

EUROPEAN HEBREW JOURNAL

Volume 1, Issue 2 (2026) · ISSN 3122-8879 (Online)

Diamond Open Access · Double-Blind Peer-Reviewed Journal

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Zikaron and Saṃskāra: Relational and Dispositional Continuity Across Shared Problem Fields

Yu-Sung Liao

Independent Scholar, Taipei, Taiwan

Published in: European Hebrew Journal, Volume 1, Issue 2 (2026)

Article Type: Research Article

Peer Review: Double-Blind Peer Review

Academic Editor: Prof. Dr. Susannah Heschel, Dartmouth College, USA

Received: 17 June 2026 | **Accepted:** 1 August 2026 | **Published:** 17 August 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.67469/EHJ2026.1.2.10>

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8279-041X>

Corresponding author: Yu-Sung Liao | yusung.kevin@gmail.com

Pages: 225–265

Abstract

Comparative inquiry frequently encounters difficulties when concepts drawn from distinct textual traditions resist lexical equivalence yet address shared human concerns. This article addresses that challenge through a comparison of the Hebrew concept of zikaron and the Yogic concept of saṃskāra. Although these concepts differ in semantic content, textual context, and practical orientation, both occupy pivotal positions within Continuity Architectures through which the past remains operative.

Drawing upon Biblical Hebrew semantic analysis and comparative analysis of Hebrew and Yogic sources, the article reconstructs zikaron as a structure of Relational Continuity grounded in Covenantal Remembrance, Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation, Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, and Intergenerational Continuity. In contrast, saṃskāra is reconstructed as a structure of Dispositional Continuity grounded in latent impression, dispositional tendency, causal persistence, and transformative processes operating within citta. The comparison identifies two distinct Continuity Structures: Relational Continuity within the Hebrew tradition and Dispositional Continuity within Classical Yoga.

Building upon this analysis, the article proposes a limited form of Structural Position Analysis (SPA), which shifts comparison from lexical equivalence toward the analysis of structural position, Continuity Structures, and Continuity Architectures while remaining grounded in philological and contextual reconstruction. The study further argues that continuity may be approached as one of the Shared Problem Fields through which traditions organize responses to questions concerning persistence, transmission, remembrance, and transformation.

The article contributes to Hebrew Studies and comparative hermeneutics by suggesting that meaningful comparison need not depend upon conceptual identity. The comparison indicates that traditions may remain irreducibly distinct while nevertheless becoming mutually

intelligible through the analysis of structural positions within broader Continuity Architectures.

Keywords: zikaron; saṃskāra; Hebrew Bible; Classical Yoga; Continuity; Shared Problem Fields; Structural Position Analysis; comparative hermeneutics

How to Cite

Liao, Yu-Sung. “Zikaron and Saṃskāra: Relational and Dispositional Continuity Across Shared Problem Fields.” European Hebrew Journal 1, no. 2 (2026): 225–265. <https://doi.org/10.67469/EHJ2026.1.2.10>.

© 2026 Yu-Sung Liao. Published by the Institute for Hebrew Language and Literature, Belgrade, Serbia.

Open Access: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

1. Introduction

Comparative inquiry occupies a central position within the study of religion, philosophy, and textual traditions. Yet comparison becomes difficult whenever concepts emerge from distinct linguistic, historical, and cultural worlds. Concepts are embedded within networks of practices, narratives, institutions, and interpretive traditions that frequently resist direct translation. Apparently similar terms may perform markedly different functions within their respective traditions, while concepts with little lexical resemblance may nevertheless participate in comparable patterns of explanation. Comparative scholarship therefore confronts a persistent methodological question: how can comparison proceed when concepts resist lexical equivalence? This challenge has been widely recognized within comparative theology and cross-traditional interpretation, where dialogue depends upon preserving the integrity of traditions while remaining open to mutual understanding (Clooney, 2010).

The present study addresses this question through a comparison of the Hebrew concept of *zikaron* (זִכָּרוֹן) and the Yogic concept of *saṃskāra* (संस्कार). At first sight, these concepts appear to belong to markedly different semantic worlds. *Zikaron* is associated with covenantal remembrance, communal participation, and intergenerational transmission, giving rise to a form of Relational Continuity. *Saṃskāra* is associated with latent formations, causal persistence, and processes of transformation operating within *citta*, giving rise to a form of Dispositional Continuity. Their linguistic origins, textual histories, and practical functions differ substantially. Precisely because of these differences, however, the comparison provides an opportunity to reconsider the conditions under which cross-traditional understanding becomes possible.

The present study examines how these concepts function within larger explanatory frameworks that address continuity across time. Both traditions engage the question of how the past remains operative within present life, yet they organize continuity through markedly different conceptual resources. The comparison therefore proceeds beyond lexical equivalence and examines the Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures through which continuity becomes intelligible within each tradition. Through this approach, the study reconstructs Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity as two distinct responses to a Shared Problem Field concerning the persistence of the past across time.

The central argument developed in this study concerns how concepts become comparable across traditions. Although *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* remain semantically distinct, both occupy structurally significant positions within larger Continuity Architectures through which the past remains effective across time. Comparison therefore becomes possible through attention to structural position, functional role, and explanatory significance. The resulting analysis develops a distinction between Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity and examines how these models emerge within different Continuity Structures.

Building upon this observation, the study proposes a limited form of Structural Position Analysis (SPA), a comparative strategy that proceeds through five analytical stages: Lexical and Semantic Reconstruction, Contextual Saturation, Functional Identification, Architectural Reconstruction, and Controlled Cross-Traditional Comparison. The objective is to clarify how distinct traditions generate alternative yet comparable responses to Shared Problem Fields. By attending to the structural positions occupied by concepts within broader Continuity Architectures, the study explores forms of interpretation that become visible through cross-traditional comparison and remain difficult to discern from within a single tradition alone. The approach developed here resonates with Gadamer's (2004) account of understanding as emerging through the interpretation of parts within larger horizons of meaning. It extends that insight into the comparative analysis of Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures.

The comparison undertaken here is intentionally limited in scope. On the Hebrew side, the analysis focuses upon key textual loci in Exodus, Deuteronomy, and the Psalms, together with selected Second Temple materials, particularly the Damascus Document and the Rule of the Community, where questions of remembrance, covenantal continuity, transmission, and communal identity receive further development. On the Yogic side, the analysis is confined to Classical Yoga as represented principally by Patañjali's *Yoga Sūtra* and its primary commentarial tradition, focusing upon discussions of *saṃskāra*, *vāsanā*, *karmāśaya*, and related concepts of persistence and transformation. The present inquiry therefore compares the structural positions of two specific Continuity Architectures. The study does not seek a comprehensive characterization of Judaism and Hinduism in their historical entirety. Its focus is a comparison of continuity within selected textual and philosophical corpora.

The study contributes to three areas of scholarship. First, it contributes to Hebrew Studies by reconstructing *zikaron* as a form of Relational Continuity through which covenantal identity remains operative across time. Second, it contributes to comparative hermeneutics by clarifying how comparison may proceed beyond lexical equivalence while preserving the integrity of the traditions under examination. Third, it contributes to comparative methodology through the development of SPA as a framework for investigating cross-traditional comparability at the level of Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures. Taken together, these contributions position the study at the intersection of Hebrew Studies, comparative hermeneutics, and methodological reflection on cross-traditional intelligibility.

More broadly, the study approaches continuity as one of the Shared Problem Fields through which traditions organize questions of remembrance, transmission, persistence, renewal, and transformation. Such fields may provide a basis for comparison even when traditions employ non-equivalent conceptual vocabularies and markedly different Continuity Architectures. This broader methodological framing also guides the textual analyses that

follow. Unless otherwise indicated, biblical quotations throughout this article are taken from the New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition (NRSVue).

The article proceeds through four major sections. Section 2 reconstructs *zikaron* and develops an account of Relational Continuity within the Hebrew tradition. Section 3 examines *saṃskāra*, *vāsanā*, and related Yogic concepts, developing an account of Dispositional Continuity within Classical Yoga. Section 4 brings these traditions into comparative dialogue through SPA and the reconstruction of Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures. Section 5 considers the broader implications of this approach for Shared Problem Fields, comparative hermeneutics, and cross-traditional interpretation. The conclusion returns to the question that motivates the study as a whole: how does the past remain operative within present life, and what forms of comparison become possible when traditions address that question through fundamentally different models of continuity?

2. *Zikaron* and Relational Continuity

2.1 *Zikaron* Beyond Memory

The Hebrew concept of *zikaron* is commonly translated as “memory” or “remembrance.” While such translations provide a convenient lexical equivalent, they risk imposing modern psychological assumptions upon a concept that operates within a markedly different religious and interpretive framework. Contemporary discussions of memory often emphasize internal cognitive processes through which information is stored, retained, and retrieved. The lexical and textual evidence examined in this study, however, suggests a broader functional profile. Derived from the verbal root *zākhār* (זָכַר, “to remember”), *zikaron* (זִכְרוֹן) is closely associated with the enduring significance of events, obligations, and relationships. Throughout the Hebrew Bible, remembering frequently concerns the continued effectiveness of formative acts, commitments, and relationships through which the significance of the past remains operative within present communal life (Schottroff, 1964, 1997).

This orientation becomes particularly apparent in relation to events such as the Exodus, the covenant, and divine acts of deliverance. These events are remembered because they continue to shape communal identity, ethical responsibility, and religious life. Formative histories remain meaningful through continuing practices of remembrance. The persistence of the past therefore depends not primarily upon internal retention but upon the renewal of relationships through which formative events remain operative across generations.

