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COURSE DESCRIPTION: Educational practice is always based on theories, frequently implicit rather than explicit, about the nature of learning. Jewish educational practice adds another layer of assumptions about the nature of Judaism and the educated Jew. This course is a kind of intellectual treasure hunt designed to flesh out the Jewish and educational assumption of Abraham Joshua Heschel, Martin Buber, Mordecai Kaplan, and Franz Rosenzweig. With the help of the educational scholar Joseph Schwab, participants will examine how the unfinished work of a sound and practical theory of education becomes embedded in the various educational contexts in which participants teach and learn. These visions are then bumped up against four distinctly contemporary visions of Jewish education appearing in the next Visions of Jewish Education published in 2003.

COURSE GOALS: Participants will develop:
1. A deepened awareness of the function of educational philosophy as a useful, practical activity;
2. An exploration of the Jewish educational thinking of Martin Buber, Mordecai Kaplan, Abraham Joshua Heschel, and Franz Rosenzweig as the neshama/soul of an educational vision;
3. An understanding of Joseph Schwab’s theory of the commonplaces as a tool for understanding the guf/body of an educational vision.
4. A critical stance both embracing and critiquing a more contemporary vision of Jewish education from the volume Visions of Jewish Education.
REQUIRED TEXTS:
Modern Jewish Thinkers, Alan Levenson, Aronson
Readings for Heschel, Kaplan, Buber, and Rosenzweig from Class Reader.
Vision at Work, Daniel Pekarsky, Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2006

COURSE FORMAT AND REQUIREMENTS:

ASSIGNMENTS

1. A 3-5 page translation of the Schwabian analysis of a chosen educational environment;
2. A 3-5 page portrait of Beit Buber, Kaplan, Heschel, Rosenzweig as an embodiment of these thinkers educational vision;
3. A 3-5 page critique of one of the thinkers from the Visions of Jewish Education volume or a dialogue where two of the thinkers from this volume are invited to comment on the students Beit Heschel, Buber, Kaplan, or Rosenzweig)

These requirements are designed for Master’s level students. Adaptations will be made for students working towards a BJS degree.

COURSE EXPECTATIONS

All students (credit or non-credit) are expected to:
- regularly attend class and arrive promptly for class beginning;
- have carefully read the week’s reading assignment and come to class with an affirmation (something in the reading that rings extraordinarily true to the reader), and a question or argument with the weeks readings;
- if class is missed contact another student about what transpired in class;
- if more than one class is missed turn in a 2 page critical response to the week’s readings.

Credit students are expected to complete the two assignments by the semester’s end (or by agreement with the Professor take an incomplete with a stipulated completion date)

CLASS OUTLINE

Introduction

September 5 (session 1)

Traditional Texts on Education, and the Role of Vision in Jewish Education

Unit 1: The Guf: The Educational Body
September 20 (session 2)
Joseph Schwab (Schwab from reader)

October 11 (session 3)
Joseph Schwab (Fox from reader)

October 18 (session 4)
Joseph Schwab (Schein from reader)

Unit 2: The Neshama and the Guf at Work

October 25 (session 5)
Vision at Work, Pekarsy, Letters 1 thru 5

November 1 (session 6)
Pekarsy, Letters 6 thru 12

Unit 3: The Neshama within the Student and Teacher Commonplaces (Buber and Heschel)

November 29 (session 7)
Martin Buber (from reader and Levenson)

December 6 (session 8)
Abraham Joshua Heschel (from reader and Levenson)

Unit 4: The Neshama within the Milieu Commonplace (Mordecai Kaplan)

December 13 (session 9)
Kaplan (from reader and Levenson)

December 20 (session 10)
The Dance of the Commonplaces meet the Educational Philosophy of Franz Rozenzweig, (from reader “The Opening of The Lehrhaus”)

TBA (session 11)
The Rosenzweig Dance continued (from reader “It Is Time”)

Unit 5: Contemporary Visions of Jewish Education

TBA (session 12)
Contemporary Visions: Meyer and Brinker in Visions of Jewish Education

TBA (session 13)
Contemporary Visions: Greenberg and Twersky in Visions of Jewish Education
EDUCATIONAL VALUES IN THE TALMUD
RAB/EDU430X
3 CREDITS
FALL 2005
TUESDAY EVENINGS, 7:30-9:30PM
LOCAL AND DISTANCE LEARNING: ATLANTA, MIAMI
MOSHE BERGER

