticism: motif, motifeme, telos, and the
neologism constanta that refers to a motifemic sequence that recurs in many,
if not all, the versions of a thematic series.

The biblical text is the starting point for this narrative theme, and as is
often the case, it is not its lucidity but rather its ambiguity, even implicated
and textual contradictions that generate midrash. Firstly, how could “the man
of God” (Deut 33:1) and “the servant of the Lord” (Deut 34:5) die like an
ordinary mortal? Secondly, how is it possible to have very clear directions
to Moses' tomb: “He buried him in the valley in the land of Moab, near Beth-
peor,” and at the same conclude that “no one knows his burial place to this
day” (Deut 34:6). The narrative resolutions of these puzzles repeat them-
selves over two millennia of literary history in which Kushelevsky distin-
guishes six chronological divisions: Hellenistic, tannaitic, early medieval,
late medieval, Renaissance, and modern. Throughout these periods the the-
matical series of “The Death of Moses” share a dominant ideological
message, its telos, that manifests itself in a narrative tension between “death”
and Genizah (“concealment”) which Kushelevsky terms the “Genizah-Death
Oxymoron.” The narrative balance between the death of Moses and the con-
cealment of his body and soul undergoes shifts and transformations. Helle-
nistic literature tends to describe Moses' death as concealment that may even
take cosmic dimensions. For example, Joshua contends in the Testament of
Moses: “Your sepulcher is from the rising to the setting sun, and from the
South to the limits of the North, the whole world is your sepulcher” (11:8).
The tannaitic texts in Sifre, Abot de Rabbi Nathan, Midrash Tannaim, and tal-
mudic baraitot, shift the emphasis to the confrontation between Moses and the
Angel of Death, viewing Moses’ death in human terms, yet without completely
abandoning the notion of Genizah. Kushelevsky considers the early-medieval
midrashic texts of Tanhuma and Deuteronomy Rabbah to be a narrative pro-
gression in the same direction, which reaches the peak of its expansion in the
13th century in texts such as Midrash Pe'irat Moshe Rabbenu 'Alav ha-Shalom
that A. Jellinek includes in his anthology of small midrashim⁴ and the more

⁴ Adolph Jellinek, ed., Bet ha-Midrasch. Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und ver-
mischter Abhandlungen aus der älteren jüdischen Literatur (Leipzig, 1853–1877; reprint
unique version of *Petirat Moshe*, of Spanish provenance, dated 1289, that is included in MS Parma 327/37 (pp. 261–278). These and some other earlier renditions of the story served as the basis for its diffusion in Jewish societies in manuscripts and later in print. In “A Chronological List” Kushelevsky registers 83 texts, of which over sixty are from the 11th century and later. Some copied, others combined earlier renditions, and the 20th-century anthologies recovered the texts from traditional books for modern readers. *Midrash Petirat Moshe Rabbanu 'Alav ha-Shalom* is the most comprehensive rendition of the story, including all of its motifemes, and then some, telling of the three major predicaments that Moses faced: succession, denial of entry to the Promised Land, and death.

Kushelevsky’s analysis of the story sets new standards for the adjective “exhaustive.” Her bibliography of primary sources, rendered twice, first as “A Categorical List,” (pp. 285–293), then as “A Chronological List” (pp. 294–296), is definitive. She makes effective use of the research tools and concepts of motif, motiteme, telos, and constanta to explore the comparative, structural, ideological, and historical aspects of the narrative, presenting the reader with a multi-dimensional study.

Thoroughness, however, is not only its own reward, but also its own challenge. Kushelevsky has made such a careful and comprehensive study of the “Moses and the Angel of Death” theme that, as meaningful research often does, she implicitly casts new doubts and generates more questions concerning her subject matter. These require a re-examination not only of her own conclusions, but also the basic principles of the thematological method.

First, like the post-biblical interpreters and retellers whose texts she analyzes, Kushelevsky privileges the biblical rendition of the “death of Moses” story as a version that transcends variations. She excludes it from the dialectics it might engage with its meta-historical conception. The Bible itself does not appear on any lists of sources. Yet, while the fragmentary or individual versions of this biblical story are irrecoverable from history, the biblical text itself does suggest the occurrence of prior oral tradition, or even, as Higher Criticism has postulated, the existence of different written sources. The conflicting views of Deut 34:6, that locate and obscure the place of Moses’ sepulcher at the same time, hint at the availability of at least two opinions. Moreover, even in the biblical narrative itself there are several previous statements concerning Moses’ death, denial of entry to the Promised Land, and succession (Num 27:12–23; Deut 1:37, 3:23–29; 4:21–22). While the Bible has a central position in Jewish culture and religion, in a study of the literary history of the Jewish people, it is necessary to apply to its analysis the same criteria to which other texts are subjected and to adhere to the same principles that guide their interpretation. Kushelevsky herself formulates this attitude quite clearly when she writes: “This emphasis on continuity dictates an egalitarian approach; all versions of a given series are deemed equally
important, with no priority given to any particular version according to
generic or chronological considerations” (p. 10).

Secondly, the historical-holistic conception of the entire corpus of narra-
tive versions is at the basis of Kushelevsky’s interpretation that the Genizah-
Death Oxymoron is the core theme of the story, and she observes a shift in
telos along this axis from the Hellenistic to tannaitic versions. However, it
is also possible to view this change not as a narrative shift but rather as a cul-
tural one. The emphasis on Genizah, and hence also on Moses’ psyche
(“soul”), is more in keeping with Hellenistic ideas of the afterlife. Therefore
the narrative shift that Kushelevsky observes in tannaitic and later Jewish
sources, emphasizing death and Moses’ human mortality, may be indicative
of the inner struggle of rabbinic Judaism attempting to rid itself of its Hel-
lenistic heritage. Furthermore, the Hellenistic emphasis on Genizah occurs
in the works of highly-educated people. The tannaitic tradition, even when
generated by learned sages, was more attuned to folk culture and oral tradi-
tion. Hence the shift in balance from Genizah to death may involve also a
transition from an educated to a more popular social context for this narra-
tive tradition.

In conclusion, as much as Kushelevsky confirms the methodological
effectiveness of the thematological project, the logical consequence of her
detailed and rigorous analysis would require a modification in its basic as-
sumptions. The search for turns and transformations in the history of a theme
would shift the process from the high grounds of meta-history to the histor-
ical, literary, cultural, and social dynamics of tradition, in which narrators
relate to texts that influence them and to audiences and readers that listen to
and read them.
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