For this reason, the present study approaches *zikaron* as a concept of continuity situated within covenantal and communal life. More specifically, biblical remembrance is reconstructed here not as an isolated mental act but as a developing structure of Relational Continuity through which covenantal bonds, communal identity, and covenantal obligations remain operative across generations. The following sections reconstruct the lexical functions, covenantal dimensions, ritual expressions, and transmission mechanisms through which

biblical remembrance may be understood as a structure of Relational Continuity.

2.1.1 The Lexical Range and Functions of זכר and זכרון

A more precise understanding of *zikaron* requires attention to the lexical range and contextual functions of the Hebrew root *zākhār* and its related nominal forms. Although *zākhār* is commonly translated as “to remember,” its usage throughout the Hebrew Bible extends beyond the recovery of past information or the retention of mental content. Lexical evidence indicates that the root appears within ritual, priestly, covenantal, ethical, historical, liturgical, and communal contexts in which remembering serves to sustain relationships, obligations, and communal identity across time (Jenni & Westermann, 1997; Koehler et al., 2000). Likewise, the noun *zikaron* encompasses meanings that include remembrance, memorialization, commemorative practice, and the preservation of covenantal significance. Recent lexical-semantic analysis similarly emphasizes that Hebrew lexical interpretation should proceed through contextual distribution, functional usage, and broader linguistic setting rather than translation equivalents alone (Stanojević, 2026b). The semantic field points beyond memory in the modern psychological sense and frequently designates practices and structures through which the significance of the past remains operative within the present life of Israel. The representative examples summarized in Table 1 illustrate this functional diversity across multiple literary settings and institutional contexts.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

The representative usages summarized in Table 1 indicate a broad functional distribution extending across ritual, priestly, covenantal, ethical, historical, liturgical, and communal contexts. These recurring patterns become more clearly visible when examined within specific textual settings. This broader functional orientation becomes particularly evident in the book of Exodus. One of the clearest examples appears in Exodus 12:14, where Passover is designated as a *yôm zikkārôn* (יום זִכָּרוֹן, “day of remembrance”). The emphasis falls upon recurring ritual participation through which the significance of divine deliverance is continually renewed. A related pattern appears in Exodus 13:9, where *zikkārôn* (זִכָּרוֹן) is associated with embodied signs and ritual observance. In both passages, formative events remain active within Israel’s covenantal existence. The past persists because it is ritually re-enacted and integrated into communal practice. The semantic force of *zikaron* may therefore be understood as extending beyond recollection toward participation, commemoration, and covenantal continuity.

The covenantal dimension of remembrance becomes even more pronounced in Deuteronomy. Here the root *zākhār* frequently appears in conjunction with covenantal instruction, ethical obligation, and historical identity. Israel is repeatedly commanded to remember divine acts, wilderness experiences, and covenantal obligations (Deut. 5:15; 8:2; 9:7; 25:17). Significantly, the opposite of remembrance is often not ignorance but forgetfulness (*šākhah*, שָׁכַח), a condition associated with covenantal failure and loss of

fidelity. As Weinfeld (1972) observes, Deuteronomic theology consistently links remembrance with covenantal loyalty and obedience. Remembering serves as an ethical orientation through which Israel remains situated within an ongoing covenantal relationship. The imperative to remember therefore sustains fidelity to a formative history that continues to shape communal life.

The Psalms further expand the semantic range of remembrance by situating it within liturgical and theological discourse. Human remembrance frequently involves recalling divine deeds and acts of deliverance (Ps. 77:11; 105:5), while divine remembrance signifies covenantal fidelity rather than cognitive recovery. Psalm 105:8, for example, describes God as remembering the covenant because covenantal commitments remain effective across time. As Levenson (1985) notes, covenantal memory within the Hebrew Bible is inseparable from Israel's ongoing participation in sacred history. Remembrance acquires a reciprocal structure: Israel remembers God's acts, and God remembers covenantal promises. In both cases, remembrance concerns the ongoing maintenance of a covenantal relationship.

Taken together, the usages of *zākhār* and *zikaron* across Exodus, Deuteronomy, and the Psalms indicate that biblical remembrance cannot be reduced to the storage and retrieval of information. It functions as a relational mechanism through which covenantal bonds, communal identity, sacred history, and covenantal obligations remain operative across time. The lexical evidence, reinforced by Deuteronomic scholarship, covenantal memory studies, and the functional distribution summarized in Table 1, suggests that *zikaron* occupies a substantially broader semantic domain than modern notions of memory alone (Jenni & Westermann, 1997; Koehler et al., 2000; Weinfeld, 1972; Levenson, 1985). This philological observation may provide a foundation for viewing *zikaron* not merely as a lexical item but as a concept whose significance emerges from its position within the Hebrew Continuity Architecture reconstructed in the following sections. The covenantal implications of this semantic profile become more clearly visible when remembrance is examined within the broader framework of covenantal relationships and obligations.

2.1.2 Scholarly Debates on זכר and זכרון

Although זכר (*zākhār*) and זכרון (*zikaron*) are commonly translated as “remember” and “remembrance,” their interpretation has generated substantial scholarly discussion. The central issue concerns whether remembering should be understood primarily as a cognitive act of recollection or as a broader religious, social, and covenantal process through which the significance of the past remains operative within communal life. Scholarly debate has therefore extended beyond lexical meaning to the ritual, theological, and social functions performed by remembrance within the Hebrew Bible.

A particularly influential contribution was made by Willy Schottroff (1964; 1997), whose studies of *zākhār* challenged interpretations that reduce remembering to the recovery of mental content. Schottroff argued that many biblical usages of the root are best understood

within covenantal and cultic contexts in which remembering functions as a covenantally effective and relational act rather than a purely psychological process. In such contexts, remembrance frequently involves the reactivation of obligations, commitments, and relationships established through prior events. The significance of remembering lies in sustaining the continuing efficacy of formative events within present communal life. This interpretation redirects attention to remembrance as an active process through which covenantal relationships remain operative over time.

Other scholars have emphasized complementary dimensions of the semantic field. Weinfeld (1972), in his analysis of Deuteronomic theology, argued that remembrance is closely associated with covenantal fidelity, obedience, and communal responsibility. The repeated injunctions to remember divine acts and covenantal obligations function not merely as historical recollections but as mechanisms through which Israel remains oriented toward an ongoing covenantal relationship. Similarly, Levenson (1985) argued that remembrance within the Hebrew Bible is inseparable from participation in sacred history. The past acquires continuing significance because foundational divine acts remain constitutive of communal identity. Hendel (2005) situated biblical remembrance within broader discussions of cultural memory, emphasizing the role of narrative, tradition, and collective identity in sustaining continuity across generations. A related perspective appears in Yerushalmi's (1982) influential reflections on Jewish memory, which highlight the distinctive role of remembrance in preserving communal self-understanding across historical discontinuities. Although these approaches differ in emphasis, they converge in suggesting that biblical remembrance extends beyond individual cognition and participates in larger structures of covenantal, communal, and historical continuity.

A further debate concerns the possible relationship between the verbal root *zākhār* (זָכַר, "to remember") and the nominal form *zākhār* (זָכָר, "male"). Some philologists and lexicographers have explored whether the phonetic similarity reflects a broader semantic field associated with preservation, continuity, representation, or social perpetuation. Others, however, regard the similarity as a case of homonymy or as an insufficient basis for establishing a genetic semantic relationship, and therefore caution against drawing strong historical-linguistic conclusions. The question consequently remains contested within Hebrew scholarship. The present study does not depend upon any proposed etymological connection between remembering and maleness and therefore remains agnostic regarding this debate. Nevertheless, the discussion illustrates why the interpretation of *zākhār* requires methodological caution and cannot be reduced to simple lexical translation.

Taken together, these debates suggest that *zākhār* and *zikaron* cannot be adequately understood through modern notions of memory alone. Scholarly interpretations emphasize covenantal participation, ritual activation, communal identity, sacred history, and cultural transmission as integral dimensions of biblical remembrance. Building upon these

observations, the present study suggests that these diverse functions may be productively understood as interrelated components of Relational Continuity. From this perspective, remembrance may be understood as contributing to the maintenance of covenantal relationships, communal identities, and formative histories across time. The following sections examine how these dimensions become visible within covenantal discourse, ritual participation, narrative transmission, and textual preservation.

2.2 Remembrance and Covenant

The relational character of *zikaron* becomes particularly evident when the functional patterns identified in Table 1 are examined within the covenantal framework of the Hebrew Bible. Biblical remembrance is rarely directed toward the past as an object of detached reflection. Instead, it is embedded within a network of obligations, commitments, and relationships that define the ongoing connection between God and Israel. Remembering may therefore be understood as a mode of participation within a covenantal order through which communal identity and obligation remain operative across generations.

This covenantal orientation appears across the ritual, historical, ethical, and liturgical materials surveyed above. Israel is repeatedly instructed to remember the acts through which the covenant is portrayed as having been established and sustained, including divine deliverance from Egypt, guidance in the wilderness, and the reception of divine instruction. Such acts of remembrance contribute to the ongoing reaffirmation of communal identity and responsibility. The Passover tradition provides a particularly important example. Exodus 12 presents remembrance not simply as reference to a past act of deliverance but as a ritual practice through which future generations are incorporated into an enduring covenantal narrative. The repeated association of ritual observance with intergenerational instruction (Exod. 12:26–27) further underscores the role of remembrance in transmitting communal identity and covenantal obligations across generations. The past remains significant because it continues to shape present obligations and future conduct.