I. THE GOALS OF THIS COURSE

1. To increase the student’s knowledge and understanding of Jewish educational values and issues, as these issues are addressed in classical Rabbinic literature generally and in the Babylonian Talmud specifically;

2. To explore possible applications of Talmudic issues in education to contemporary issues;

3. To provide the student with an opportunity to become acquainted (or better acquainted, as the case may be) with the Babylonian Talmud: its sub-genres, its various ways of thinking, and its poetic, legal, meta-legal and theological qualities.

II. METHOD

At each class meeting, we shall study a Talmudic passage (sugya) from the reader which I have prepared. We shall attempt to understand each sugya on its own terms and also consider its implications for educational values.

III. REQUIREMENTS

1. FIND A CHEVRUTA FOR WEEKLY PREPARATION AND REVIEW

In order to successfully master the material, you must carefully review each class meeting and prepare the assigned text before each session. I therefore require that each student “team up” with a study partner (chevruta), with whom to prepare and review the material on a weekly basis.

The Jewish learning tradition has always understood that “two heads are better than one”. (See, for example, table of contents in my reader under Berachot 63b and Makkot 10a.) This is especially true when confronting classical texts which are at times elliptical and which often allude to realities,
practices, and ways of thinking foreign to life as we presently know it. Your chevruta may be a member of the class or someone who is not presently taking the course. If your schedule makes it difficult to meet someone in person, you might find it more convenient to arrange to meet over the phone.

The long-term benefit you derive from the course, as well as the quality of classroom discussion, will be directly proportional to the time and effort which members of the class are willing to devote to this material during the week.

2. ATTENDANCE

Try to attend each meeting; the amount of material covered is very difficult to make up, even with a chevruta. If you know you will be unable to attend a meeting, please have someone tape that class, if possible.

IV. FOR CREDIT

Undergraduate Credit

Students are to compose a journal 12-18 typewritten pages in length. This journal should consist of two parts (which may be integrated). Part 1 is a reworking of class discussions. In this section, you should summarize all concepts discussed during the class meetings, communicating them in your own words and style, as if you were writing to an interested friend. The goal of this section is that you clarify your understanding of the material and the concepts, to the extent that you are comfortable communicating them to others.

You are not required to summarize the Talmudic texts studied, only the concepts which emanated from these texts in the classroom discussions. Since it is our hope, however, that you will utilize your journal in the future, you may desire to include the texts (or summaries of them) as well. If you choose to do so, please do not count those sections towards the 12 page minimum.

Part 2 consists of your own, independent responses to at least four of the concepts mentioned in Part 1. The responses should average about one page each. They may be subjective and personal, or objective and analytic, or any combination thereof. The goal of this section is to enable you to integrate these concepts into your own thinking, so that you are able to respond creatively to them.

Graduate Credit

The requirement is qualitatively the same as for the undergraduates. Instead of a twelve page minimum, you have a sixteen page minimum. In Part 2, please present at least eight responses.

Assignment is due one month from the last class meeting.

Students NOT taking the course for credit who desire to engage in additional learning are warmly invited to meet with me for project ideas or guidance.
Contrasting Ways of Teaching
Baba Metzia 85b
(Hiya and Hanina)
USING A COMBINED JEWISH AND REGGIO EMILIA LEN TO LOOK AT JEWISH EARLY CHILDHOOD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Jewish educators in a variety of settings (CAJE, the Teacher Educators Institute, etc.) have become very fond of analyzing a particular Talmudic text that contrasts the teaching/learning styles of Rabbis Hanina and Hiya.

Whenever R. Hanina and R. Hiya were in a dispute, R. Hanina would say to R. Hiya, “Do you presume to dispute with me? If—God forbid!—the Torah were forgotten in Israel, I could restore it by my dialectical power.” R. Hiya would reply, “But I see to it that the Torah is not forgotten in Israel, What do I do? I go and sow flax, make nets (from the flax cords), and trap deer, whose flesh I give to orphans and out of whose skin I prepare scrolls, upon which I write the Five Books of (Moses). Then I go to a town that has no teachers for the young and teach the Five Books to five children and the six divisions (of Mishnah) to six young people. And I say to them, “Until I return, read scripture to one another and recite Mishnah to one another.” Thus, I see to it that the Torah is not forgotten in Israel.”

