University of Missouri, St. Louis
IRL @ UMSL

Dissertations   UMSL Graduate Works

8-2-2011

DOES A SECOND CENTURY RABBI'S TEACHING METHODS AND PROCESS ELEMENTS ALIGN WITH MALCOLM KNOWLES' ANDRAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK?

Luke Brad Bobo
University of Missouri-St. Louis, lbobo@lindenwood.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation

Part of the Education Commons

DOES A SECOND SECOND CENTURY RABBI'S TEACHING METHODS AND PROCESS ELEMENTS ALIGN WITH MALCOLM KNOWLES' ANDRAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK?

Luke B. Bobo
MDiv., Covenant Theological Seminary – St. Louis, 2003
M.S., University of Missouri-Columbia, 1988
B.S., University of Kansas – Lawrence, 1982

A Thesis Submitted to The Graduate School at the University of Missouri-St. Louis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Education

May 2011

Advisory Committee

Paulette Isaac-Savage, Ed.D.
Chairperson

John Henschke, Ed.D.

Pi-Chi Han, Ed.D.

Ron Moseley, Ph.D.

Acknowledgements

It is inconceivable that a project of this magnitude can be completed alone. I am especially grateful for the several people who offered their encouragement and concrete assistance along the way. I am grateful to my paternal grandparents, Henry and Willa Mae Bobo, who instilled in me as a child the possibility and inevitability of attending college. I am appreciative for my mother Connie Marie Frazier, who did not finish high school, but nonetheless emphasized repeatedly and emphatically the importance of obtaining an education. Covenant professors, Drs. Robert Vasholz and David Calhoun, modeled not only sound scholarship to me but they also modeled that one can have fun learning about Jewish and church history, respectively. I am thankful for Dr. T. D. Stubblefield, Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Chesterfield (Chesterfield, MO) who had the uncanny ability and timing to call me when I needed it the most. And also grateful for my dissertation committee chair Dr. Paulette Isaac-Savage, the 'APA goddess', who gladly took the baton from Dr. John Henschke (my former dissertation committee chair), and coached me through this arduous process. There are several people at Lindenwood University (St. Charles, MO) that provided encouragement along the way too. In particular, I am thankful for Connie Borjes and Carl Hubenschmidt. Ms. Borjes was gracious to make several draft copies of this dissertation during its many drafts and iterations and Mr. Hubenschmidt graciously fulfilled my many book orders and article requests. And lastly, I am extremely thankful for my wife, Rita S. Holmes-Bobo, who has not only been patient during my matriculation through this doctoral

program but she has also labored through reading and editing these many pages and has gently encouraged me to finish this work.

Abstract

Teaching methods and process elements facilitate learning. Rabbi Akiva, a second century rabbi, used teaching methods and process elements that exercised his students' mental and auditory faculties and their imaginations and bodies. Practioners in the field of adult education who desire to hone their craft can learn best practices from the likes of Rabbi Akiva. This research study is therefore significant, because it offers assistance to practitioners in the field of adult education as the aim of this work is to discover if alignment exist between Rabbi Akiva's teaching methods and process elements and Knowles' teaching methods and process elements. Rabbi Akiva shaped and taught Rabbinic Judaism. And his teaching methods and process elements provide an excellent source of teaching practitioners how to help their students put into practice what they have learned in the classroom as this has been the primary goal of Rabbinic Judaism for centuries dating back to B.C.E.

Rabbi Akiva is an ideal candidate to study as he considered the father of Rabbinic Judaism (Solomon, 1998). This is remarkable considering Rabbi Akiva was an unlearned man in Torah for most of his adult life. He was ignorant or considered an 'am ha-arez. Stories about his beginnings in the learning of Torah are varied. Nonetheless, Rabbi Akiva is credited with systematizing the Mishnah and most importantly he was an adult educator. Solomon (1998) and Wigoder (2002) write that Rabbi Akiva was a pre-

eminent sage of the Mishnaic era. Cohen (2008) added that "he may be described as the architect of the plan of the Mishnah" (p. xxvi). Rabbi Akiva even has a street in Bnei Brak named in his honor (Efron, 2003).

Akiva excelled beyond his colleagues and masters in the matter of understanding and teaching Torah. Teaching was of utmost importance to him. In fact, Akiva argued that one must continue to teach even in old age according to Ecclesiastes 11:6 (Tanakh).

The late Malcolm Knowles is known as the father of American andragogy (Cooke, 1994; Henschke, 1998). And like Rabbi Akiva, Dr. Knowles was an adult educator. Both men practiced a philosophy of education. Both men used teaching methods and processes. For Knowles, he proposes teaching methods that compliment his six assumptions about the adult learner. Knowles also proposes eight process elements when teaching the adult learner. So, Knowles' teaching methods and process elements have been clearly articulated and employed in various educational contexts. In contrast, Rabbi Akiva's rabbinic philosophy of adult education (RPAE) and his teaching methods and process elements are yet to be discovered. And while Akiva did operate an academy in Bene Berek, little is known about his methodology for teaching adults.

This is a qualitative research study which used historiography or historical research in particular as the primary data collection tool. Knowles' andragogical framework served as the data analysis tool. Namely, his teaching methods and process elements were categories or concepts by which the researcher analyzed the data. The Babylonian Talmud, which is comprised of the Mishnah and Gemara, served as the primary source as it was completed in the 6th century (Common Era). The Tosefta and

Midrash were consulted too. Akiva taught in the second century and until his brutal

death in 135 C.E.

Several of Akiva's teaching methods emerged including debate, question-answer,

story-telling, the use of study-partners, shouting, lecture and delivering sermons and

chanting. It is worth noting that these debates were far from polite and proper but rather

quite intense. This was strictly an oral teaching and learning environment; so, note-

taking, for instance, was not permitted because the rabbi was considered the living and

sole voice of the Torah. Akiva's process elements included intellectual preparation and

the creation of an environment conducive for learning.

Knowles' andragogical framework, namely, the teaching methods paired with

each assumption and his eight process elements, was used as a grid to determine if there

was any alignment between Knowles and Akiva. In sum, many of Akiva's teaching

methods did align with those teaching methods suggested by Knowles that complimented

his six assumptions about the adult learner. However, only Knowles' process element of

setting the climate aligned with Akiva's creating a conducive learning environment.

This study merely scratches the surface of plumbing the rich depths of Rabbinic

Judaism; thus, this area of study affords ample opportunities for future research for both

researcher and practioners of adult education. Nevertheless, this study showed that some

teaching methods and process elements not only transcend culture but also time.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Andragogy is a term coined by Alexander Kapp in 1833 to distinguish the teaching of adults from that of teaching children or pedagogy - the art and science of helping children learn. Etymologically, andragogy is derived from two Greek words, *anere* (meaning *adult*) and *agogus* (meaning *leader of*). From its etymology, andragogy came to be defined as "the art and science of helping adults learn" (Knowles, 1970, p. 38). The late Dr. Malcolm Knowles is credited with further developing the term and its application in the United States. In fact, Cooke (1994) and Henschke (1998) refer to Knowles as the father of American Andragogy.

Knowles' (1989, 1990, 1996) attention to developing the term and its practice led to his six assumptions about the adult learner: (a) adult learners have a need to know; (b) they need to be self-directing; (c) adult learners have a greater volume and quality of experience that the adult educator should tap; (d) adult learners are characterized by a readiness to learn; (e) adult learners are oriented to learning; and (f) adult learners are motivated by internal and external factors to learn (with internal being the primary factor). Additionally, it was through Knowles' many years of practice that he employed and therefore, proposed teaching methods that are associated with each assumption.

Similarly, Knowles (1989) developed and applied an andragogical process to inform the adult educator's practice. This process has constituent parts that if implemented can create a conducive learning atmosphere for the adult learner. This process is comprised of eight elements: (a) preparing the learners for the program; (b) setting the learning climate; (c) creating

a mechanism for mutual planning; (d) diagnosing the participant's learning needs; (e) translating learning needs into objectives; (f) designing a pattern of learning; (g) helping learners carry out their learning plans; and (h) evaluating the extent to which the objectives have been achieved (Henschke, Cooper, & Isaac, 2003; Knowles, 1989, 1990, 1995, 1996).

Knowles' andragogical framework, which for the purposes of this study, refers to the teaching methods associated with his six assumptions about the adult learner and his eight andragogical process elements, has been applied in a variety of educational settings. These settings include corporate America (e.g., human resource development), adult education graduate courses, counseling, government, religious education, elementary and secondary education and in the gospel music industry among African-American women (Brookfield, 1986; Henschke, 2009; Ingalls, 1976).