The reciprocal dimension of remembrance remains centrally operative within biblical covenantal discourse. Biblical texts not only command Israel to remember but also describe God as remembering. One of the clearest examples appears in Exodus 2:24, where God “remembered” (*zākar*, זָכַר) the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Similar formulations occur in Exodus 6:5 and Psalm 105:8, both of which portray divine remembrance as covenantal fidelity rather than cognitive retrieval. In these contexts, divine remembrance cannot plausibly be understood as the recovery of forgotten information. Instead, remembrance signifies fidelity to an existing covenantal relationship. Divine remembrance becomes manifest through actions that reaffirm previously established covenantal commitments. Such passages illustrate the reciprocal structure of Covenantal Remembrance through which covenantal relationships remain operative across time.

2.3 Ritual, Narrative, and Transmission

The covenantal significance of remembrance becomes durable through the ritual, narrative, pedagogical, and textual practices by which it is carried across time. Biblical remembrance is not confined to individual acts of remembrance but is embedded within ritual observance, narrative repetition, pedagogical instruction, and textual transmission. Through these mediating practices, formative events remain effective beyond the generation that originally experienced them.

The broader significance of such mediating practices has long attracted attention within the study of religion and collective memory. Durkheim's (1995) classic analysis suggests that ritual participation contributes not only to the expression of communal beliefs but also to the periodic reaffirmation of the moral and symbolic bonds through which communities constitute themselves as enduring social groups. From this perspective, remembrance may be understood as operating through communal practices that sustain shared frameworks of meaning across time.

Related insights appear in the work of Halbwachs (1992), whose theory of collective memory emphasizes that remembrance is maintained through social frameworks rather than through isolated acts of individual recollection. Memories acquire durability because they are continually reinforced through communal practices, narratives, institutions, and forms of transmission. Remembering depends not only upon what individuals recall but also upon the social contexts that render particular pasts meaningful and transmissible.

Anthropological approaches to ritual have further highlighted the role of participation in sustaining continuity. Turner (1969) emphasized the capacity of ritual processes to renew communal bonds and reinforce shared symbolic worlds, while Bell (1992) argued that ritual practices do not merely express existing identities but actively participate in their reproduction and maintenance. Ritual practices serve as modes of commemoration and contribute to the continual re-establishment of relationships with formative narratives, obligations, and traditions.

These perspectives suggest that ritual observance, narrative repetition, pedagogical instruction, and communal participation may function as mechanisms through which formative memories and collective identities remain operative across time. Such observations do not determine the interpretation of biblical remembrance, but they provide a useful theoretical framework for understanding how remembrance may remain operative across generations through communal forms of transmission.

Within the textual world of the Hebrew Bible, the Passover tradition provides a particularly clear illustration of these broader ritual and mnemonic dynamics. Exodus 12 establishes Passover as a recurring act of remembrance through which successive generations participate in an ongoing remembrance of divine deliverance. The significance of the ritual lies in continually re-situating the community within a shared narrative of covenantal identity. Remembrance operates here as an ongoing process of participation rather than

retrospective recollection alone. In this respect, biblical remembrance corresponds to what Ricoeur (2004) describes as the narrative mediation of memory, whereby the past remains meaningful through interpretive mediation connecting memory, identity, and communal life. Beyond the Passover tradition, narrative repetition performs a similar function elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Psalm 78 presents the recounting of divine acts as a means through which future generations remain connected to the covenantal past. The psalm links remembrance to the preservation of communal knowledge across generations, portraying narration as a pedagogical practice through which identity and continuity are sustained over time. The goal is not simply historical preservation but the cultivation of continuity across generations. As Fishbane (1985) argues, biblical traditions frequently sustain continuity through ongoing processes of interpretation and reappropriation in which inherited meanings remain active within new historical circumstances. A complementary perspective appears in Childs' (1962) analysis of memory and tradition in ancient Israel, where continuity is maintained through interconnected processes of instruction, communal appropriation, and the preservation of tradition. Remembrance serves not only to preserve the significance of the past but also as a means through which inherited traditions remain intelligible and effective within successive generations.

The transmission of remembrance acquired additional textual dimensions during the Second Temple period. While ritual participation and narrative instruction remained central mechanisms of continuity, greater attention came to be attached to scribal, interpretive, and textual practices through which inherited traditions could be preserved, transmitted, and renewed across changing historical circumstances. The concern with continuity did not disappear with the emergence of Second Temple Judaism but assumed new communal and textual forms. Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls suggests that concerns central to biblical remembrance—covenantal fidelity, communal identity, and continuity with foundational traditions—remained active within Second Temple Jewish communities. The Damascus Document, for example, repeatedly frames communal life in relation to obligations inherited from earlier generations and preserved through ongoing discipline and scriptural interpretation. Continuity may be understood as emerging not merely through the preservation of texts but through active participation in covenantal relationships linking present communities to foundational traditions.

Analysis of 4Q175 similarly suggests that continuity frequently operated through processes of textual selection, recomposition, and reinterpretation rather than through simple preservation alone (Stanojević, 2026a). Scriptural traditions could remain authoritative while undergoing adaptation within new communal and interpretive settings. As Dimant (1988) observes, Second Temple Jewish literature frequently reappropriates inherited scriptural traditions through processes of interpretation and preservation that sustain continuity while responding to new historical circumstances. Similarly, Schiffman (1994) argues that the

Qumran community understood itself as a covenantal remnant whose identity depended upon the preservation, interpretation, and enactment of inherited traditions. Continuity remained an active process of communal renewal, covenantal participation, and ongoing textual interpretation and reconfiguration.

Writing preserved traditions while providing durable mechanisms through which communal continuity could survive historical disruption. As Carr (2005) and Schaper (2005) argue, textual practices assumed an increasingly important role in maintaining the continuity of religious traditions during the exilic and post-exilic periods. Remembrance depended not only upon ritual and narrative repetition but also upon the institutional structures through which traditions were preserved, interpreted, and carried across time.

Across these diverse contexts, remembrance functions less as the preservation of information than as the transmission of significance. Ritual observance, narrative retelling, pedagogical instruction, textual preservation, and scriptural reinterpretation all contribute to the continued efficacy of formative events across generations. The persistence of the past may therefore be understood as depending not only upon remembering but also upon the social, ritual, and textual processes through which remembrance is sustained across generations. Biblical continuity may be understood as emerging through the ongoing mediation of remembrance across successive generations. These transmissive processes provide the institutional, ritual, and interpretive conditions through which Relational Continuity may be sustained.

2.4 Relational Continuity

The foregoing analyses suggest that *zikaron* may be more productively understood not as a theory of memory but as a structure of continuity. Its significance emerges through a network of covenantal, ritual, narrative, pedagogical, and textual practices through which the past remains effective within present communal life. The semantic range of *zākhār* and *zikaron* extends beyond recollection, while covenantal remembrance situates remembrance within enduring relationships and obligations. Ritual observance, narrative transmission, pedagogical instruction, and textual preservation further provide mechanisms through which formative events continue to shape successive generations. What persists across time is not merely information about prior events but an ongoing relationship linking communities to sacred histories, covenantal commitments, and inherited identities.

This observation distinguishes the Hebrew model of Relational Continuity from approaches that locate persistence primarily within the individual subject. Throughout the Hebrew Bible, remembrance operates through public and communal structures rather than through internally retained contents alone. Covenantal participation, ritual participation, narrative transmission, pedagogical instruction, and textual transmission serve as mediating practices through which the past remains operative within the present. Continuity may therefore be understood as emerging through participation in shared forms of life sustained across

generations.

The importance of such mediating structures becomes especially apparent within the textual culture of ancient Judaism. As Tov (2004) observes, the preservation and transmission of traditions depended upon complex scribal practices through which texts were copied, interpreted, and circulated across generations. Likewise, Carr (2005) argues that the continuity of tradition involved practices of memorization, recitation, copying, and embodied instruction through which traditions became incorporated into communal life. The persistence of the covenantal past depended not only upon acts of remembering but also upon durable structures capable of preserving and renewing relationships linking present communities to foundational traditions.

This broader pattern corresponds closely to what Assmann (2011) describes as cultural memory: the preservation of formative meanings through ritual, textual, and institutional carriers that extend continuity beyond the lifespan of individual participants. Similarly, Hendel (2005) emphasizes that remembrance in the Hebrew Bible is inseparable from the construction and maintenance of communal identity. Remembrance acquires significance because it sustains the frameworks through which communities understand themselves in relation to their origins, obligations, and collective histories. Such continuity is maintained not only through the preservation of traditions but also through ongoing participation in relationships that remain constitutive of communal identity, a feature that resonates with broader scholarly accounts of relationality in ancient Israelite religion (Sommer, 2009). Continuity therefore depends upon socially mediated forms of participation and remembrance through which meaning is preserved across time.

From this perspective, continuity within the Hebrew tradition may be interpreted as fundamentally relational. The past remains effective because communities continue to participate in practices that renew covenantal commitments across generations. Ritual observance, narrative transmission, pedagogical instruction, textual transmission, and interpretive renewal do not merely conserve information about the past; they sustain the relationships through which the past remains meaningful within present communal life. Such participation reflects what Fishbane (2008) describes as the ongoing reappropriation of inherited traditions within changing historical circumstances, a process that may involve renewal, reinterpretation, and textual reconfiguration rather than static preservation alone. Continuity depends neither upon static preservation nor upon the uninterrupted survival of identical forms. Rather, as Ackroyd (1972) observes, continuity is maintained through enduring links connecting past and present communal existence.