(Talmud, as retold in Bialik and Ravitsky’s Book of Legends)

Whenever we have taught this text to mixed groups of rabbis and Jewish educators we ask these basic questions:

1. How would you characterize the educational approaches of Hanina and Hiya?
2. If you personally were given the gift of six months devoted exclusively to Jewish study would you rather study in Beit Sefer Hanina or Beit Sefer Hiya? Why?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each of these methodologies (given your understanding of children or adults and how they learn)?

When we study this text with Early Childhood Educators, we ask one more question: In whose tzeelem (image) do you think most Early Childhood Educators are fashioned (or mint themselves)? The answer is always Hiya. The natural affinity with hands-on, whole-bodied, multi-sensory learning so critical for good early childhood practice creates an immediate sympathy with the Hiya character.
But here is where we believe that a too exclusive reliance on a Hiya mode of educational functioning can end up limiting the early childhood educator. We gently challenge ourselves and teachers by asking what might be missing from what we would call educational shlemut (fullness, wholeness) when we are kulo Hiya (entirely Hiya).

Many early childhood educators use both observational and reflective techniques in their work while working with children, parents, and class dynamics. Yet, they typically do not reflect on their own abilities to use abstract and theoretical thinking (an act of “meta-cognition”). They underestimate how much of the Hanina type intellect is involved in their own work. They typically do not think of themselves as “smart” or “intellectual” if by smart we mean abstract or theoretical. They underestimate how much of the Hanina type intellect is involved in their own work. They fall prey to a cultural bias that confuses reflectivity with abstract thinking that often makes the Jewish early childhood educator appear less sophisticated and less abstract than they in fact are.

Here is where we think Reggio Emilia philosophy and a Jewish inspired challenge of cultivating both the Hiya and Hanina sides of our pedagogic personalities converge importantly. Reggio Emilia philosophy provides a model of using reflective thinking as a tool for developing the intellectual and analytic powers of early childhood educators. Through Reggio Emilia’s emphasis on observation and documentation of the world of the child the Jewish Early Childhood educator stretches his/her reflective/analytic abilities. It offers the early childhood educator the opportunity to become a teacher researcher in exciting and important ways.

The key goes back to the importance of questions. One of the major emphases of Reggio Emilia philosophy is inviting not only the children to ask and research questions, but also the teacher. In Making Learning Visible, Carla Rinaldi shares that

"The work of the teachers – provided they are not left on their own, without rules or collegial support – not only produces daily experience and action, but can also become the object of critical reappraisal and theory building. In this way, practice is not only a field of action necessary for the success of the theory, but is an active part of the theory itself: it contains it, generates it, and is generated by it."
Towards the Development of a Jewish Pedagogy:
Rav Chiya’s Vision of Torah Education

Moshe Berger

A few years ago, I was asked to teach an introductory Talmud course to a cohort of Jewish educators at the Cleveland College of Jewish Studies. My original goal was unrelated to Jewish education per se. I desired simply to initiate these specific students as gently as possible into the world of the Babylonian Talmud. I therefore searched for pedagogically oriented ‘sugyot,’ hoping that their relevance to the students’ professional lives would make the subject matter appear less “foreign” to them than would otherwise be the case.

As the class delved into these sugyot, however, we quickly perceived that the effect of my curricular choice far exceeded my expectations. The students did not simply view those texts as “gateways to Talmudic literature.” Quite the opposite: we (myself included) quickly began to view the Talmud as a “gateway” to our own development as Jewish educators! We saw that the Talmud provided us with frames of reference both for defining contemporary educational issues as well as for exploring them. After working through each sugya, we found ourselves, quite naturally, incorporating Talmudic pedagogical concepts and categories into our conversations about contemporary Jewish education. We felt that the Talmud was replete with sugyot, waiting, as it were, to be tapped for their educational wisdom, both practical and theoretical. We thus began to relate to relevant sugyot as being catalysts which could help us deepen, and even transform, our understanding of Jewish education and of our roles as Jewish educators.
Towards the Development of a Jewish Pedagogy

Further Discussion

I. Basic Distinctions between the Two Scholarly Visions

The claims of these two great Amoraim reflect two important models of Torah learning. Note that R. Chanina's self-characterization contains the three following characteristics—to be distinguished from those of R. Chiya:

1. It assumes that the in-depth intellectual mastery of Torah is the major factor that will guarantee the Torah's survival in this world. R. Channa apparently views the Torah as an integrated system which on its deepest level is accessible to human reason. Analogous to a complex mathematical equation, therefore, the Torah may be "reconstructed" by the unique Torah scholar who is endowed with sufficient intellectual prowess.