One educational setting that Knowles' andragogical framework has not been examined in is the Jewish adult educational context in antiquity. The primary facilitator of the Jewish adult teaching-learning exchange is the rabbi. Rabbi is often abbreviated "R." as in "R. Moses." The office of rabbi was/is highly esteemed. According to Moseley (2010),

> The first century Jews had three levels of the term rabbi. The first was just a
>
> teacher. The second was a stronger term referring to an exalted teacher, and the
>
> third was the head of an academy, which carried the idea of lord or master. (p. 3)
>
> Today, the second meaning as exalted teacher for the rabbi applies. Interestingly, the

rabbi's authority does not rest on this elevated status; rather, his authority "rested on the word scripturally fixed in the Torah and the prophets" (Weber, 1960, p. 412).

Presently, rabbis do not teach Judaism but rather Rabbinic Judaism (Boccaccini, 2002). Neusner (2010) states "Rabbinic Judaism defined the paramount, norm-setting Judaism" (p. 23).

Chilton and Neusner (2004) add, "From its beginnings in the first six centuries C.E. (common era) to nearly the present day, Rabbinic Judaism, represented by Scripture and the oral Torah, defined the normative faith for nearly all practitioners of Judaism" (p. 22). Conventionally, Rabbinic Judaism is referred to as the dual Torah because the Torah is comprised of what is written and the sayings of the rabbinic sages (Chilton & Neusner, 2004). Formerly, the Torah was thought to consist of that which was orally communicated to Moses at Mount Sinai only. However, Rabbinic Judaism contends that written extrabiblical traditions were also part of the oral law, a second Torah given by God to Moses at Sinai along with the oral law (Hartman, 1999; Schiffman, 1991). This dual Torah is what is called Rabbinic Judaism. Thus, since the emergence of Rabbinic Judaism, rabbis continue to be the teachers of Jewish adults and the primary text was/is the Torah. Traditionally, the Torah is the first third of the Hebrew Bible or the first five books of Moses. These five books are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

Teaching Methods

The purpose of teaching is to enhance learning or causing students to learn (Heimlich & Norland, 2002; Kuethe, 1968). And teaching methods not only facilitate the teaching-learning transaction but they also facilitate the interface between the learner and the content to be learned (Conti & Kolody, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2006). All educators come to the teaching enterprise not only with a philosophy of education but also with a tool box of teaching methods. A philosophy of education is not concerned with the *what* or *how* of teaching but rather with the why of teaching. In other words, one's philosophy of education informs practice (Elias & Merriam, 2005).

However, methods "are those tools to use within the instructional process to enhance the teaching and learning encounter" (Galbraith, 1990, p. 18). At times an educator may be aware of the teaching method being employed; other times, educators are unconscious of the teaching methods being used (Tisdell & Taylor, 2000). Some teaching methods are learned while others are instinctive. In many cases educators simply emulate their teachers or use the teaching methods their teachers used (Bigge, 1976; Porter, 1982; Helterbran, 2008). Yet, Fitzgerald (2006) warns, "the ideal method for any situation is the one that best suits the learner's needs, not your own" (p. 334). Indeed, Conti and Kolody (2004) and Fitzgerald (2006) advise that the adult educator must make sure that the pedagogical methods are designed specifically for adults; otherwise, apathy among the adult learners may ensue. Hansman (2001) says something similar, "it is imperative that adult educators understand that learning can take place in many settings and therefore design programs that incorporate tools, context, and social interactions with others" (p. 49).

Therefore, an adult educator should try a myriad of methods in the teaching-learning exchange. Kuethe (1968) and Fitzgerald (2006) inform us that most teaching-learning relationships involve more than one teaching method. These teaching tools include role play, show and tell, question and answer and the conventional lecture format.

Statement of the Problem

Learning about the teaching methods of scribes, prophets and priests in antiquity is readily accessible. Some of these teaching methods included the use of proverbs, parables, precepts, epigrams and learning by rote memorization. Similarly, adult educators know much about the 20th century adult educator Malcolm Knowles and his development of American andragogy. Emerging from this development was a set of assumptions about the adult learner

and process elements that Knowles practiced and championed. Concomitant with these assumptions about the adult learner, Knowles proposed certain teaching methods. For example, he advocated that adult educators use self-directed projects. Yet, a gap exists in the literature. Namely, a study that considers the alignment of teaching methods and the process elements employed by a rabbi in the second century and the twentieth century adult educator, Malcolm Knowles, has not been done.

Theoretical Framework

The researcher has chosen the teaching methods associated with Malcolm Knowles' six assumptions about the adult learner and his eight andragogical process elements for the theoretical framework. What is a theoretical framework? Merriam (2009) writes that "a theoretical framework is the underlying structure, the scaffolding or frame of your study" (p. 66).

A theoretical framework is like a set of lenses. Yet, Anfara and Mertz (2006) offer this caveat when using theoretical frameworks, "no theoretical framework, provides a perfect explanation of what is being studied" (p. xxvii). A theoretical framework will illuminate some aspects of the phenomena under investigation but on the other hand, the theoretical framework will also mask other aspects.

This qualitative research study seeks to unmask the teaching methods and process elements of a rabbi situated in antiquity. His teaching methods and process elements will be compared to Knowles' andragogical framework to determine if there is any alignment.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this qualitative research study is to identify the teaching methods and process elements employed by a second century rabbi when teaching the adult learner and to discover if his teaching methods and process elements align with Knowles' andragogical

framework; the teaching methods that are associated with his six assumptions and his eight andragogical process elements.

A cursory review of Jewish literature provides some fascinating clues about teaching methods employed by rabbis in antiquity. For instance, the creation of the Talmud provides an interesting clue about how rabbis taught adults in the first century. The Talmud was created as rabbis passionately dialogued on a text from the Torah for the sole purpose of discovering the truth. The Talmud, which is "written as a flowing rabbinic discourse", was originally written in old Hebrew and Aramaic (Kershner, 2010, A9). Yet, the Talmud was all about learning (Kershner, 2010). The goal of such a document like the Talmud was the formulation of specific procedures that could be considered prescriptive or authoritative for conduct (Segai, 1996).

Research Question

The primary research question is do the teaching methods and process elements used by a second century rabbi align with Malcolm Knowles' andragogical framework – the teaching methods that are associated with his six assumptions and his eight andragogical process elements? Secondary questions that will be explored are:

1. What teaching methods did this second century rabbi employ in teaching the Torah?

2. Did this second century rabbi use process elements such as preparing the learners for the program, setting the learning climate, creating a mechanism for mutual planning, diagnosing the participant's learning needs, translating learning needs into objectives, designing a pattern of learning, helping learners carry out their learning plans, or evaluating the extent to which the objectives have been achieved?

3. How does this second century rabbi's teaching methods and process elements compare and contrast with Malcolm Knowles?

4. Did this second century rabbi operate from a rabbinic philosophy of adult education (RPAE)?

Significance of Study

Rabbinic Judaism is an applied religion. As an applied religion, the tenets of Rabbinic Judaism were meant to inform one's thinking, living, being and doing. That is, Rabbis taught that Judaism can be applied to all aspects of daily living. Cohen (1988) explained that "Judaism was the practice of the laws and rituals that Moses commanded in God's name" (p. 216). In other words, Rabbinic Judaism has ethical import or it was meant to be applied in all of life. This is evidenced in the Hebrew word, *halakhah*, which means walking or guiding one's life. Rabbis taught that the Torah was the guide for how to live as a husband, wife, worker, etc. in a hostile environment. In this case, the hostile environment was the domination of the Romans. The Jewish historian Josephus (1961) suggests this goal of putting into practice what was learned is what separates educators of Judaism from other educators in the Greco-Roman world. Josephus states,

> All schemes of [Jewish] education and moral training fall into two categories: instruction is imparted in the one case by precept, in the other by practical exercising of the character. In contrast, Josephus writes, all other legislators, differing in their opinions, selected the particular method which each preferred and neglected the other. Thus the Lacedaemonians and Cretans employed practical, not verbal, training; whereas the Athenians and nearly all the rest of the Greeks made laws enjoining what actions might or might not be performed, but

neglected to familiarize the people with them by putting them into practice. (p.

361)

Christianity, like Judaism, is an applied religion too. Christianity, like Judaism, has

ethical import. That is, Christianity is meant to be practiced or applied to all of life (family,

work, play, etc). For example, in James 1:27 we find one example of Christianity as an applied

religion because Christians were commanded to care for the material needs of widows (English

Standard Version). The New Testament word that is a corollary to the Hebrew word, *halakhah*,

is *peripateo* (White & Unger, 1996).   Like *halakhah*, *peripateo* means to walk and thus, relates

to moral conduct for the Christian. Indeed, the major motif of the Pauline corpus in the Christian

Bible is ethical living in response to unmerited favor.