The foregoing discussion thus suggests that *zikaron* may be understood as a structure of Relational Continuity. Across lexical usage, covenantal discourse, ritual participation, narrative transmission, and textual transmission, remembrance functions as a mechanism through which the past remains operative within present life. Biblical continuity may be

understood as emerging through the renewal of relationships rather than through the persistence of internal traces alone. This model provides the basis for the analysis of continuity developed in the following sections. Whereas the Hebrew tradition sustains continuity through relational mechanisms of remembrance and transmission, the Yogic materials examined in the following section approach continuity through a markedly different explanatory framework.

3. Saṃskāra and Dispositional Continuity

3.1 Saṃskāra Beyond Memory

At first glance, saṃskāra appears comparable to memory. Both concern the continued presence of the past within present experience. Yet Classical Yoga maintains a clear distinction between *smṛti* (memory) and saṃskāra (latent impression). In the *Yoga Sūtra*, memory is classified among the mental fluctuations (*vṛttis*) (YS I.5–11) and refers to the retention and re-presentation of previously experienced content. Saṃskāra, by contrast, operates at a deeper explanatory level. It refers not to remembered content but to the residual efficacy produced by experience itself. As Bryant (2009) observes, saṃskāra functions as a latent subliminal activator that continues to shape subsequent patterns of experience even when the originating experiences are no longer consciously available. More generally, Classical Yoga interprets continuity through enduring dispositional formations that persist beneath conscious awareness and continue to influence subsequent experience (Larson, 2018). The persistence of the past does not depend upon conscious recollection but upon the enduring efficacy of latent formations generated through experience. Classical commentators consistently maintain this distinction, locating continuity not in memory itself but in the enduring effects generated by prior experience (Vyāsa, 1914).

This distinction suggests a broader feature of Yogic psychology. Experiences do not simply disappear once conscious awareness has passed. Instead, they leave latent impressions that continue to influence subsequent configurations of *citta*. Saṃskāra may be understood as providing an account of how prior experience remains effective beyond the moment in which it originally occurred. The concept may be interpreted as addressing how experience acquires continuity across time through latent impressions that persist beneath conscious awareness. These impressions influence future experience while remaining largely inaccessible to direct introspection. Within the Yogic model, *vṛttis* leave saṃskāra; accumulated latent impressions contribute to the formation of *vāsanā*; and these dispositional tendencies participate in subsequent processes of *pariṇāma*. Continuity may therefore be understood as grounded not in the recollection of past events but in the enduring consequences of previous experience.

This understanding of persistence provides an important counterpart to the account of remembrance associated with *zikaron*. Both traditions seek to explain how the past remains operative within the present, yet they identify different Continuity Structures through which

such persistence becomes possible. Whereas biblical remembrance depends upon communal, ritual, and textual mediation, Yogic continuity begins with the retention of latent impressions. The following sections examine how this model develops through *karmāśaya* and *vāsanā* and culminates in the broader configuration reconstructed in this study as Dispositional Continuity.

3.2 *Karmāśaya* and Causal Persistence

The explanatory significance of *saṃskāra* becomes more fully developed through the related concept of *karmāśaya*. In the *Yoga Sūtra*, Patañjali describes *karmāśaya* as the accumulated causal reservoir of karmically significant impressions that condition future experience (YS II.12). Whereas *saṃskāra* refers to latent impressions produced by experience, *karmāśaya* designates the causal structure formed through the accumulation of such impressions.

This concept extends the Yogic account of persistence beyond individual episodes of experience. Experiences generate impressions that may accumulate over time and participate in the formation of enduring patterns of experience. Continuity may be understood in both causal and dispositional terms. The effects of prior experience are not confined to conscious awareness but remain embedded within structures that continue to influence future developments. Classical commentators consistently interpret *karmāśaya* as a mechanism through which actions produce consequences across time. Bryant (2009) notes that karmic deposits remain capable of generating future effects long after the original actions have occurred. The persistence of the past may therefore be interpreted through forms of causal persistence linking prior actions to subsequent outcomes within an evolving dispositional structure. Experience acquires temporal depth because its effects extend beyond the moment of occurrence.

The concept of *karmāśaya* also clarifies an important feature of Yogic psychology. Continuity does not depend upon conscious awareness of past experiences. Causal deposits remain effective regardless of whether their origins can be recollected. What persists is not a remembered event but the capacity of prior experience to shape future conditions. The past continues to influence present and future life through accumulated causal structures operating beneath conscious awareness.

Viewed in this way, *karmāśaya* may be understood as providing a bridge between latent impressions and future manifestations. It contributes to understanding how the effects of experience become organized, preserved, and carried forward across time. The concept expands the account of continuity introduced through *saṃskāra*, preparing the way for the further development of Dispositional Continuity through *vāsanā*.

3.3 *Vāsanā* and Dispositional Continuity

The account of persistence developed through *saṃskāra* and *karmāśaya* reaches a further level of elaboration through the concept of *vāsanā*. While *saṃskāra* refers to latent impressions generated through experience and *karmāśaya* designates the accumulated

causal deposits associated with action, *vāsanā* concerns the enduring dispositional tendencies that shape the future orientation of *citta*. Classical commentators frequently describe *vāsanā* as patterned inclinations that influence perception, motivation, and conduct while remaining largely inaccessible to conscious awareness.

The significance of *vāsanā* lies in its directional character. Latent impressions do not remain inert. Through accumulation and interaction, they contribute to the formation of enduring dispositions that orient future experience. *Vāsanā* may therefore be understood as describing how the effects of prior experience acquire directional force within the ongoing transformations of *citta*. The concept extends the account of persistence beyond retention alone and toward the patterned tendencies through which future experience becomes conditioned.

Within the Yogic model, *vṛttis* leave *saṃskāra*; *saṃskāra* contribute to the formation of *vāsanā*; and *vāsanā* participate in subsequent processes of *pariṇāma*. Continuity is not maintained through the preservation of identical contents but through the persistence of dispositional tendencies that continue to influence future configurations of experience. The past remains effective because its consequences become incorporated into the evolving structure of *citta*.

This account suggests a distinctive model of Dispositional Continuity. What persists across time is neither a remembered event nor a fixed psychological state but a dynamic configuration of latent impressions, causal deposits, and dispositional tendencies. Continuity may therefore be understood as emerging through ongoing transformation rather than through simple preservation. The persistence of the past depends upon the continuing efficacy of structures that shape future experience while themselves undergoing modification.

3.4 Dispositional Continuity

The preceding discussion has examined three interrelated concepts—*saṃskāra*, *karmāśaya*, and *vāsanā*—through which Classical Yoga accounts for the continued efficacy of the past within present experience. Together, these concepts describe a tradition-specific model of Dispositional Continuity grounded in latent impressions, causal persistence, dispositional tendencies, and ongoing transformation. Continuity is not located in recollection but in the enduring effects generated by prior experience and carried forward through successive modifications of *citta*.

A comparison with the Hebrew materials examined in Section 2 suggests that both traditions engage a Shared Problem Field concerning the persistence of the past within present life. Each develops an account of how formative influences remain operative across time, how continuity survives change, and how present experience remains connected to what has preceded it. Yet the two traditions organize these questions through markedly different Continuity Structures.

The Hebrew materials reconstruct continuity through Covenantal Remembrance, Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation, Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, and Intergenerational Continuity. Continuity emerges through relationships that are repeatedly renewed across generations. The Yogic materials, by contrast, locate continuity within latent impressions, causal persistence, dispositional tendencies, and processes of transformation operating within *citta*. Whereas biblical remembrance sustains continuity through relational mediation, Classical Yoga locates continuity within dispositional processes operating within *citta*.

These observations suggest two tradition-specific models: Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity. Taken together, these models provide the basis for reconstructing two Continuity Structures at the comparative level. The comparison focuses on the continuity problems addressed by each tradition and examines how similar questions concerning continuity generate different explanatory configurations, conceptual vocabularies, and modes of transmission. The next stage is Architectural Reconstruction, which examines how each tradition embeds continuity within larger Continuity Architectures composed of practices, institutions, narratives, texts, and interpretive mechanisms. SPA provides the methodological framework through which these Continuity Architectures are reconstructed and compared.

4. Structural Comparison of Continuity Models

Having reconstructed the tradition-specific models associated with *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* separately, this section brings these models into direct comparison. The objective is to clarify how each tradition addresses the persistence of the past through distinct Continuity Structures. Comparison therefore proceeds at the level of Continuity Structures rather than isolated concepts. From this perspective, Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity may be understood as tradition-specific Continuity Structures situated within larger Continuity Architectures.

The preceding analyses identified two contrasting continuity models. The Hebrew tradition organizes continuity through Covenantal Remembrance, Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation, Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, and Intergenerational Continuity. The Yogic tradition organizes continuity through latent impression (*saṃskāra*), dispositional tendency (*vāsanā*), causal persistence (*karmāśaya*), and transformative processes (*pariṇāma*). Although these Continuity Structures differ substantially, both traditions address a Shared Problem Field concerning how the past remains effective within present life.