2. R. Channa's ultimate vision of Torah greatness does not primarily entail the act of communicating Torah to others. He asserts that if Torah were to be forgotten, he would be able to reconstruct it by means of his mind alone, i.e., independently of anyone or anything else. His act of retrieval thus requires no teaching, no creative confrontations with the world (human or material) outside of himself. It consists simply of the independent cogitative act.

3. R. Channa boasts of his potential, not of his accomplishments: "Were the Torah to be forgotten from Israel..."

R. Chiya's ideal vision for the preservation of Torah contrasts with that of R. Channa on all three accounts:

1. First, he ensures preservation of the Torah by enabling children to understand the sources of Torah (션;base עלстроית פסוקים) on what appears to be a basic level of understanding. He does not refer to unique intellectual strengths or analytic abilities. R. Chiya's vision of preserving Torah thus appears to focus primarily upon communicating the basics, rather than upon developing a profound, highly sophisticated understanding of the material.

2. Second, R. Chiya's act of preserving Torah involved both teaching and industry, i.e., confronting and working creatively with representatives of all categories of life: with other people (מועדים), with animals (כלים) and with the vegetable kingdom (צמחים).

3) Third, R. Chiya doesn't refer to his potential, but to his actual accomplishments. He asserts that due to his actions, the Torah will never be forgotten from Israel.

II. The Significance of the Grave-Marking Project

Raysh Lakish's preoccupation with grave-marking symbolizes how he assesses the posthumous significance of the righteous. He engages, according to Rashi, in a type of "damage control" in order to minimize their malevolent effect. By marking their graves, he hopes to prevent inadvertent contact with their corpses. Raysh Lakish thus appears to hint that after they die the righteous possess a potential for doing harm, i.e., their power to contaminate kohanim as their remains decompose.

As we saw, Heaven denied Raysh Lakish the opportunity to mark R. Chiya's grave only because of the former's relative inferiority to R. Chiya in the realm of ורחבת תורה (=dissemination of Torah). In the area of לע泯ל, however—which in this sugya means the intellectual mastery and in-depth understanding of Torah—Raysh Lakish's proficiency was not judged to be inferior. By using the term "מעפלת" (verse 10) to describe the strengths of both Raysh Lakish and R. Channa, the sugya implies that Raysh Lakish's Torah greatness was akin to that of R. Channa's. In attempting to integrate the "grave-marking" section of the story with the section describing the differences between R. Chiya and R. Channa, I would suggest that Raysh Lakish's commitment to the grave-marking project reflects his "R. Channa-like vision" of the Torah scholar as a great מעפל—"depth mastery" scholar.

As I suggested in my characterization of R. Channa (1.,2 above), pilpul per se is a lonely, non-dialogical endeavor. The exclusively "pilpulistic" scholar, while alive, achieves much merit for himself and for the world as he successfully "masters" the Torah. After his death, however, he is no longer able to generate sanctity in this world because he is no longer of this world. In a sense, the great מעפל (who was not involved in ורחבת תורה) "takes his Torah with him." His posthumous effect in this world, alas, is relegated to that of a decomposing corpse, contaminating all who come into contact with his remains. Raysh Lakish therefore views his primary obligation towards these scholars in negative, "damage-control" terms: he must carefully mark their graves in order that they not be the cause of anyone contracting impurity.
Selections from Journals of Moshe Berger’s Students
Throughout our lives we meet all types of teachers. The Gemara presents two different teachers for us to study. The first is R' Chiya, whose burial crypt Reish Lakish tries to find, but is unsuccessful. It is customary to mark graves so that the Kohanim can traverse through the area without stepping on the burial site. If they did step on the graves, they would become ritually impure. Rashi comments that the righteous who are buried would not want to do any harm--they would not want to be a halachic failing. Reish Lakish was concerned with the great ages who were buried and marked the graves so that the decaying bodies would not become a negative factor--but he could not find R' Chiya's grave.