This researcher believes one can learn from others; so the significance of this study is, on

one hand, quite personal. The researcher wants to improve or hone his teaching craft. However,

others who may benefit from this study include Jewish and non-Jewish adult educators.

This study is also significant because this research may indicate that Knowles'

andragogical framework had a historical precedence. It is intriguing that both Knowles (1989)

and Savicevic (2000) suggest that within ancient Jewish educational circles, andragogical

institutions were the first to be established. However, neither Knowles nor Savicevic mention

this second century rabbi by name that is considered in this study. So, this study gives a human

face to this claim. Finally, this study offers more clarity and organizational form to the Rabbinic

Philosophy of Adult Education (RPAE). This is important in light of this comment by Cohen *et

al.* (1974),

We must not expect to find within Rabbinic tradition a coherent and logically

organized presentation of educational goals and methods. This is not the nature of

the record which was left to us by the Rabbinic community. It is rather a tapestry

which must be examined minutely both for what is explicitly stated and what is

suggested by implication. (pp. 14-15)

Methodology

This qualitative inductive study utilized historiography to study a second century rabbi in

detail. Tentatively, several material data sources were used in crafting a description of the

second century rabbi's teaching methods and process elements employed. For instance, an initial

search was done of Bar-Ilan University's database in Israel for primary and secondary source

materials. However, because the researcher was not a student at Bar-Ilan he was denied access.

After consulting with several leading Jewish scholars, the Babylonian Talmud, which was

compiled in the late 6th century C.E., was used as the primary source. The Talmud is the

compilation of two books: the Mishnah (or Oral Law) and the Gemara (meaning learning). The

Talmud was chosen as the primary source because,

Much of the Talmud follows a format in which a law from the Mishnah is cited,

followed by rabbinic discussions and rulings on its meanings. The Talmud

explains and elaborates on every aspect of Jewish life, including daily prayers,

mitzvoth, and holiday celebrations. (Eisenberg & Scolnic, 2001, p. 160)

Finally, the researcher consulted with Dr. Ron Moseley, founder of the American

Institute of Advanced Biblical Studies in Little Rock, Arkansas. Dr. Moseley was consulted

because he has traveled to Israel over 30 times and is quite knowledgeable of Jewish culture,

geography, archaeology and the history of the Middle East.

Assumptions/Delimitations

The researcher used historiography in general and historical research in particular to collect data on the second century rabbi. However, historical data on the second century rabbi was limited because full biographies were not available. So, the researcher consulted not only the primary source - the Babylonian Talmud - but other sources to fashion a profile of the second century rabbi's teaching methodology.

Definition of Terms

Below are definitions of key terms that are used throughout this dissertation.

Aggadah (also spelled haggadah) – the non-legal portions of the Torah. This information is usually expressed in the form of parables, stories or legends (Moseley, 2000).

Andragogy – art and science of helping adults learn (Knowles, 1990).

B.C.E – Before Common Era.

C.E. – Common Era.

While "these reference terms and abbreviations [B.C.E. and C.E.] are usually used in Jewish studies" (Patten, 1980, p. 166), B.C. (Before Christ) and B.C.E. and A.D. (Anno Domini) and C.E. will be used interchangeably where citations by scholars and authors specify.

Gemara –means literally, learning. It is a compilation of 300 years of rabbi's legal and ethical discussions or commentaries on the Mishnah (Eisenberg & Scolnic, 2001).

Halakhah - the legal and authoritatively binding rulings of the oral and written law which directed the steps of the Jew (Cohen, 2008; Moseley, 2000).

Historiography & Historical Research – historiography is the purposeful collection and analysis of historical data (Berg, 2009; Gall *et al*., 2007). However, Berg states that historical

research is the systematic "recapture of the complex nuances, the people, meanings, events, and even ideas of the past" (p. 297). Historical research will be employed in this study.

Midrash – means literally, interpretation. Midrashim are written interpretations and discussions of the laws, customs and rituals of Jewish life as mentioned in the Torah. In these discussions, the rabbis dissected the Torah verse by verse, looking for explanations and the meaning of each word. Other midrashim are like sermons; they often include fanciful stories that have a moral (Eisenberg, 2001).

Mishnah – this literally means teaching or instruction or repetition/study. The Mishnah was the first authoritative compilation of the oral law and served as the basis for the Talmud. Mishnah is typically capitalized when referring to the actual document; however, when referring to the various forms of instruction like a lecture or sermon, *mishnah* is used (Gottwald, 1985; Scott, 1995).

Rabbi – the Hebrew term rabbi means great one or leader. Later, rabbi came to mean master or teacher (Douglas & Merrill, 1987).

Talmud – is a collection of ancient rabbinic laws, commentaries and traditions related to the Torah. There are two Talmuds: the Palestinian Talmud and Babylonian Talmud (Cohen, 2008).

Tanakh - is considered "an acronym for the three books that make up the cornerstone of the Jewish beliefs" (Eisenberg & Scolnic, 2001, p. 161). "T" stands for Torah, the five books of Moses; "N" stands for Neviim, the Prophets; and "K" stands for Ktuvim, the writings (Cohen, 1988; Gottwald, 1985; Segai, 1996).

Tanna – some rabbis in antiquity are often referred to as Tannaitic Rabbis. Tannaim and its singular form, tanna, is Aramaic for repeaters or teachers or to study (Segai, 1996). The rabbi considered in this study was a tanna.

Torah – which is defined as teaching or direction, is comprised of the first five books of the Hebrew Bible. They include Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy (Cohen, 2008).

Yeshiva – the name yeshivah was applied to institutes or academies of Talmudic learning (Assaf *et al.*, 2007; Klapholtz, 1970). Yeshivot is the plural form of yeshivah.

Organization of Study

The remainder of this study is organized into four chapters. Chapter 2 explores the related literature dealing with teaching methods and process elements in antiquity and the present. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology to collect and analyze the data. Chapter 4 will present the data and an analysis of the data. Finally, Chapter 5 will include a discussion of the findings, conclusions and recommendations for future work.

Chapter 2 – Literature Search

This chapter provides the theoretical framework for this study by examining the relevant literature. As such this chapter will cover these topics sequentially: (a) a review of the history of Rabbinic or Tannaitic Judaism; (b) the transition from Pharisees to Tannaitic Rabbis; (c) teaching methods in antiquity and the present; (d) the Humanist and Rabbinic Philosophies of Adult Education (PAE); (e) a discussion of andragogy, including its origin and a discussion of Knowles' six assumptions about the adult learner and the associated teaching methods for each assumption and his eight process elements; and finally, (f) a chapter summary.

History of Rabbinic [or Tannaitic] Judaism

Judaism, the monotheistic religion of Jewish people, derives its name from the patriarch Jacob's son, Judah. Judaism began in the early second millennium B.C.E. in Mesopotamia where God summons Abram and his family (wife Sarai, Abram's father Terah and nephew, Lot) to leave the city of the Ur of the Chaldees for another unknown land (Dumbrell, 1984; Segai, 1996; Wood, 1970). They eventually migrated to a land called Canaan and there developed a key and nascent tenet of Judaism, monotheism (Heiser, 2008). Indeed, this is remarkable because Abram, whose name was later changed to Abraham, was a henotheist – someone who believed that "all gods are species equals" (Heiser, p. 28). And Williams (1998) claims and Dumbrell (1984) hints, that Abraham never fully relinquished his devotion to henotheism for monotheism. Although Neusner (2010) remarks that the "transition from henotheism to universal monotheism can be seen in late prophecy," (p. 2) in Abraham's journey to Canaan we see nonetheless the germinal tenet of monotheistic thought.

Jacob, a descendent of Abraham, would have 12 sons. Jacob was partial toward two sons, Joseph and Benjamin. This partiality infuriated Jacob's other 10 sons and they became jealous of Joseph. Because of this jealously, Joseph's brothers sold him into to Egyptian slavery. While in Egypt, Joseph gained favor with Pharaoh (King of Egypt) and is placed in charge of the Egyptian government's affairs. However, the Patriarch Jacob mourns for his son, Joseph, who is thought to be dead. Because of famine conditions, Jacob sends some of his sons to Egypt to seek relief.