The comparison developed below does not proceed through lexical equivalence or conceptual identity. It examines how distinct traditions organize continuity through different configurations of practices, relationships, dispositions, and explanatory mechanisms. The focus therefore shifts from individual concepts to the broader structures within which those

concepts acquire significance. Comparability emerges through the reconstruction of structural positions occupied by key concepts within larger Continuity Architectures. From this perspective, *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* become comparable because each occupies a pivotal location within a broader response to the Shared Problem Field examined in this study: the persistence of the past across time.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Table 2 summarizes the principal analytical dimensions emerging from the preceding analyses. The comparative categories presented here are derived from the lexical, contextual, functional, and architectural reconstructions developed in Sections 2 and 3. Rather than comparing isolated concepts, the table highlights the distinct Continuity Structures associated with *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* and situates them within their respective Continuity Architectures. These dimensions provide the basis for the structural comparison developed in the remainder of this section.

4.1 Relational Continuity

The Hebrew model approaches continuity through the ongoing renewal of relationships linking present communities to formative events, covenantal obligations, and inherited identities. The persistence of the past may be understood primarily in relational rather than psychological terms. Continuity emerges through practices that reconnect communities to foundational histories and shared obligations across generations. Within this framework, remembrance participates in a broader network that includes Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation, Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, and Intergenerational Continuity. These practices sustain the relationships through which the past remains meaningful within present communal life. A defining feature of this model is its emphasis on the renewal of relationships rather than the retention of latent formations.

The temporal logic of *zikaron* may be described as a movement from remembered past to renewed participation. Foundational events remain operative through the continuing reactivation of relationships established through covenant, tradition, and communal identity. The past is not simply preserved but repeatedly brought into the present through ritual observance, narrative retelling, and covenantal renewal. Continuity depends less upon the preservation of internal traces than upon the maintenance and reactivation of relational bonds linking present communities to formative histories.

This tradition-specific model may be characterized as Relational Continuity. The persistence of the past is sustained through publicly enacted structures that support communal participation and intergenerational continuity. What remains continuous is not primarily a latent residue but a network of relationships repeatedly renewed through communal practice. Continuity may therefore be understood as emerging through the reactivation of formative relationships rather than through the retention of enduring impressions. From this

perspective, remembrance contributes to a relational logic of renewal, participation, and covenantal continuity across time. Continuity within this model does not require the static preservation of identical forms. Inherited traditions may remain effective through processes of reinterpretation, renewal, and historical reconfiguration while preserving meaningful links to formative origins.

4.2 Dispositional Continuity

The Yogic model organizes continuity through a markedly different Continuity Structure. Classical Yoga locates the enduring influence of the past within latent impression (*saṃskāra*), causal persistence (*karmāśaya*), and dispositional tendency (*vāsanā*). This Continuity Structure differs substantially from the relational configuration reconstructed in the Hebrew materials. Continuity may therefore be understood as organized through structures embedded within *citta* rather than through publicly enacted forms of transmission. Within this framework, experiences generate latent impressions that contribute to enduring dispositions and continue to influence subsequent configurations of experience. The efficacy of the past derives from its incorporation into the dispositional organization of *citta*. A defining feature of this model is its emphasis on the retention and transformation of latent formations rather than the renewal of communal relationships.

The temporal logic of this model is fundamentally transformative. Patañjali's discussion of *pariṇāma* (YS III.13) suggests that continuity does not require the preservation of identical states across time. Continuity may be understood as emerging through successive processes of transformation linking past and present conditions. What persists is not static content but an organized pattern of causal persistence capable of generating future manifestations. Experiences become sedimented as *saṃskāra*; *saṃskāra* contribute to *vāsanā*; and *vāsanā* participate in subsequent transformations of *citta*. The past therefore remains operative through the retention and transformation of latent formations rather than through recurrent acts of remembrance.

This tradition-specific model may be characterized as Dispositional Continuity. Persistence is sustained through the ongoing interaction of *saṃskāra*, *vāsanā*, and *pariṇāma* operating within *citta*. The continuity of this model resides in a dynamic organization of latent formations capable of shaping future experience through processes of retention, transformation, and reproduction. Continuity emerges through transformative persistence rather than through relational renewal. Classical Yoga interprets the efficacy of the past through a dispositional logic in which impressions are retained, reorganized, and reproduced across successive moments of experience.

Whereas the Hebrew model organizes continuity through the recurrent renewal of relationships, the Yogic model organizes continuity through the retention and transformation of latent formations. Both traditions address a Shared Problem Field concerning how the past remains effective within present life, yet they reconstruct that

problem through different Continuity Structures. These contrasting Continuity Structures provide the basis for the Architectural Reconstruction developed below.

4.3 Structural Position Analysis

The comparison developed in this study suggests that meaningful comparison may proceed without conceptual equivalence. *Zikaron* and *saṃskāra* emerge from distinct linguistic, historical, and religious traditions and perform different functions within their respective systems of thought. The basis of comparison lies in the structural positions these concepts occupy within broader Continuity Architectures. SPA compares Continuity Structures while situating them within the larger Continuity Architectures that organize each tradition. In both traditions, the selected concepts function as pivotal mechanisms through which the persistence of the past becomes intelligible. Their comparability derives from the structural positions they occupy within broader responses to continuity across time.

SPA examines how concepts function within wider networks of relationships, practices, interpretive traditions, psychological processes, and explanatory frameworks. The relevant question becomes: what position does a concept occupy within the system through which a tradition addresses a recurring problem? Comparison proceeds by reconstructing those positions before examining convergences and divergences across traditions. SPA assumes that concepts become intelligible through the broader structures within which they operate. SPA proceeds through five analytical stages:

Lexical and Semantic Reconstruction (Philological Foundation) – examining the linguistic range, textual distribution, and semantic usage of concepts within their original languages and textual traditions.

Contextual Saturation (Contextualization) – situating concepts within their historical, ritual, doctrinal, and interpretive settings.

Functional Identification (Functional Mapping) – identifying the roles concepts perform within broader systems of thought and practice.

Architectural Reconstruction (Structural Integration) – locating these functions within larger Continuity Architectures composed of practices, institutions, narratives, transmission mechanisms, and explanatory frameworks.

Controlled Cross-Traditional Comparison (Comparative Synthesis) – comparing reconstructed Continuity Structures in relation to Shared Problem Fields while preserving conceptual and historical differences.

The analyses of *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* presented in Sections 2 and 3 provide an illustration of these analytical stages. Examination of the semantic ranges associated with *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* constituted the first stage of Lexical and Semantic Reconstruction. Analysis of their historical, ritual, doctrinal, and interpretive contexts supplied Contextual Saturation, while Functional Identification examined the roles these concepts perform within their respective traditions, including Covenantal Remembrance, Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation,

Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, Intergenerational Continuity, latent impression (*saṃskāra*), dispositional tendency (*vāsanā*), causal persistence (*karmāśaya*), and transformative processes (*pariṇāma*). Architectural Reconstruction yielded the tradition-specific models described in this study as Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity and situated them within broader Continuity Architectures. The present section completes the procedure through Controlled Cross-Traditional Comparison and examines how these reconstructed Continuity Structures address Shared Problem Fields concerning continuity across time.

The comparison developed here therefore moves from textual reconstruction to structural comparison through these analytical stages. The objective is not to establish semantic equivalence but to determine whether concepts occupy analogous structural positions within broader responses to Shared Problem Fields concerning continuity across time.

Philological, historical, and contextual reconstruction remain integral to this procedure. The reconstruction of structural positions depends upon prior examination of linguistic range, textual distribution, historical setting, and interpretive function. The present comparison follows this sequence. The analysis of *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* builds upon the preceding reconstructions of Hebrew continuity structures and Yogic dispositional processes. SPA begins from contextual specificity and proceeds toward structural comparison through successive stages of reconstruction.

From this perspective, *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* occupy structurally comparable positions within different Continuity Architectures. The Hebrew tradition organizes continuity through Covenantal Remembrance, Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation, Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, and Intergenerational Continuity. Classical Yoga organizes continuity through latent impression (*saṃskāra*), dispositional tendency (*vāsanā*), causal persistence (*karmāśaya*), and transformative processes (*pariṇāma*). The mechanisms differ substantially, yet both traditions address a Shared Problem Field concerning how the past remains effective within present life.

Structural comparison remains attentive to internal complexity, historical variation, and overlapping forms of continuity. Although the Hebrew tradition primarily organizes continuity through relational and communal mechanisms, certain texts also internalize continuity through images such as the law written upon the heart (Jer. 31:33). Similarly, Yogic traditions include forms of instruction, transmission, and communal practice that extend beyond purely internal processes. The comparison focuses on dominant Continuity Structures without treating these orientations as exhaustive or exclusive descriptions of either tradition.

SPA offers an alternative to both conceptual assimilation and radical incommensurability. Traditions need not employ identical vocabularies in order to become comparable. Comparison becomes possible when concepts are situated within the Continuity

Architectures through which traditions organize Shared Problem Fields concerning continuity across time. The persistence of the past constitutes one instance of the Shared Problem Fields examined in this study, and the Continuity Structures reconstructed here illustrate how distinct traditions may generate alternative yet intelligible responses to it. Concepts become comparable through the structural positions they occupy within broader Continuity Architectures even when their semantic contents remain distinct.

5. Implications for Comparative Hermeneutics

5.1 Beyond Lexical Equivalence

One of the principal implications of the present study concerns the limits of lexical comparison in cross-traditional inquiry. Comparative studies frequently begin by identifying apparent similarities between concepts drawn from different traditions. Such approaches can generate valuable insights, particularly when linguistic, historical, or conceptual relationships can be established with reasonable confidence. Yet lexical comparison alone often provides only a partial basis for understanding how concepts function within broader religious and intellectual traditions.