Reish Lakish believed that his inability to find R' Chiya's grave must be a sign from heaven. He initially believed that he was not merited to find the grave, but then a voice from heaven emanated and said that he had deliberated on Torah like R' Chiya, but that he had not disseminated Torah as R' Chiya had. And the story continues regarding R' Chiya and another great teacher, R' Chanina.

R' Chanina was a brilliant scholar. He claimed to have been able to reconstruct the entire Torah if need be (that is if the Jewish people forgot it!) He was a scholar who did not need a classroom since he could figure it out all by himself. He was not oriented towards teaching others to be teachers. He was in his head and not thinking of the future. R' Chiya had a different approach--he made sure the people did not forget Torah in the first place.

R' Chiya was a teacher of students who taught other students who taught other students and so on. He had set up a system where students had taught their area of expertise to many and often that the other students had to teach them back as well so that in the end everybody learned everything that was needed to be known regarding the Torah. R' Chiya discussed the long process he would go through in order to achieve his goal of educating many--he would sow flax, then weave nets from the flax, trap deer with the nets and then feed the meat to the orphans, he would use the skins to make parchment and then write the five books of Moses on them and the six orders of Mishnah and then go to teacherless villages and teach 11 children the 11 separate parts of the Torah and Mishnah and have them teach their part to all the others. He was patient in the process of learning and teaching. R' Chiya was a teacher with vision and goals and was not self-serving. He was brilliant in that he knew what it would take for Torah to outlive him. Unlike R' Chaninah, he saw the future of Judaism as outside of himself. Maybe R' Chaninah was a brilliant Torah scholar, but on the day of his death, what was his contribution to mankind?

So what kind of teacher am I in relation to these two teachers? I only hope and pray I can possess some of the wonderful qualities of R' Chiya. I have a difficult challenge in teaching kindergarten in a Reform shul. Many of these children come from interfaith families where there is very little Judaism present on a day-to-day basis. Some children have never had Shabbat, some have never attended a seder, and many have Christmas trees in their homes. I often feel as if I am the only one who is concerned about their Judaism for now and in the future. I teach them everything I can in the 52 hours I have with them for the entire school year. I am absolutely committed to them and not self-serving as was R' Chanina. Take every opportunity I get to teach the whole family as well. I often invite the parents in for family education programs and send home prayers and blessings and things to do as a family for all the holidays. The entire family needs to be educated and I try my hardest to have them learn to love and embrace Judaism. I teach as much as I can and do not take a "lite" approach. Kindergarten students are so spiritual and most excited about every new holiday and story they learn, and I would be failing them if I made it simple and easy to disregard.

In the past three years, I have also begun to work for the Jewish Outreach Institute by teaching non-Jewish women married to Jewish men who are raising Jewish children. I know this presents some major halachic problems, but these children are being raised as Jews! Many have been converted and I feel very responsible to teach the mothers so that they can teach their children. In a sense, I become the women's Jewish mother since they don't have one. We do everything from learning the alef-bet to learning how to make great chicken soup. The opportunities are endless. And many of these women end up converting to Judaism after they learn about what an amazing religion it is.

I also like to teach by doing activities with my kindergarten students and the older grades (fourth and up). I invite the older students into my classroom and we work on projects together. The younger students love having the "big kids" join us, and the older students are teaching the younger ones and sharpening their own skills. This is a symbiotic relationship where everyone ends up a winner! I have done this for years with great results.

Our madrichim system we have at our Temple is something that R' Chiya would have been delighted with. We have our teenagers as classroom assistants (not for menial tasks like copying, but for teaching). These madrichim are given opportunities to shine in their teaching and give back what they have gotten from their religious school experience. My pride and joy is my first madricha who is now a religious school teacher and just finished her master's degree in education. The cycle now continues...