After several face-to-face meetings between Joseph and his brothers, Joseph finally discloses his identity to his brothers and sends for his father, Jacob (who was later called Israel). Joseph dies in Egypt and eventually a new Pharaoh would ascend the throne that is unaware of and not sympathetic to Joseph and his people (Tanakh, 2000). The people of Jacob, later called Israelites, multiply in number and Pharaoh assigns them to arduous labor for over 400 years. Amidst some cataclysmic events, the Israelites numbering several million leave Egypt in approximately 1250 B.C.E. and arrive at Sinai (Epstein, 1975; Kaiser, 1998; Scott, 1995; Wood, 1970). It is at Sinai that God audibly and visibly reveals himself to Moses. Schiffman (1991) elaborates, "Out of the experience at Sinai, and out of the Israelites' perception that they had been vouchsafed a revelation of God, emerged the Torah literature" (p. 23). So, it is here that the Torah and more importantly the Jewish religion, Judaism, is officially born. Hartman (1999) says it best,

> God's love liberates students of Torah to create, and to regard their creation as an
>
> elaboration of what the original teaching contained. The claim to originality is not
>
> the highest aspiration when love characterizes the teacher [God]-student

relationship. It is in this spirit that we should understand the Talmudic ascription

of all rabbinic and later creativity to the founding moment of Sinai. (p. 48)

Importance of the Temple

At the center of Judaism in general and Jewish piety in particular was the Temple cult

(Cohen *et al.*, 1988; Tomasino, 2003). Wright (1996) elucidates the Temple's importance when

he writes, "Temple, Sabbath, circumcision and purity of food were thus crucial marks of Jewish

identity" (p. 387). The Temple was not only the center of worship but it was also the locus for

priests who carried out offering sacrifices (Howard, 1993; Tomasino, 2003). Priests were not

only responsible for administering the sacrificial system but they were also teachers of Torah.

For instance, Ezra was both a scribe and priest who was skilled in teaching the law of Moses as

Ezra 7:10 records, "for Ezra had dedicated himself to study the Teaching of the Lord so as to

observe it, and to teach laws and rules to Israel" (Tanakh, 2000).

However, before priests, fathers were chiefly responsible for teaching Torah. Cohen *et
al.* (1974) captured this sentiment when he writes, "The Talmud states that among the obligations

of the father are to teach his son Torah and to teach him livelihood" (p. 15). Also, we find

support in the Tanakh (2000) for parents to teach their kids Torah in what is known as Shema

(meaning, *to hear*) which appears in Deuteronomy 6:4-9.

The first temple was constructed in Jerusalem under the leadership of King Solomon and

dedicated 963 B.C.E. (Josephus, 1961; Mettinger, 2006; Neusner, 2010; Tanakh, 2000).

However, it was decimated in 586 B.C.E. after standing for nearly four centuries by the

Babylonians during their third invasion of Jerusalem (Walton, 1994). The Temple was rebuilt

under the guidance of Nehemiah and the scribe and priest Ezra in 520 B.C.E. This

reconstruction of the Temple in 520 B.C.E. marks the beginning of the Second Temple Era (Provan, Long, & Longman, 2003; Tomasino, 2003).

The transition from B.C.E. to C.E. would find the Jews under foreign and cruel domination by the Romans. In particular, the Romans' domination would eventually reach a climax with the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. The destruction of the Second Temple would serve as a watershed moment not only for Jewish people but also the early Christian church in Jerusalem. For instance, Bruce (1977) writes, "the Jewish revolt against Rome in A.D. 66, led not only to the destruction of the temple and the city of Jerusalem four years later, but also to the dispersal of the church of Jerusalem" (p. 464).

The destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. was not an overnight affair but rather the culmination of seven decades of Jewish unrest and anti-Roman agitation (Grabbe, 1996; Tomasino, 2003). The opposition to Roman rule finally reached its zenith with a full-scale revolt of 66-73 C.E. led by the Zealots (Epstein, 1959; Scott, 1995). The Zealots, who were uncompromising partians in the cause of Israel's freedom from Rome, hated Rome and refused to adhere to the Roman government (Moseley, 2000). Other scholars also contribute these factors to this Great Revolt: (a) the heritage of the Maccabean uprising (Gottwald, 1985; Segai, 1996; Tomasino, 2003) and (b) the speculations of an imminent messianic redeemer (Bruce, 1977; Cohen, 1988; Grabbe, 1996; Jeremia, 1969; Willem van Henten, 2009).

So guided by the Zealots, these other factors and the Roman procurator Gessius Florus' (64-66 C.E.) utter disrespect for Jewish religious sensibilities, widespread strife broke out in Jerusalem when some of the priests decided to forgo collecting the offering on behalf of the emperor. This passive but deviant act alone declared revolt. Yet, despite efforts from King Agrippa II, other leading priests and some Pharisees to discourage furtherance of the revolt,

Jerusalem soon was in the hands of rebels. And this ultimately led to uprisings throughout the country, where Jews battled their non-Jewish (Roman) neighbors (Grabbe 1996; Schiffman, 1991).

Once Galilee was captured by Roman emperor Nero (54-68 C.E.) appointee - General Vespasian, civil strife broke out among the various factions in Jerusalem. Rome's superior military forces and unlimited resources and the outbreak of civil strife among various factions in Jerusalem eventually led to the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and the Temple by the Passover of 70 C.E. and capture of Judea under the leadership of Titus - son of Vespasian.

Transition from Temple to Synagogue

To fully understand the emergence of Rabbinic Judaism, we must understand the significance of the Temple's destruction and particularly the aftermath. Consider the things that happened as a result of the destruction of the Temple in the area of Jewish law and practice. First, orally circulated Intertestmental Judaism was collected and reduced to writing by rabbis. The result was the Mishnah, Gemara, the Tosefta, targums, and midrashim (Scott, 1995). Second, temple-oriented rituals, such as the sacrificial cult were supplemented by prayer and the study of the Torah and these new rituals moved to the home or synagogue (Cohen, 1988; Segai, 1996).

Third, in the time of the prophet Jeremiah [and onwards] the temple court was used as a place of public instruction (Swift, 1919). So, the destruction of the Temple meant that this educational activity had to be relocated elsewhere. The synagogue and study houses became the places where adult members studied the Torah (Newsome, 1992; Pitts, 2008; Rubenstein, 2003; Scott, 1995). And this would be true for both the tannatic (10-200 C.E.) and amoraitic (220-475 C.E.) periods as well (Fendel, 1981; Goodblatt, 1975; Pitts, 2008).

Finally, the most dramatic change as a result of the Temple being destroyed was the change of the center of worship from Temple to synagogue (McFarlan, 1986).   This is noteworthy because prior to the first century C.E. in Palestine, there is no evidence of the synagogue existing as an institution in Palestine (Meyers & Strange, 1981; Newsome, 1992; Schiffman, 1991). And from this post-temple destruction time onward, the Temple had been replaced by synagogues; the priests were replaced by scholars (rabbis); the sacrificial cult was replaced by prayer and the study of Torah; and finally, personal piety which emphasized the observance of Torah had replaced the intermediation of the Temple priesthood (Cohen, 1988). These synagogues became the centers for prayer, private meetings and forums (Savicevic, 2008; McFarlan, 1986).

Placement and Displacement of Jewish Sects

Several Jewish sectarian groups were affected positively and negatively by the revolt. Of the 24 sects in the first century C. E., there were three main sects (Palestinian Talmud Sanhedrin 10:29c). Of these three – the Sadducees, Essenes and Pharisees - the Sadducees were considered the aristocrats and had the support of the well-to-do contingent (Cohen, 1988; Neusner, 1984). However despite their station in life, the Sadducees lost their power base when the Temple was destroyed and may even have been responsible for the debacle because some of them had been close to the Romans. Nevertheless, the Sadducees exited the stage of history with the destruction of the Temple (Epstein, 1959; Neusner, 1984; Newsome, 1992; Patten, 1980).

The Essenes, who began by the first century B.C., had become a monastic order of priests and laymen. And although this sect was dedicated to the ritual and fulfillment of the Torah, it also disappeared from the scene (Cohen, 1988; Epstein, 1959; Patten, 1980). According the Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus (1961), the Essenes were decimated by the Romans.

The most popular sect, the Pharisees, was the only Jewish sect to survive the destruction of the Temple (Newsome, 1992; Segai, 1996).   While some of the Pharisaic leaders had taken an active part in the revolt, many had vehemently opposed the revolt. In fact, the Pharisees initially tried to restrain the Jewish people from "plunging headlong into war and ruin" (Epstein, 1959, p.108). This resistance caught the eye of the Roman administration as they regarded this Pharisaic sect as representative of the Jewish nation.   So, the Romans considered the Pharisees [which would emerge the tannaim or rabbis and subsequently, Rabbinic Judaism] as ideally suited to be the Jews' leaders (Bruce, 1977; Newsome, 1992).

As predecessors to rabbis or tannaim, the Pharisees were not only popular with the Jewish people but they strongly encouraged accommodation with the Romans (Schiffman, 1991). And Newsome (1992) reminds us that "Rabbinic Judaism, of which modern Judaism is a descendent, is in considerable measure the product of Pharisaism" (p. 113). The name tannaim was given to the first generation of rabbis. Tannaim and its singular form, tanna, is Aramaic for repeaters or teachers or to study (Segai, 1996).