The analyses developed in this study suggest that *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* are best understood within the larger Continuity Architectures in which they operate. Although both concepts contribute to continuity across time, they do so through different Continuity Structures and within different Continuity Architectures. Their significance derives from the roles they perform within broader networks of practices, institutions, narratives, explanatory frameworks, and forms of transmission. Comparison therefore benefits from examining structural location in addition to lexical meaning.

This observation has broader methodological implications. Concepts may become comparable even when direct semantic equivalence cannot be established. Comparison may proceed through analysis of how concepts function within broader Continuity Structures and through examination of the positions they occupy within larger Continuity Architectures. Attention shifts from isolated concepts toward the broader Continuity Architectures through which concepts acquire significance.

The distinction developed in this study between Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity illustrates this possibility. The Hebrew materials reconstruct a model of Relational Continuity, whereas the Yogic materials reconstruct a model of Dispositional Continuity. These traditions employ different conceptual vocabularies and explanatory frameworks, yet both generate structured responses to the persistence of formative influences across time.

The resulting comparison therefore concerns structural position rather than semantic identity. Concepts become intelligible through the Continuity Structures within which they function and the Continuity Architectures that situate those structures within broader religious and intellectual traditions. This perspective expands the scope of comparative inquiry while preserving historical specificity and conceptual difference.

The implications extend beyond the comparison of zikaron and saṃskāra. Many concepts encountered in cross-traditional research resist straightforward translation or direct equivalence. Structural comparison offers an additional analytical pathway through examination of the Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures through which concepts, practices, institutions, and forms of transmission organize continuity within particular traditions. The comparison developed in this study suggests that Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures provide productive analytical categories for examining Shared Problem Fields across traditions. In this respect, SPA contributes a framework through which conceptual differences may be preserved while patterns of comparability become more clearly visible.

5.2 Continuity as a Trans-Traditional Problem Field

If lexical equivalence is not the primary basis of comparison, attention may shift toward the broader problems to which traditions respond. Concepts need not share equivalent meanings in order to become comparable. Comparison becomes possible when distinct traditions address recognizable concerns through different conceptual resources. The present study has focused upon continuity because it represents one instance of the Shared Problem Fields that recur across human experience. Questions concerning continuity appear in diverse cultural and historical settings: how does the past remain effective within the present? How are formative inheritances transmitted across generations? How do prior experiences continue to shape future possibilities? Traditions address these questions through different conceptual vocabularies and institutional forms, yet the underlying concern with continuity remains recognizable across contexts. Shared Problem Fields therefore provide a basis for structural comparison without requiring conceptual equivalence.

Developments in memory studies provide additional support for approaching continuity as a broader comparative problem field. Halbwachs (1992) argued that memory is sustained through social frameworks that enable communities to preserve meaningful relationships to the past. Building upon this insight, Assmann (2011) distinguished between communicative memory and cultural memory, emphasizing the role of rituals, texts, institutions, and symbolic practices in carrying formative meanings across generations. Olick (2007) similarly describes collective remembering as an ongoing social process through which communities negotiate relationships between past and present. Although these approaches emerged within different disciplinary contexts, they converge in highlighting continuity as a socially mediated process extending beyond the retention of information alone.

From this perspective, continuity may be understood as a broader analytical category encompassing remembrance, transmission, persistence, renewal, and transformation. These dimensions do not operate independently. Rituals, texts, institutions, pedagogical practices, and symbolic frameworks function together as mechanisms through which formative

influences remain operative across time. Continuity therefore depends upon the maintenance, transmission, and renewal of significance through a variety of social, cultural, and symbolic processes.

Such observations support the view that continuity may be approached as one of the Shared Problem Fields through which different traditions organize distinct Continuity Architectures. Some traditions sustain continuity through publicly enacted cultural carriers, communal practices, and textual transmission; others explain continuity through the retention, reproduction, and transformation of dispositions within experience itself. The specific mechanisms vary, yet each architecture addresses the problem of how formative influences remain effective across time.

Viewed from this perspective, *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* may be understood as structurally significant components within larger responses to the problem of continuity. The Hebrew tradition reconstructs Relational Continuity, whereas the Yogic tradition reconstructs Dispositional Continuity. The significance of the comparison lies in illuminating alternative structural responses to a Shared Problem Field rather than demonstrating conceptual similarity. Distinct Continuity Structures may emerge as alternative responses to that Shared Problem Field while remaining embedded within markedly different Continuity Architectures.

Recent developments in textual scholarship further illustrate the broader relevance of this perspective. Drawing upon evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ulrich (2015) argues that scriptural traditions frequently develop through processes of growth, revision, and transmission rather than through static preservation. Continuity therefore need not imply immutability. Similarly, Mattison's (2025) study of *Jubilees* illustrates how inherited covenantal traditions were reconfigured in response to changing concerns regarding communal identity and group survival. Pioske (2025) likewise emphasizes that continuity within biblical traditions frequently depends upon reinterpretation and reactivation rather than the preservation of fixed historical forms. Studies of composite manuscripts such as 4Q175 suggest that scriptural traditions may remain authoritative while undergoing adaptation, recomposition, and reinterpretation within changing historical and communal settings (Stanojević, 2026a). Together, these studies indicate that continuity is frequently sustained through renewal, adaptation, and reconfiguration. Continuity may therefore be understood as preserving meaningful connections across time rather than maintaining unchanged forms.

Seen in this light, continuity may be understood as a trans-traditional problem field capable of generating multiple forms of religious, philosophical, and cultural articulation. Traditions organize different Continuity Architectures through which relationships between past and present remain meaningful despite processes of reinterpretation, adaptation, and historical change. Comparative inquiry therefore benefits from examining how Continuity Structures

are embedded within broader Continuity Architectures and how those architectures address Shared Problem Fields. The comparison developed in this study highlights not hidden sameness but patterned diversity, illustrating the range of ways in which traditions render continuity intelligible across time.

5.3 Ecology of Comparative Hermeneutics

The comparison developed in this study also carries broader implications for comparative hermeneutics. If continuity is approached through the framework of Shared Problem Fields, comparison becomes less dependent upon conceptual equivalence and more attentive to the interpretive environments within which concepts acquire meaning. Traditions do not preserve continuity through isolated ideas alone. Concepts operate within wider configurations of texts, rituals, institutions, pedagogical practices, forms of transmission, and interpretive communities. Comparative inquiry therefore benefits from examining how Continuity Structures function within these broader interpretive settings.

Recent developments in ritual studies and memory studies reinforce this perspective. Bell (1992) emphasizes that ritual practices participate in the production and maintenance of social worlds. Assmann (2011) highlights the role of ritual, textual, and institutional carriers in sustaining cultural memory across generations. Both approaches draw attention to the broader contexts within which continuity becomes possible. Continuity is sustained through interconnected configurations of practices, texts, institutions, and forms of participation. These configurations provide the conditions through which continuity remains intelligible across time.

These observations suggest that traditions may be understood as developing distinctive interpretive ecologies. Within such ecologies, continuity emerges through the interaction of multiple elements. Ritual observance, textual transmission, pedagogical instruction, institutional organization, and interpretive practice collectively contribute to the maintenance and renewal of meaningful relationships between past and present. The significance of a concept depends upon its location within a wider ecology of continuity.

From this perspective, Continuity Architectures may be understood as particular forms of ecological organization through which traditions sustain continuity across time. Continuity Structures identify the principal mechanisms through which continuity operates, whereas Continuity Architectures situate those mechanisms within broader networks of practices, institutions, narratives, and forms of transmission. The distinction developed in this study between Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity therefore points toward different modes of organizing continuity within larger interpretive environments.

The Hebrew tradition illustrates one such Continuity Architecture. Relational Continuity emerges through an integrated configuration of covenantal, ritual, textual, pedagogical, and intergenerational practices that sustain communal participation across time. The persistence of the past remains intelligible through the renewal of relationships linking present

communities to formative traditions.

Classical Yoga illustrates a different Continuity Architecture. Dispositional Continuity emerges through the dynamics of latent formations operating within *citta*. Continuity remains intelligible through processes of retention, transformation, and causal persistence that connect past and present experience. The resulting architecture differs substantially from the Hebrew model while engaging comparable questions concerning the efficacy of the past.

Such observations highlight the value of SPA as a comparative framework. It enables comparison across traditions without requiring conceptual identity, historical influence, or doctrinal equivalence. Concepts become comparable through the structural positions they occupy within broader Continuity Architectures. Comparison therefore proceeds by examining how traditions organize Shared Problem Fields through different Continuity Structures situated within different Continuity Architectures and Interpretive Ecologies.

This perspective also contributes to an understanding of why traditions frequently remain comparable despite substantial differences in vocabulary, theology, cosmology, or anthropology. The objective of comparison is not the discovery of hidden sameness but the reconstruction of patterned responses to recurring human concerns. Comparative hermeneutics may therefore benefit from shifting attention from isolated concepts toward the Continuity Architectures within which concepts become meaningful. Such an approach preserves historical specificity while expanding the possibilities for structurally informed cross-traditional comparison.