R' Chiya's lessons also go to a much deeper and spiritual level. His tomb could not be found by Reish Lakish, because he is not to be found in just one place. His influence and contribution to the Jewish people are everywhere! The information he taught is still being taught today--his memory has lived on in his teaching. What teacher could want more--to be remembered for what they contributed to their students and the Jewish people as a whole?
Why was there a disagreement between these two teachers? Chiya taught the basics while Chanina was a back up or insurance policy. Why did they not acknowledge their need for each other? The narrator seems to favor Chiya. Chiya is given the last word. Yet, Chanina was also needed as a back up. Chiya’s approach would generate both the basics in education but also generate scholars like Chanina. Chiya would teach five students each a book of Torah and six students each a book of Mishnah. Each of these eleven students would teach others their book. They would learn from the other another book and so on and so on. Through this interpersonal dissemination, scholars like Chanina would be created. As students would learn another book, their perspective and knowledge would grow and multiply. Through their growth in knowledge, they would read their book differently than they had read it before. Genesis begins with the birth of man and Exodus begins with the birth of Moses. Genesis creates a world that makes space for man to live. Exodus ends with man creating a space for G-d by building the Tabernacle. Each creation is followed by the day of the Sabbath. By knowing the book of Genesis, understanding the book of Exodus becomes more profound. By knowing the book of Exodus, Genesis becomes more profound, etc. Teaching and learning the books of Torah and Mishnah from different teachers with different styles, knowledge grows. Teaching and learning the books of Torah and Mishnah from different teachers with different styles helps to create scholars on the level of Chanina. There is a cumulative, qualitative enhancement of the knowledge that is taught. Chiya starts with the basics of education but ends up with sophisticated scholarship. From the Chiya level of the basics, students can grow into the Chanina level of scholarship. Knowledge becomes integrated on different levels. Creative students become creative teachers. Each student becomes a communicator of knowledge. Moses communicated the Torah to us and each student communicates Torah to others. Through the communication of knowledge a process is formed where learning takes place. Through the experience of teaching and learning a mastery of the material grows. We both teach and learn directly from the face of G-d. There is a spiritual ramification from each encounter of teaching and learning. The process of oral communication is unique. The process of oral communication is central to learning.
Teaching Jewish Texts and the Mystery of Rabbi Abbahu’s Lit Up Face

Dr. Jeffrey Schein
London, 5765
A PERSON'S WISDOM LIGHTS UP HIS FACE
Rabbi Abbahu’s Face
(Talmud Yerushalmi, Pesachim 10:1)

(Rabbi Abbahu lived in the 3rd century, in Caesarea. He was the disciple of Rabbi Yochanan, the head of the yeshiva in Tiberias.)

R. Abbahu came to Tiberias. R. Yochanan’s students saw him with his face lit up. They said before R. Yochanan, “Rabbi Abbahu has found a treasure.” [R. Yohanan] said to them, “Why [do you think so]?” They said to him, “His face is lit up.” He said to them, “Perhaps he has heard a new word of Torah.”


---

1 A tosefta is an early supplementary teaching, from the same period as the Mishnah (c. 1st-2nd centuries).
exceeding deep—who can find it out? "I applied my mind to know, and to search, and to seek out wisdom and the reason of things, but only to understand that wickedness is folly, and folly madness. "I also find more bitter than death the woman, whose heart is snares and nets, and whose hands are fetters. He who pleases God shall escape from her, but the sinner shall be taken by her. "See, this I have found, says Kohelet, adding one thing to another to find out the account. "What my soul still seeks, but what I have not found: one man among a thousand have I found, but a woman among all those I have not found. "Lo, this only have I found: that God made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.

"Who is a wise man?
And who knows the interpretation of a thing?
A man’s wisdom lights up his face,
And the harshness of his face is changed."

"I counsel you: keep the king’s commandment, also in regard to an oath to God. "Be not hasty to go out of his presence; stand not in an evil thing; for he does whatever pleases him. "Where the word of a king is, there is power; and who may say to him: What are you doing?

"One who obeys the commandment shall feel no evil thing, and the wise mind discerns the time of judgment."

"For to every matter there is time and judgment, and a man’s calamity may be great upon him. "For he knows not that which shall be: for who can tell him when it shall be? "There is no man who has power over the breath of life to retain the breath of life, neither has he..."
Mishnah 20

Judah ben Tema said, Be strong as the leopard, (and) light as the eagle (and) fleet as the hart, and mighty as the lion to do the will of thy Father Who is in Heaven. He used to say, The bold-faced are for Gehenna, but the shame-faced are for the Garden of Eden. [He said further], May it be Thy will, O Eternal our God and God of our forefathers, that Thy City be rebuilt speedily in our days and grant our portion in Thy Law.