In Jewish history, the destruction of the temple led Tannaitic rabbis to create an interpretative culture. For these esteemed Tannaitic rabbis, the aim of this interpretative culture or comprehensive framework was to help the Jewish laity to interpret their experience, to provide a discipline of religious practice in communal life and to ultimately help to guide their actions in a hostile world. This life and world view is captured supremely and primarily in the rabbinic legal materials while the ethos of this interpretative culture is captured in the non-legal materials. And both the legal and non-legal literature provide us with insight into the inner lives of the intellectual elites; namely, the rabbis (Green, 1978; Scott, 1995).

Transition from Pharisees to Tannaitic Rabbis

The Great Revolt of 66-73 C.E. brought about the desire to gather traditions and systematically standardize Judaism. For example,

> The tendency toward more organized schools replacing informal circles of
>
> Pharisaic times was encouraged to some extent by the new status with the
>
> tannaitic academy was granted by the Roman overlords. The rise of a
>
> bureaucracy and the role of tannaim as judges throughout the land resulted from
>
> the new political situation. Finally, the desire to collect and preserve traditions is
>
> always strengthened in periods after wars and catastrophes, a pattern which can be
>
> observed repeatedly in the ancient Near East. (Schiffman, 1991, pp. 178-179)

However, the word, academy, may be anachronistic. In other words, we cannot be sure the tannaim worked under the contemporary idea of an academy where there was a bureaucracy, funding, etc. However, tannaitic sources do mention houses of study along with the synagogues.

As mentioned, the tannaim were preceded by a series of Pharisaic sages known as pairs (Hebrew *zugot*), one of whom, in each instance, is reported to have served as patriarch (*nasi'*), and the other as head of the court ('*av bet din*), during the Hasmonean and Herodian periods. These two offices – patriarch and head of court - culminated in Hillel and Shammai. The last of the zugot were followed by the first generation of tannaim, consisting of the Houses of Hillel and Shammai, the major schools, which were made up of the followers of these two great sages. In fact, Walton (1994) maintains that the tannaim can trace their heritage to Ezra and through Hillel.

The establishment of tannatic or rabbinic authority did not take place immediately or without difficulty. The earliest attempts to assert control seem to have occurred in the immediate

aftermath of the war, when the sages gathered together at Yavneh under the leadership of

Yohanan ben Zakkai. His claim to authority was based only on his learning and respect. Soon,

however, the Hillelite patriarchal house came back into power after Rabban Gamaliel II

reasserted his authority at Yavneh around 80 C.E. Rabban Gamaliel traced his descent to Hillel,

the prominent Pharisaic sage of the end of the first century B.C.E and beginning of the first

century C.E. at Yavneh. Under Rabban Gamaliel's direction, the rabbis engaged in

standardizing, recording and gathering traditions. This process and its extension to the entire

Jewish people, would take centuries to complete.

Rabbis and Their Schoolhouses

Etymologically, the Hebrew term rabbi comes from *rab* which means great one; thus

rabbi means, my master (Danker, 2000; Weber, 1952). Later, rabbi came to mean master or

teacher (Douglas & Merrill, 1987). The title of rabbi was highly regarded or esteemed in the

first and second centuries. These rabbis or scholars were so revered that during processionals

everyone would rise to their feet (Jeremias, 1969). However, craftsmen were exempt to stand if

they were engaged in their occupation. And rabbis, who were considered legal specialists, took

their roles quite seriously. For instance, rabbis, who often refused remuneration, regarded their

work as a life-long committed vocation rather than a profession. Rabbis not only applied

themselves to the rigorous study of Torah and its application to all areas of life (family, work,

etc.) but the study of Torah was also intended to be the preoccupation of the Jewish person or

laity.

Although the use of the term rabbi cannot be verified before the time of Jesus Christ (3

B.C.E. to 33 C.E.), it was a title given to men who were intellectuals and teachers of the Torah or

better those who would tirelessly settle disputes over interpretations (and re-interpretations) of the law.

In rabbinic literature, the word Torah denotes both the written text as well as an oral tradition. The oral portion consists of both the traditional interpretations and amplifications handed down by word of mouth from generation to generation; these interpretations and amplifications are now embodied in the Talmud - a collection of ancient rabbinic laws, commentaries and traditions related to the Torah - and the Midrash - the written interpretation and discussions of the laws, customs and rituals of Jewish life mentioned in the Torah.

Aspiring adult male students took the initiative and sought out a particular rabbi to sit under or study Torah (Pitts, 2008). This training was typically done in advanced schoolhouses or a bet. (Bet or beit is the transliteration of the Hebrew word for school.) So, it was not unusual for a student to attend or be associated with a 'school of Rabbi X' where 'X' is a rabbi's name. For example, students (or disciples) attended the school of Tarphon.

It was often while teaching Torah to their students that rabbis and their respective school would engage in dialectical competition with other schools. These competitions were typically and primarily over clearly defined rules for scriptural exegesis (Segai, 1996). For instance, Davies (1965) writes that the schools of Hillel (or bet Hillel) and Shammai (or bet Shammai) disputed over two and half years on the question: would it have been better if man had or had not been created? The final ruling was it would have been better if man had not been created.

Rabbis were notorious for inventing rules of exegesis and many were considered unconventional by Jewish hermeneutical standards. However, rabbis built in a system of checks and balances for their peers. This checks and balances occurred in the context of communal circles. That is, rabbis wrestled together in small circles or groups to arrive collectively at the

meaning of a text; in this way, the interpretation of passages did not rest on a single rabbinic authoritative interpretation but rather, the interpretation was a composite verdict arrived at by consensus. These communal sessions effectively brought the fluidity of undisciplined exegesis to an end (Gottwald, 1985).

Contributions of these many rabbinic schools were far reaching. For example, the school of Johanan ben Zakkai convened a council in Yavneh (Latin, Jamnia) in C.E. 90 for the purposes of finally deciding on the contents of the Hebrew canon and thus, putting an end to the fluidity of this vital piece of Jewish literature. The chief aim of this council was to make a ruling on the status of the third portion of the Hebrew canon known as the sacred Writings (Newman, 1976; Segai, 1996). The rabbis would later divide the Hebrew Bible into three sections: the Law (or Torah), the Prophets, and finally the sacred Writings. These rabbinic schools also gave birth to rabbinic Judaism (Solomon, 1998).

Rabbis, while preserving the Hebrew Bible, nonetheless collected and added to a growing body of Bible interpretation and exegesis. This activity was officially termed midrash, which means interpretation or commentary. Cohen (2008) believes the first hint of this commentary appears in Ezra 7:10 because the word for "to seek" or *darash* means to "deduce, to interpret"; a process later referred to as Midrash. Besides being a line by line commentary of the biblical text, early midrashic commentaries contained many legal discourses. Dissenting views were respectfully recorded first before the majority opinion was rendered and recorded. Other key literary creations of the rabbis include the:

- Mishnah [or Repeated Tradition], which literally means teaching or instruction or repetition/study, was the first authoritative compilation of the oral law and served as the basis for the Talmud. The Mishnah serves as the basic document of Rabbinic

Judaism and was compiled around 200 C.E. It is fundamentally a curriculum for the study of the Jewish law and is arranged topically (Gottwald, 1985).

- Tosefta, which in Aramaic means addition, is a collection of tannaitic teachings which supplemented those in the Mishnah. The Tosefta was the earliest commentary on or a continuation of the Mishnah.

- Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds, which are the authoritative body of Jewish law and lore, incorporate both the Mishnah and Gemara (the rabbinical discussions of the Mishnah). These two Talmuds, which were compiled by the amoraim, are commentaries on the Mishnah.

The goal of such documents, which were often preceded by very spirited discussions, was the formulation of specific procedures that could be considered prescriptive for conduct (Segai, 1996). These prescriptive legal codes for living life or conduct are termed *halakah* – way of life.

In an orally structured culture, rabbis employed a variety of teaching methods in their schools including the seminar method, formal lecture, exposition of Scripture, dispute, dialectical argument and debate (Newman, 1976). Students met daily and for a full workday and often sat in tiers as in a vineyard (Newman, 1976; Solomon, 1998). Enrollment into school was always open for anyone (except women) who sought and received the requisite education (Segai, 1996; Streisand, 1983). Once a student completed his course of study to the rabbis' satisfaction, he was subsequently ordained as a rabbi.

Most importantly, at this juncture in Jewish history, a dual Torah (oral and written) was binding or authoritative for the Jew. Judaism today is founded on the Judaism practiced and interpreted by the early rabbis in late antiquity; thus the formation of Rabbinic Judaism. And

Rabbinic Judaism defines the normative faith for nearly all practitioners of Judaism today (Chilton & Neusner, 2004).