5.4 Limitations

The approach proposed in this study is subject to several limitations. First, SPA does not replace philological, historical, textual, or contextual reconstruction. Comparative interpretation remains dependent upon the careful reconstruction of concepts within their original linguistic, textual, historical, and cultural settings. Structural comparison becomes meaningful only after such contextual work has been undertaken. The analytical sequence employed in SPA presupposes prior attention to linguistic range, textual distribution, historical setting, and interpretive context.

Second, the present analysis concerns structural comparability rather than conceptual identity. *Zikaron* and *saṃskāra* occupy different locations within distinct religious and intellectual traditions. Hebrew and Yogic traditions remain differentiated at the levels of doctrine, anthropology, cosmology, and religious practice. Structural comparability is therefore compatible with substantial conceptual difference. Concepts may occupy analogous positions within different Continuity Structures while remaining embedded within distinct historical and intellectual traditions.

Third, Shared Problem Fields should not be understood as timeless universals existing independently of historical contexts. Traditions formulate and experience concerns such as

continuity, remembrance, transmission, transformation, and identity through distinct historical trajectories, interpretive ecologies, and institutional frameworks. Comparative inquiry therefore requires continued sensitivity to cultural specificity even when broader patterns of comparison become visible. Continuity Architectures remain historically situated and cannot be abstracted from the traditions within which they emerge and operate.

These limitations indicate the scope within which SPA may be applied. The framework contributes to clarifying how concepts become comparable through their positions within Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures and through their relation to Shared Problem Fields. At the same time, linguistic, historical, and conceptual differences remain integral to the comparative enterprise and provide the conditions under which comparison becomes analytically productive.

5.5 Hermeneutic Synthesis

The comparison developed in this study suggests that meaningful cross-traditional inquiry need not begin with conceptual equivalence. The analyses of zikaron and saṃskāra indicate that concepts emerging from different linguistic, historical, and religious traditions may become comparable when examined in relation to the roles they perform within broader Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures. Comparison therefore benefits from moving beyond isolated lexical correspondences toward the reconstruction of Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures.

The Hebrew and Yogic traditions examined here organize continuity through markedly different organizational logics. The Hebrew materials reconstruct Relational Continuity, whereas the Yogic materials reconstruct Dispositional Continuity. These traditions therefore generate different Continuity Structures while remaining concerned with the persistence of formative influences across time.

The distinction developed in this study between Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity provides one way of describing these different organizational logics. Relational Continuity emphasizes the renewal of covenantal relationships through communal participation, ritual practice, textual transmission, and intergenerational instruction. Dispositional Continuity emphasizes the retention, transformation, and reproduction of latent formations within experience. Each model reconstructs continuity through a distinctive configuration of mechanisms, practices, and explanatory assumptions.

At a broader analytical level, these Continuity Structures become intelligible within different Continuity Architectures. Continuity Architectures encompass the wider networks of practices, institutions, narratives, interpretive traditions, and forms of transmission within which Continuity Structures operate. The distinction between Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures enables comparison to proceed across traditions while preserving historical and conceptual specificity. Concepts acquire significance through their locations within these larger Continuity Architectures. Their structural positions become visible

through the relationships they maintain with other elements within the architecture.

The analyses presented in this study further suggest that continuity may be approached as one of the Shared Problem Fields that recur across diverse traditions. Questions concerning how the past remains effective within the present, how formative inheritances are transmitted across generations, and how continuity is maintained despite historical change appear in multiple cultural settings. Traditions respond to these concerns through different conceptual resources and organizational forms. Comparison therefore becomes possible through attention to the ways in which traditions configure responses to Shared Problem Fields. Distinct Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures emerge from these responses while preserving historical and conceptual differences.

SPA provides a methodological framework for undertaking such comparisons. By moving from Lexical and Semantic Reconstruction through Contextual Saturation, Functional Identification, Architectural Reconstruction, and Controlled Cross-Traditional Comparison, SPA enables concepts to be examined in relation to the Continuity Architectures within which they function. The comparison of *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* illustrates how concepts may become structurally comparable even when their semantic contents, historical trajectories, and doctrinal contexts remain distinct.

The significance of this approach extends beyond the present comparison. Comparative inquiry frequently encounters concepts that resist translation, equivalence, or direct alignment. Structural comparison offers a way of engaging such differences without reducing them to sameness or treating them as wholly incommensurable. Concepts become comparable through the structural positions they occupy within Continuity Architectures and through the roles they play in relation to Shared Problem Fields.

Viewed from this perspective, the comparison of *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* contributes not only to Hebrew Studies and comparative hermeneutics but also to broader discussions concerning continuity, transmission, memory, and tradition. The analysis suggests that traditions may generate distinct yet intelligible responses to recurring questions concerning the persistence of the past. Relational Continuity and Dispositional Continuity represent two such responses. Their comparison illustrates how structurally oriented inquiry can illuminate both difference and comparability across traditions while preserving the integrity of each tradition's historical and conceptual particularity.

6. Conclusion

The analysis of *zākhar* (זָכַר) and *zikaron* (זִכְרוֹן) across the examined Hebrew corpus suggests that remembrance functions as a mechanism through which covenantal obligations, communal identity, and formative events remain operative across time. Its significance extends beyond recollection alone. This philological and textual finding provides the starting point for the broader comparative inquiry undertaken in this study. Reconstructed through their respective source traditions, the Hebrew and Yogic materials yield two distinct

Continuity Structures. The Hebrew tradition organizes Relational Continuity through Covenantal Remembrance, Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation, Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, and Intergenerational Continuity. Classical Yoga organizes Dispositional Continuity through latent impression (*saṃskāra*), dispositional tendency (*vāsanā*), causal persistence (*karmāśaya*), and transformative processes (*pariṇāma*) operating within *citta*. These Continuity Structures are neither equivalent nor reducible to one another. Their comparability derives from the structural positions they occupy within distinct Continuity Architectures concerned with explaining how the past remains effective within present life.

Building upon this observation, the study proposes a limited form of SPA, a comparative strategy that proceeds from Lexical and Semantic Reconstruction and Contextual Saturation toward Functional Identification, Architectural Reconstruction, and Controlled Cross-Traditional Comparison. SPA builds upon philological, textual, historical, and contextual reconstruction in order to investigate how concepts function within broader networks of practices, narratives, institutions, and explanatory mechanisms. Its contribution lies in clarifying how structurally comparable positions may emerge across traditions while preserving conceptual and historical differences.

The broader argument advanced here is that continuity may be approached as one of the Shared Problem Fields that recur across traditions. Religious and philosophical traditions frequently develop different conceptual resources in response to questions concerning persistence, transmission, remembrance, transformation, and temporal existence. Comparative inquiry may therefore proceed through examination of the ways traditions organize responses to Shared Problem Fields. The comparison developed here suggests that distinct Continuity Structures and Continuity Architectures may emerge in response to comparable concerns while remaining historically and conceptually differentiated. Comparative inquiry may generate forms of interpretation that remain difficult to discern from within a single tradition while rendering broader patterns of intelligibility visible across traditions.

This perspective carries implications beyond the specific comparison undertaken here. Questions concerning memory, transmission, embodiment, agency, suffering, obligation, and transformation may benefit from approaches that attend to structural positions, Interpretive Ecologies, and architectural configurations. Such questions may be investigated through reconstruction of the organizational frameworks through which traditions preserve meaning, identity, and practice across time. The findings further suggest that questions commonly explored within memory studies, ritual studies, and comparative hermeneutics may benefit from comparative attention to the diverse Continuity Architectures through which traditions organize relations between past and present.

At the same time, the present study has argued that meaningful comparison remains

dependent upon careful philological reconstruction and sustained attention to the textual traditions within which concepts acquire meaning. Comparative understanding begins from contextual specificity rather than abstraction from it. Comparative hermeneutics may therefore benefit from attention to Continuity Architectures, Interpretive Ecologies, and Shared Problem Fields as complementary analytical categories. Such an approach preserves the importance of historical specificity while creating additional conditions under which traditions may enter into dialogue without requiring conceptual assimilation. Comparison becomes a practice of cultivating intelligibility across difference while preserving the distinctive forms of life, memory, and transmission through which traditions organize human experience.

Ultimately, the comparison between zikaron and saṃskāra suggests that traditions may remain irreducibly distinct while nevertheless becoming mutually intelligible. The Hebrew tradition preserves continuity through Relational Continuity; Classical Yoga preserves continuity through Dispositional Continuity. These traditions organize continuity through different Continuity Structures situated within distinct Continuity Architectures. The comparison developed here suggests that intelligibility across traditions may emerge through reconstruction of those structures and architectures while preserving historical and conceptual differences. In this respect, difference becomes a condition of comparison rather than a barrier to it. Structural comparison does not eliminate distinction; it clarifies how traditions become comparable precisely through the different ways they organize Shared Problem Fields across time.

References

- Ackroyd, P. R. (1972). The temple vessels: A continuity theme. In *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel* (pp. 166–181). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004275461_010
- Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, C. (1992). *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Bryant, E. F. (2009). *The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali: A New Edition, Translation, and Commentary*. North Point Press.
- Carr, D. M. (2005). *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Childs, B. S. (1962). *Memory and Tradition in Israel*. SCM Press.
- Clooney, F. X. (2010). *Comparative Theology: Deep Learning Across Religious Borders*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dimant, D. (1988). Use and interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. In M. J. Mulder (Ed.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Vol. 2, Part 1, pp. 379–419)*. Van Gorcum; Fortress Press.