1 Here Mishnah 23 starts in the Prayer Book. 2 Nothing must be allowed to stand in the way of leading a righteous life. 3 Compare 41; Psalm 119, 60. 4 Compare II Samuel 1, 23. 5 Or shameless, brazen-faced, impudent. See 15, Note 9. 6 A sense of shame is a preventive for transgression. 7 The abode of the righteous in the Hereafter. Compare שְׁמַעְתָּן 20a. 8 This prayer is incorporated in the Prayer Book at the end of the חֲנָנָּא. 9 In the Prayer Book, שְׁמַעְתָּן מִבֶּן הָעָקֵב, that the Temple be rebuilt (thus, too, at the end of the חֲנָנָּא; and also שְׁמַעְתָּן, instead of שְׁמַעְתָּן, there). 10 Originally Chapter 5 concluded here. 11 In some texts מִבֶּן הָעָקֵב יִתְנַהְוָהָ, instead of מִבֶּן הָעָקֵב, there.}

Mishnah 21

He used to say, At five years of age [one is ready for] the [study of] the Scripture, at ten [years] of age one is fit for [the study of] the Mishnah, at the age of thirteen for [the fulfilment of] the commandments, at the age of fifteen for [the study of] the Talmud, at the age of eighteen for marriage, at the age of twenty for pursuing [a vocation], at the age of thirty for entering into one's full vigour, at the age of forty for understanding, at the age of fifty for counsel, at the age of sixty one attains old age, at the age of seventy...
Taanith

salvation springs forth and waxes great, as it is said, 'Let the earth open, that they may bring forth salvation'.

R. Tanhum b. Hanai said, No rain falls unless the sins of Israel have been forgiven, as it is said, 'Lord, Thou hast been favourable unto Thy land, Thou hast turned the captivity of Jacob, Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of Thy people, Thou hast pardoned all their sins'. Selah.

Ze'iri of Dahanath said to Rabina: You have learnt it from this verse, but we have learnt from the following verse, Then hear Thou in heaven and forgive the sin etc.

R. Tanhum the son of R. Hzya of Kefar Acco said: Rain is withheld only when the enemies of Israel have merited destruction as it is said, 'Drought and heat consume the snow waters; so doth the nether world those that have sinned'. Ze'iri of Dahanath said to Rabina: You have learnt from this verse, but we have learnt it from the following verse, And He will shut up the heaven... and ye perish quickly.

R. Hilda said: Rain is withheld only because of the neglect to bring heave-offerings and tithes, as it is said, 'Drought and heat consume the snow waters'. How is this derived from the verse?—In the school of R. Ishmael it was taught: Because you have not performed in the summer the things I have commanded you, you shall be denied snow waters in the winter.

R. Simeon b. Pazari said: Rain is withheld only because of those who talk slander, as it is said, 'The north wind bringeth forth rain, and a backbiting tongue an angry countenance'.

R. Salla said in the name of R. Hammuna: Rain is withheld only because of the insolent, as it is said, 'Therefore the showers have been withheld; and there hath been no latter rain; yet thou hast a harlot's forehead etc.'

(1) Ps. LXXV, 3. (2) Place not identified. Rashi reads: Said Mar Ze'iri to Rabina. (3) I Kings VIII, 16. (4) [Capha] Archo in lower Galilee; v. Hildebrand, Bibl., p. 31.] (5) A euphemism for God Himself. God is unable (lit., 'too poor') to send rain because Israel do not merit it. (6) Lev. XXVII, 8. (7) Ps. XXV, 21. (8) Prov. VI, 32. (9) Because of their disregard of the Torah which is compared to light, the wind disperses the clouds that were bringing the rain. (10) Job XXXVI, 11. (11) Jonah III, 8.
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somewhat look like God, that the human form and the divine form, however we understand those phrases, have something in common. In particular, this seems to mean that the human face—every human face—is a copy or reflection of the face of God.