Oral and Written Torah

The Pharisees trace their non-biblical legal and exegetical traditions to the traditions of the fathers or unwritten laws. It is important to note that these traditions of the fathers were considered a fence around the Torah. A fence was understood as an attempt to preserve the integrity of the written law (Edwards, 2002). For example, Rabbi Akiva explains, "Tradition is a protective fence for Torah" (Mishnah Avoth 3:13). While the Pharisees did not assert that these traditions came from Sinai, on the contrary "the tannaim asserted that their extrabibilical traditions, many of them inherited from the Pharisees, were part of the oral law, a second Torah given by God to Moses at Sinai along with the written law" (Schiffman, 1991, p. 178). It was on this premise that the tradition and authority of the tannaim rested. In other words, the tannaim or rabbis believed both the oral and written law had been given by God to Moses on Sinai (Neusner, 1983). In fact, rabbis believed that Moses had initiated the process of giving explanatory laws alongside written laws at Mount Sinai (Gottwald, 1985). And in the turbulent years following the revolt, when having the support of the Jewish people was so vital, it was important that the rabbis could occasionally appeal to the divine origin and nature of the oral law. For these rabbis, the oral tradition or oral Torah served as "final authority greater than the written Torah" (Schniedewind, 2004, p.15).

So, in the rabbinic purview, the two Torahs (oral and written) were complementary. Neusner (1983) provides this enlightening perspective on the two Torahs, "at the center of Rabbinic Judaism is the concept of the dual Torah and the fundamental conviction that the written Torah is not the whole record of revelation" (p. 13). And fostering culture and

maintaining social order was considered the utility of the Written and Oral Torah according to Kaplan (1974). Again, the social order spoken of here comes from the root word meaning walking or guiding one's life; this idea is referred to as *halakhah* (Gottwald, 1985).

Teaching Methods in Antiquity and the Present

This section includes a historical look at teaching methods employed by teachers of Torah in antiquity. Among those who taught Torah in antiquity included fathers, parents, scribes, priests and of course, rabbis. And a brief treatment will be made of three contemporary teaching methods.

Teaching Methods in Antiquity (B.C.E.)

All schemes of Jewish education and moral training fell into two categories: (a) instruction imparted by precept and (b) instruction imparted by practical exercising of character (Josephus, 1961). In other words, Judaism sought to bridge theory and practice. But who were the teachers of Torah before the C.E.? Who were these instructors who imparted these precepts? Crenshaw (1998) identifies these teachers as sages, priests, parents, prophets and specialists of all kind who taught others in word and deed. But what teaching methods did they employ?

Fathers in particular and parents in general were the teachers of their children (Hoffman, 1997; Swift, 1919; Tanakh Deuteronomy 6:4-9). Rabbi Akiva suggested to one of his disciples, "when you teach your son, teach him out of a well-corrected book" which suggests that the father had an incredible responsibility to teach his offspring (Schiff, 1997). Fathers and parents used stories and modeling to teach morals and ethics (Hoffman, 1997). Whether there were formal schools is a matter of debate and conjecture and according to Crenshaw (1998),

The strongest evidence for the existence of schools is epigraphic. These

inscriptions leave little doubt that schools existed in Israel from about the eighth

century [*sic* B.C.E], if not earlier, but they do not clarify the nature of these places

of learning. (p. 112)

Nevertheless, educating children and adults in Torah occurred. Not only did parents

teach, but also priests. On one hand, priests offered sacrifices on behalf of the people and served

as the intermediary between God and the people. But priests, on the other hand, were called to

teach the people too (Wood, 1970). Hoffman (1997) and Swift (1919) tell us that the Temple's

court was used as the place of public instruction. In the court were often the king and princes to

receive instruction (Swift, 1919). There are several instances from the Torah that speak of the

priests serving as teachers. And this was God's idea from the first establishment of the

priesthood with Aaron and his progeny. For example, we find these words in Leviticus 10:10,

"the Lord spoke to Aaron, saying, you must teach the Israelites all the laws which the Lord has

imported to them through Moses" (Tanakh, 2000).

After his release from Persian, Ezra, a scribe and a priest, was also called upon to teach

the law of the Jews (Howard, 1993). Crenshaw (1998) adds "some sort of mass education is

envisioned in the time of Ezra (fifth century B.C.E.) when oral reading of the Torah was

followed by interpretation" (pp. 5-6). Priests, as teachers, date back to the custom of placing the

law in the Tent of the Testimony. That is, the placement of the law in the Tent of the Testimony

and later the Temple coincided with "the expectation that the priests and Levites were

accountable for the teaching of the law" (Vasholz, 1990, p. 87). For example, the Tanakh (2000)

states that Moses commissioned the priests and Levites to "teach the Israelites all the decrees the

Lord has given" (Leviticus 10:11). Later in Israelite history, Azariah son of Obed, a prophet,

mentions that Israel had been a long time "without a priest to teach" (Tanakh, 2 Chronicles 15:3).

Scribes (or soferim) were devoted to prolonged and special professional training themselves because "in the temple court or in synagogue, noted scribes gathered about themselves groups of youths and men" (Swift, 1919, p. 100) and because "their personal disciples and theirs in turn were primarily considered as qualified scholars" (Weber, 1952, p. 392). In other words, the stakes were high for the soferim to be competent and know their material thoroughly.

In these schools of the soferim emphasis was placed on the study of the sacred writings of the Hebrews and to the memorization of a large amount of oral literature (Swift, 1919). This mass of learning consisted of two parts – the *halakah* or legal elements of the law and the *haggadah* (literally, "narrative") or non-legal elements. And in Jewish history, Jews believed that the halakah was of divine origin. This belief finds its basis in the Tanakh, "I will give thee [*you*] tables of stone and a law" (Exodus 24:12). And based on this text, it was asserted that Moses had received from Yahweh upon Mt. Sinai, in addition to the written law, an oral law, namely the *halakah*. In contrast to the written and oral law, the *haggadah* included proverbs, fables, traditions, history and science.

The scribes used methods such as proverbs, precepts and epigrams - to help select pupils retain their words. The scribes "also presented concrete cases, real or imaginary, to train their pupils in the application of legal principles. Parable and allegory were employed for illustration. And public discussions between different scribes were frequently held" (Swift, 1919, pp. 101-102). Soferim also made extensive use of the question and answer method. Soferim also gave free lectures to adults in synagogues and schools.

Later in Jewish history, prophets acted as public teachers of Israel on behalf of God (or Yahweh). As Wood (1970) notes, the prophets' teaching took on the form of preaching –

addressing their message to the heart and the will. And prophets such as Isaiah, who had a group

of [adult] disciples, made use of symbolism, the object lesson and the dramatic method. For

example, the prophet Isaiah, to give force to his message to king Hezekiah not to join with Egypt

against Assyria, for three years, "posed as a prisoner of war on the way to captivity, going naked

and barefoot (probably wearing only an undergarment); [by doing so Isaiah]…symbolized the

captivity of Egypt and Ethiopia at the hands of the Assyrians" (Bullock, 1986, p. 140).

Other prophets who employed similar methods include Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Hosea

(Swift, 1919; Tanakh, 2000). Although the loyal followers of [these] influential prophetic

figures comprised schools in a loose sense of the word, they do not qualify as formal institutions

(Crenshaw, 1998).

Learning by heart or rote memorization was emphasized rather than creative, independent

combination of facts or independent thinking (Bayer, n.d.; Isbell, 2003). For example, the Old

Testament wisdom book Proverbs chapters 1-9, had to be memorized mechanically prior to

understanding its message (Bayer, n.d.). Jewish historian Josephus (1961) notes that the key to

success was repetition,

> Should anyone of our nation be questioned about the laws, he would repeat them
>
> all more readily than his own name. The result, then, of our thorough grounding
>
> in the laws from the first dawn of intelligence is that we have them, as it were,
>
> engraven on our souls. (p. 365)

Many rhetoric and literary devices such as mnemonic devices were employed to aid rote

memorization. For example, among these devices were alliteration, riddles, acrostic poetry,

metric structure, paronomasia (word play) and cantillation (murmur) (Bayer, n.d.; Crenshaw,

1998). Bayer (n.d.) lists other mnemonic devices such as question and answer or stating a verse

and letting the student finish. Although these were common teaching methods for children,

Rabbi Jesus used many of these same mnemonic literary devices when teaching his twelve adult

pupils (Bayer, n.d.). Other teaching methods employed by priests-teachers, prophets and scribes

(in the B.C.E.) for teaching adults included the use of parables (attention-attracting stories that

communicated truths), symbolism, imagery, music and poetry, questions and answers, debates,

dramatization, parallelism, acrostics and examples of moral behavior from history (Hoffman,

1997; Isbell, 2003; Young, 1998).