- Durkheim, E. (1995). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (K. E. Fields, Trans.). Free Press. (Original work published 1912)
- Fishbane, M. (1985). *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford University Press.
- Fishbane, M. (2008). *Sacred Attunement: A Jewish Theology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (2nd rev. ed., J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1960)
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory* (L. A. Coser, Ed. and Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Hendel, R. (2005). *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford University Press.
- Jenni, E., & Westermann, C. (Eds.). (1997). *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Vol. 1). Hendrickson.
- Koehler, L., Baumgartner, W., & Stamm, J. J. (1994–2000). *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (5 vols.). Brill.
- Larson, G. J. (2018). *Classical Yoga Philosophy and the Legacy of Sāṃkhya*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Levenson, J. D. (1985). *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Harper & Row.
- Mattison, K. (2025). *Jewish Identity, Exclusion of Foreigners, and Group Survival: Jubilees' Recasting of Circumcision for the Hellenistic Age*. *Vetus Testamentum*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685330-bja10235>
- National Council of Churches. (2021). *The Holy Bible, New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition (NRSVue)*. National Council of Churches.
- Olick, J. K. (2007). *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*. Routledge.
- Pioske, D. (2025). *The Hebrew Bible and the Theory of Anachronism*. *Vetus Testamentum*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685330-bja10223>
- Ricoeur, P. (2004). *Memory, History, Forgetting* (K. Blamey & D. Pellauer, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
- Schaper, J. (2005). *Exilic and post-exilic prophecy and the orality/literacy problem*. *Vetus Testamentum*, 55(3), 324–342. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568533054359850>
- Schiffman, L. H. (1994). *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Jewish Publication Society.
- Schottroff, W. (1964). *Gedenken im Alten Testament: Die Wurzel זכר im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient*. Neukirchener Verlag.
- Schottroff, W. (1997). זכר zkr. In E. Jenni & C. Westermann (Eds.), *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Vol. 1, pp. 379–388). Hendrickson.
- Sommer, B. D. (2009). *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stanojević, Ž. (2026a). 4Q175 (Testimonia) in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Scribal memory and

textual recomposition [Unpublished manuscript]. Institute for Hebrew Language and Literature. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19557658>

Stanojević, Ž. (2026b). Wine or grape juice? The use of the noun Yayin in the Old Testament: A lexical-semantic and exegetical analysis [Unpublished manuscript]. Institute for Hebrew Language and Literature.

Tov, E. (2004). *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Brill.

Turner, V. (1969). *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Aldine.

Ulrich, E. (2015). *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*. Brill.

Vyāsa. (1914). *The Yoga-System of Patañjali, or the Ancient Hindu Doctrine of Concentration of Mind* (J. H. Woods, Trans.). Harvard Oriental Series (Vol. 17). Harvard University Press.

Weinfeld, M. (1972). *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford University Press.

Yerushalmi, Y. H. (1982). *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. University of Washington Press.

Table 1. Representative Uses and Functions of zākhar and zikaron in the Examined Hebrew Corpus

Passage	Hebrew Expression	Grammatical Form	Speaker Subject	/ Object Remembrance	of Literary Context	Function within the Passage	Functional Category
Exod. 12:14	זָכְרוּן יוֹם (yôm zikkārôn)	Noun phrase (ms)	Israel	Exodus deliverance	Passover institution	Ritual remembrance of divine deliverance	Ritual
Exod. 13:9	זָכְרוּן (zikkārôn)	Noun phrase (ms)	Israel	Divine deliverance from Egypt	Passover instruction	Embodied remembrance through covenantal ritual observance	Ritual / Covenantal
Exod. 17:14	זָכְרוּן בְּסֶפֶר (zikkārôn bassēfer)	Noun phrase (ms)	YHWH (to Amalek's hostility Moses)	(to Amalek's hostility)	Divine command to record	Preservation of remembrance through inscription	Historical
Exod. 28:12	זָכְרוּן אֲבֵנֵי (zikkārôn 'avnê)	Construct noun phrase (ms)	High Priest	Names of Israel's tribes	Israel's Priestly vestments	Memorial representation before YHWH	Priestly
Exod. 28:29	לְזָכְרוֹן (lezikkārôn)	Prepositional noun phrase (ms)	High Priest	Names of Israel's tribes	Priestly mediation	Covenantal representation before YHWH	Priestly / Covenantal
Exod. 30:16	לְזָכְרוֹן (lezikkārôn)	Prepositional noun phrase (ms)	Israel	The Israelites before YHWH	Sanctuary maintenance	Ritual memorial before God	Priestly / Ritual
Lev. 23:24	זָכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה (zikkārôn terû'āh)	Construct noun phrase (ms)	Israel	Sacred observance	festival Festival legislation	Liturgical memorial through trumpet observance	Liturgical
Num. 10:10	לְזָכְרוֹן (lezikkārôn)	Prepositional noun phrase (ms)	Israel	The Israelites before YHWH	Cultic worship	Ritual invocation and covenantal presentation before God	Ritual / Covenantal
Deut.	וּזְכָרְתָּ	Qal perfect 2ms	Israel	Egyptian bondage	Covenant renewal	Ethical remembrance	Ethical

Passage	Hebrew Expression	Grammatical Form	Speaker Subject	/ Object Remembrance	of Literary Context	Function within the Passage	Functional Category
5:15	(<i>wezākharta</i>)	with waw		and deliverance	discourse	grounded in liberation history	
Deut. 8:2	וזכרת (<i>wezākharta</i>)	Qal perfect with waw	2ms Israel	Wilderness experience	Covenant instruction	Historical-covenantal identity formation	Historical / Covenantal
Deut. 9:7	זכר (<i>zākhor</i>)	Qal infinitive absolute used imperatively	Israel	Rebellion in the wilderness	Covenant warning	Prevention of covenantal forgetfulness	Ethical / Covenantal
Deut. 25:17	זכור (<i>zākhor</i>)	Qal infinitive absolute used imperatively	Israel	Amalek's attack	Covenantal parenesis / admonition	Collective memory and moral responsibility	Historical / Ethical
Ps. 105:8	זכר (<i>zākhar</i>)	Qal perfect	3ms YHWH	Covenant Israel	with Hymnic celebration	Divine remembrance as covenantal fidelity	Covenantal
Mal. 3:16	ספר זכרון (<i>sēfer zikkārôn</i>)	Noun phrase (ms)	God-fearing community	Faithful worshippers	Prophetic reflection	Preservation of communal memory and identity before YHWH	Communal

Note. The selected examples illustrate the functional diversity of the root *zākhar* and its related nominal forms across ritual, priestly, covenantal, ethical, historical, liturgical, and communal contexts. Remembrance appears within a variety of institutional, ritual, theological, and social settings through which formative events, obligations, and relationships remain operative across time, extending beyond recollection alone. The table is not intended as an exhaustive lexical inventory but as a representative corpus demonstrating the distribution and functions of *zākhar* and *zikaron* within the Hebrew materials examined in this study. These patterns provide the textual basis for the subsequent reconstruction of the structural position of *zikaron*. The following analysis reconstructs this structural position through Covenantal

Remembrance, Covenantal Participation, Ritual Participation, Narrative Transmission, Pedagogical Instruction, Textual Transmission, and Intergenerational Continuity.

Table 2. Comparative Continuity Structures in Hebrew and Yogic Traditions

Analytical Dimension	Hebrew Tradition (<i>zikaron</i>)	Yogic Tradition (<i>saṃskāra</i>)
Primary Mechanism	Continuity Remembrance (<i>zikaron</i>)	Latent impression (<i>saṃskāra</i>) and dispositional tendency (<i>vāsanā</i>)
Dominant Mode of Continuity	Mode of Relational Continuity	Dispositional Continuity
Location of Persistence	Covenantal relationships, institutions, textual traditions and communal continuity	ritual <i>citta</i> , <i>saṃskāra</i> , <i>karmāśaya</i> , and <i>vāsanā</i>
Basic Unit of Transmission	Covenantal relationship and communal identity	Latent impression and dispositional tendency
Temporal Logic	Remembrance and renewal	Retention and transformation
Mode of Persistence	Reactivation of formative relationships	Persistence of latent impressions and dispositional tendencies
Relation to the Past	Remembered and re-enacted	Sedimented and reproduced
Principal Threat to Continuity	to Forgetfulness (<i>šākhah</i> , שכח)	Afflictive conditioning (<i>kleśa</i>) and habitual fixation
Dynamic Process	Covenantal Remembrance Covenantal Participation Covenant Renewal	→ <i>vṛtti</i> → <i>saṃskāra</i> → <i>vāsanā</i> → → <i>pariṇāma</i>
Ontology of Change	Continuity through covenantal fidelity	Continuity through transformative persistence
Social Orientation	Communal and intergenerational	Dispositional and causal
Carrier of Continuity	Narrative transmission, participation, textual deposits, and pedagogical instruction	Latent impressions, karmic tendencies and dispositional tendencies
Visibility of Continuity	Publicly enacted	Largely latent (<i>sūkṣma</i>)
Verification of Continuity	of Communal remembrance and ritual participation	Recurring dispositional and experiential patterns
Characteristic Temporal Architecture	Past → Remembered → Renewed	Past → Sedimented → Transformed

Note. The table summarizes analytical dimensions derived from the lexical, contextual, functional, and architectural reconstructions developed in Sections 2 and 3. These dimensions highlight how Hebrew and Yogic traditions organize continuity through different

Continuity Structures situated within their respective Continuity Architectures, thereby illustrating the structural positions occupied by *zikaron* and *saṃskāra* within each tradition.