Our search for a Jewish way in which to speak about life as an ongoing religious quest inevitably brings us back to the Psalmist, and especially to those passages where the author of the Psalms cries out to “seek My face,” “to behold the beauty of God,” or “to dwell in God’s courts.” The quest, when put in Jewish language, is our longing for intimacy, for a “face-to-face” relationship with the Divine. We long to repeat the experience of Moses, who could converse with God “face to face, like a person with his neighbor.” The most ancient and revered blessing that has been passed down among Jews from generation to generation contains the phrase “May God cause His face to shine upon you,” as though to say that God is possessed of a shining or radiant countenance.

The God of our tradition has a face so radiant that when Moses comes down from the mountain after being with Y-H-W-H, his face shines so brightly that he is forced to wear a mask. An ancient poem preserved in the synagogue liturgy for Yom Kippur tells of the priest coming forth from his annual visit to the Holy of Holies, his face shining like the sun. Both prophet and priest, the two great models for religious intimacy in our ancient sources, seem to take into themselves something of God’s own shining face in their moments of most intimate contact with the Divine.

We shudder, of course, at such a fully anthropomorphic concept of God. At the very least, we would follow Maimonides in understanding the “face” of these passages in a met-

agree with this claim at all. I am fully aware of the crucial role projection plays in religion and in all our images of God. But I also do not believe the matter is quite that simple. Our need to create God, I believe, comes out of the deepest recesses of ourselves, the place within us that also knows, in a way we cannot fully articulate, that God created us. We are but an effulgence of the One, a ray of that light called Y-H-W-H. From deep within us, there wells up a need to testify to that truth, to construct a reality that will remind us of our hidden source.

We are created in the image of God, if you will, and we are obliged to return the favor. God seeks to make us become ever more holy; we seek to make God human. The divine voice deep within each of us (and given expression within all the great human religious traditions) calls upon us to reshape our lives as embodiments of divinity. This inner drive to imitate our source calls forth in us the unceasing flow of love, generosity of spirit, and full acceptance, both of ourselves and of all God’s creatures. Frightened by our own mortality and ultimate powerlessness, we cannot live with a faceless God. We will strive to mold ourselves over in the image of divinity. But in exchange we need a God to whom we can cry, with whom we can argue, with whom we can trust, and even love. For us humans, such a God needs to have a human face. So the face is our gift to God. But the light that shines forth from that face and radiates with love—that surely is God’s gift to us.

The understanding that projection plays a key role in our theological imagination, so central to the modern understanding of religion since Feuerbach, Nietzsche, and Freud, is not original to these moderns. Maimonides’ claim that prophecy contained a perfect mixture of intellect and imagination already points in this direction. What is the role of
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Transforming the Subject Matter: Examining the Intellectual Roots of Pedagogical Content Knowledge
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ABSTRACT

This article questions the basic assumptions of pedagogical content knowledge by analyzing the ideas of Jerome Bruner, Joseph Schwab, and John Dewey concerning transforming the subject matter. It argues that transforming the subject matter is not only a pedagogical but also a complex curricular task in terms of developing a school subject or a course of study. This curricular task, however, has been obscured by the concept of pedagogical content knowledge that construes transformation as primarily a pedagogical task in terms of transforming the subject matter of an academic discipline into pedagogical forms. The article further argues that what constitutes the subject matter of a school subject is an essential issue of curriculum research and inquiry—an issue that is crucial yet largely underexplored in Shulman and associate’s conceptualization of teachers’ specialized subject matter knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) has become a powerful lexical item in the educational community. In the policy arena, it has informed the development of teaching professional standard, licensure examination, and evaluation procedures (e.g., Haertel, 1991; Phelps & Schilling, 2004; Shulman, 1986, 1987). In the area of teacher education, it has been used in the design and development of teacher education programs (e.g., Clermont, Krajcik, & Borko, 1993; Grimmett & MacKinnon, 1992; Peterson & Treagust, 1998). In the research circle, a substantial body of empirical studies has been devoted to the investigation and elaboration of this concept in relation to classroom teaching and teacher education (see Ball & Bass, 2000; Lederman, Gess-Newsome, & Latz, 1994; Loughran, Mulhall, & Berry, 2004; among others). However, surprisingly little effort has been made to examine the intellectual roots of the concept.
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