Several teaching methods were in use in antiquity (B.C.E.) and through the time of Rabbi

Jesus (C.E.). Fathers, parents, priest, prophets and scribes used storytelling, modeling, epigrams,

and question/answer to teach their students (children and adults). Mashal (parables, proverb,

aphorism) was a favorite method of wisdom teachers (Green, 2006).

Teaching methods employed in the yeshivas included *remez* which meant rabbis made an

allusion to the Old Testament text (Cohen, 2008). Hyperbole, which is also referred to as qol

veh homer or light and heavy, was another teaching method used in the yeshiva. The idea with

this hyperbolic teaching method was to caution a disciple that a light offense (like anger) might

escalate to a heavy offense (murder) if not rectified (R. Moseley, personal communication, April

29, 2011). Matthew 5:29-30 offers a great example of this teaching method in which Rabbi

Jesus says it is better to pluck out one's eye or cut off one's hand and enter the Kingdom of

Heaven than to enter hell with both eyes and hands. The desired outcome was putting the Torah

into practice in day to day living. In contrast, many adult educators today use the lecture,

discussion or project method when teaching adults. However, what is unclear are the process

elements Jewish adult educators used in antiquity.

Present-Day Teaching Methods

There are several teaching methods that many adult educators use in our present day context. These methods "facilitate the teaching-learning transaction" (Conti & Kolody, 2004). While there is no one perfect method for all learners and all learning experiences, Fitzgerald (2006) argues that educators should seek to use a combination of instructional methods to enhance learning. For example, "the lecture may be used as a primary method, with opportunities for question and answer periods and short discussion sessions being interspersed throughout the lecture period" (Fitzgerald, p. 320). Of course, whatever methods are chosen depends largely on the audience (Conti & Kolody, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2006).

This section will explain a few present day teaching methods. This is not intended to be an exhaustive treatment; rather, the researcher will concentrate on three teaching methods, namely, the lecture, discussion and project methods of instruction. The reason for choosing to explain these teaching methods is explained below.

Lecture. This method was chosen because it is considered one of the oldest methods to date (Henschke, 1975, 2009; Schuster, 2003). While the original meaning of the word lecture was *to read* [from the Latin *legere* meaning "to read"], today we may define lecture as a formal discourse intended for instruction (Farrah, 1990, 2004; Kuethe, 1968). Formal does not necessarily mean boring or uninteresting. So, the adult educator must strive to design a good lecture. A good lecture will motivate group interest, be well organized and clear, and be developed well and presented well (Heitzmann, 2010; Henschke 1975, 2009; Schuster, 2003).

One advantage of using this method is that it is an "efficient and cost-effective method for getting large amounts of information across to a large number of people at the same time and within a reasonable time frame" (Fitzgerald, 2006, p. 321). Other advantages include: (a) the

lecture method is the most appropriate learning-teaching technique to impact behavioral outcomes of knowledge and values; (b) the lecture method facilitates the absorption of factual, descriptive or explanatory material; and (c) lastly, the lecture method allows students to see the instructor think (Farrah, 2004; Henschke, 1975, 2009).

Some drawbacks using this method include its misuse and excessive use (Farrah, 2004; Sukati *et al.*, 2010). Other disadvantages include: (a) the method only expresses the view of the instructor; (b) the lecture in its purist form provides no opportunity for interaction between speaker and students unless the instructor opts to use the modified lecture in which a student may be required to supply a missing word or phrase in lecture notes (Newton, 1971); and (c) the lecture affords the instructor too much control (Farrah, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2006; Henschke, 1975).

Discussion. The discussion method is considered by Brookfield (2004) to be the "adult educational method par excellence" (p. 209). The discussion method is two-way verbal and lively interaction between teacher and students or between students (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999; Kuethe, 1968; Lindeman, 1926; Vella, 1995). Discussion allows learners to exchange information, feelings and opinions and it serves as an ideal companion to the lecture method (Fitzgerald, 2006). Discussion possesses elements known to be important in motivation and maintaining interest. This method involves the active participation of the students in the teaching-learning process (Chorzempa & Lapidsus, 2009). Discussion can follow, or be integrated with, a wide range of activities including a field trip, a film, an experiment, or a demonstration (Brookfield, 1990, 2004; Kuethe, 1968).

There are several advantages and disadvantages in employing the discussion method in teaching. Advantages include: (a) the discussion method aids in achieving particular cognitive and affective ends; (b) the discussion method encourages active, participatory learning

(Brookfield, 2004; Legge, 1971); (c) this method helps students to explore diverse perspectives; and (d) this method aids students to be retrospective in recognizing and investigating their own worldviews (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999).

However, some of the advantages of the discussion method can also create disadvantages. For example, Brookfield (2004) contends that, "discussion groups can easily become competitive emotional battlegrounds with participation a highly threatening experience" (p. 213). Another disadvantage of the discussion method is that by its nature, it is unpredictable and educators must be willing to surrender some element of control (Brookfield, 2004; Fitzgerald, 2006). Finally, another drawback of using this method requires the facilitator to take considerable time to foster a classroom environment that is critical and democratic (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999).

Project. The project method was chosen because it is considered the workhorse of andragogy and it is so commonplace among adult learners (Tough, 1971). In fact, Tough argues that most adults undertake at least one to two learning projects a year. Shupak (2003) refers to this method as "autodidactic study method through experimentation and personal learning, without the mediation of an educational authority" (p. 422). Knowles (1975) is a champion of this method, namely, self-directed projects. In general, projects under this category refer to some task that requires relatively little direct interaction with teaching. The project method is quite adaptable and valuable. Kuethe (1968) explains that,

> Projects are valuable in that they promote the development of the capacity for
> self-reinforcement, which is so important in later life. The individual takes pride
> in the fact that the project is his, and he is additionally motivated by the
> realization that the teacher expects him to do a good job and has expressed
> confidence in his capacity to handle the task on his own. (p. 132)

According to Knowles (1986), Rogers (1986) and Berger and Caffarella and O'Donnell (1990, 2004), a learning contract would fall under this category. A learning contract is a formal agreement written by a learner and specifies the what (what will be learned), the how (how the learning will be achieved), the when (the period of time involved), and specific evaluation criteria to be used in judging the completion and mastery of the learning.

Like the lecture and discussion methods have advantages and disadvantages, the same holds true for the project method. Advantages include the following: (a) the project method affords learners some control of their learning process; (b) the project method affords learners the opportunity to develop instructional design and self-directed learning skills; (c) students actually acquire knowledge using this method (Roberts & Harlin, 2007); and (d) the project method is quite flexible thereby making it suitable for many different learning contexts (Berger, Caffarella & O'Donnell, 2004). For example, Roberson and Merriam (2005) found that the life stages for older adults often provided the impetus for self-directed learning projects.

Before employing the project method, however, the adult educator must be aware of the disadvantages too. Disadvantages of this method include: (a) many adult learners have a discomfort with his method because they have been conditioned to rely solely on the instructor; (b) many educators worry about the depth and breadth of the learning that self-directed projects afford (Berger, Caffarella & O'Donnell, 2004); (c) this method requires students who are inclined to a bit of self-regulation (Helle, *et. al.*, 2007); and (d) educators need to be aware that self-directed learning or projects are riddled with emotion. Rager (2009) explains that "emotion and cognition cannot be separated in learning but rather that both are integral to the process" (p. 25).

In addition to these present day learning methods, Daines and Daines and Graham (1993) and Rogers (1986) adds case study, case story, forum (panel and symposium), internship, mentorship, questioning, computer-enriched instruction interactive television, exposition, role-play, games, diary or journaling, buzz groups, writing, debate, brainstorming, experiments, simulation and demonstration. However, Daines and Daines and Graham (1993) make a distinction about demonstration: there is demonstration by showing and demonstration by allowing the student to do the activity with the instructor. A buzz group is small groups of two or three students for the purpose of discussing a question or short topic briefly (Daines, Daines & Graham, 1993).

Philosophies of Adult Education and Teaching Methods

How important is one's philosophy of adult education? Kilpatrick (1951) offers this answer, "As a philosophy is to life so is a philosophy of education to education. Specifically, it should help us evaluate and choose in all matters of school life and management" (p. 9). One's philosophy of adult education is also important because philosophical beliefs inform educational practice (Chambliss, 2009).

This section will give an overview of two philosophies of adult education (PAE), namely, the Humanist Philosophy of Adult Education (HPAE) and the Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education (RPAE). The Humanist PAE is discussed because Knowles and his andragogical framework reside within this orientation. Included with the Humanist PAE discussion are some characteristics of the adult educator that subscribes to this particular PAE and some teaching methods this educator would use.

Humanist Philosophy of Adult Education

Humanistic philosophy of adult education claims "that an individual has the potential to grow, and further, has the desire to grow" (Jackson, 2009, p. 21). This perspective to learning draws upon some tenets of humanism which can be traced back to Confucius and Greco-Roman thinkers, especially Aristotle; and historically humanism has been expressed in religion, literature, education and psychology (Elias & Merriam, 2005). Humanistic philosophy of adult education adopts the dignity and autonomy of human beings as foremost.

According to Price (2000), "humanistic adult education sets goals for the holistic development of persons toward their fullest potentials. Human emotional and affective dimensions are afforded equal importance with the intellectual in educational processes" (pp. 4-5). The key concepts of this philosophy are freedom and autonomy, active co-operation, participation and self-directed learning (Fordjor *et al.*, 2003).

Early in its development, this philosophy (humanism) posited the belief that by studying literature in antiquity (Greek and Roman) the desired result would be individuals who were responsible and autonomous. This movement dubbed "'New Learning' was a revolt against the stultifying authority of a church-dominated world" (Elias & Merriam, 1995, p. 110). For instance, Italian humanism introduced the study of Greek and Plato's writings in Latin and produced work in historiography. Again, these classical writings confirmed the notion that man had great potential and an innate ethical sense. The legacy left by Renaissance humanists was a revolt against the church which tried to control knowledge; an emphasis on man's intellectual capabilities; the ideal of a gentleman scholar; and the promotion of the good-life for all humanity.

The Enlightenment period in the 18th century demonstrated compatibility with the humanistic worldview. Namely, the Enlightenment thinkers' interest in works of antiquity, confidence in human intellect and reason and an appetite for learning were ideas quite congruent with humanism. Existentialism is considered a modern or contemporary expression of humanistic thought. The basic underlying belief of existentialist thinkers such as Albert Camus, Soren Kierkegaard, Paul Tillich, Martin Buber, Sartre, and Nietzsche is the deep concern for man's freedom (Heywood-Thomas, 1970).

Since Aristotle, the basic and essential principles of humanistic education have been promulgated. The primary operative principle for the humanist adult educator is to produce a well-rounded educated or self-actualized person (Jackson, 2009). In short, the goal of humanistic education is to produce a humanist.

Characteristics of the Humanist Adult Educator.

Malcolm Malcolm Knowles serves as an example of an educator who adheres to this philosophy of adult education.   Like Knowles, an adult educator, with this philosophy must view education as student-centered and thus help the adult learner toward being self-directed. Secondly, the adult educator is one who sees the adult as one who has a reservoir of life experiences that he brings to the educational table. So, this educator must respect all adult learners' experiences. Thirdly, the adult educator must view his mission as assisting adults in becoming self-actualized and mature adults (Jackson, 2009) or more authentic (Cranton, 2006). In this way, teachers or educators who hold this particular philosophy of adult education serve in the roles of "facilitator, helper and partner in the learning process. The teacher does not simply provide information; it is the teacher's role to create the conditions within which learning can

take place" (Elias & Merriam, 2005, p. 127). Brown (2006) puts it succinctly, "students move from 'learning about' something to 'learning to be' something" (p. 19). Brown makes this comment in the context of observing Professor Belcher, professor of physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), as he sets up communities of practice whereby graduate level students learn about electricity through social interchanges.

Teaching Methods of the Humanist Adult Educator.

There are several teaching methods that a Humanist Adult Educator may consider using. And because, "the humanistic adult educator functions as a facilitator of learning rather than as a disseminator of fixed knowledge" (Price, 2000, p. 4), he will use methods to complement this belief. Among the teaching methods used by educators who adhere to the humanist philosophy of adult education are team teaching, discovery and experimentation (particularly in collaboration with others), and individualized learning (Price, 2000; Zinn, 1990). Learning contracts and leading discussion groups would certainly fit in this category. The humanist adult educator also relies on small group projects, committees and teams as instructional techniques. Here the curriculum functions as a vehicle or a means to an end. In other words, the curriculum is not the end but rather a means of moving adult learners to developing into self-actualizing individuals.

Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education (RPAE)

Any RPAE will stress the teaching and the study of the Torah and most importantly the practice of it commandments (Greenberg, 1969; Raskas, 1990; Rechnitzer & Brandes, 2009). Rabbi Nathan says "whoever studies the Torah as a child absorbs the words in his blood and

articulates them distinctly, but one who acquires knowledge of the Torah in old age does not absorb the words into the bloodstream nor speak them clearly" (Crenshaw, 1998, p. 8).

This educational system involves the whole person and not only his intellect and body. However, a RPAE has not been formalized or systematized according to Greenberg (1969),

When we speak of the Rabbinic philosophy of education, we do not wish to imply that there is a systematic presentation of that philosophy in the Bible or the Talmud. While very useful attempts have been made to present the history of Jewish education in Biblical and Talmudic times, to the best of my knowledge no one has heretofore even tried to present either *the* or a Rabbinic *philosophy* of education. (p. 18)

Yet Greenberg (1969) posits these assumptions that undergird the Rabbinic Philosophy of adult education: (a) man has a conflict between two inclinations (good and evil) but the good inclination will prevail with man attaining intellectual maturity; (b) the overarching goal of Jewish education was to enable man to fulfill his potentialities as a creature made in the image of God; (c) and the learned or those who continue to study, the older they grow, the greater becomes their wisdom.

Because Rabbinic Judaism is a text centered culture, the exact and thorough knowledge of the sacred texts was the basic prerequisite for the sound development of man's highest potentialities, and so memorization was stressed. Memorization was aided by studying the text audibly – to study pronounce the words of the text distinctly. Besides memorization other teaching methods included a lively give and take between master and pupil and between fellow students. While not a teaching method, forming close relationships with worthy colleagues was also a vital component (Greenberg, 1969). The rabbis believed that forming close relationships

with colleagues were "indispensible to a proper education" (Greenberg, 1969, p. 28). One reason rabbis formed close relationships with their peers was for the purpose of debate (Barnett, 1997).

An un-formalized RPAE represents an opportunity to the researcher (Cohen *et al.*, 1974; Greenberg, 1969). That is, from this qualitative study the researcher believes more elements of a RPAE might emerge. Or a grounded theory of rabbinic philosophy of adult education might emerge because of this study.

Every adult educator has a philosophy of adult education (PAE) whether he can clearly articulate it or not (Tisdell & Taylor, 2000). An adult educator's PAE informs his or her practice when doing adult education. This section also demonstrated that an educator's PAE provided a clue what teaching methods the educator might use in the teaching-learning transaction. The Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education is considered unformalized. In other words, it would be difficult to point to a rabbi and make the judgment that he was teaching adults per a coherent and systematized Rabbinic PAE.

Andragogy

What is andragogy? Modern understandings of andragogy range from equating andragogy to humanism to the art and science of helping adults learn and the study of adult education theory, processes, and technology to self-directed learning to the dimensions of social, philosophical, contextual circumstances, moral, aesthetic, cultural and anything else that would bring all people to their full degree of humaneness (Henschke, 1998). Yet several questions remain. For instance, is andragogy a teaching method? Is it an adult learning theory or philosophy statement? Questions such as these continue to fuel a debate that has a marked beginning according to St. Clair (2002). He states, "since the language of andragogy was introduced to North American adult educators by Malcolm Knowles, there have been continual

debates about whether it is an adult learning theory, a teaching method, a philosophical statement, or all the above" (p. 1). As a former student of Knowles, Henschke (2009) also acknowledges that much debate has centered on whether andragogy is a theory, method, technique or simply a set of assumptions.

Savicevic (1999), who introduced the concept to Knowles, unequivocally adopts andragogy as a scientific discipline. Savicevic (1999) goes on to define andragogy "as a scientific discipline which deals with problems relating to adult education and learning in all of its manifestations and expressions whether formal or informal organized or self guided" (p. 250). Nevertheless, since this researcher's research question is, "do the teaching methods and process elements used by a second century rabbi align with Knowles' andragogical framework – namely, the teaching methods associated with his six assumptions and his eight andragogical process elements?", this portion of the literature search will focus on the question, is andragogy a teaching method?

There is a historical basis for the word, andragogy. It is a compound word of the genitive form of the Greek word *aner* or *andros*, which means mature man; and –*agogia* which means spiritual guidance or education. Presumably, from this compound word, one could say that andragogy is the teaching of or providing spiritual direction to a mature person. Does the meaning of this compound word (educating mature persons) suggest that it was derived from its individual components – *aner* and *agogia*? Carson (1996) suggests that we cannot assume the etymology of a compound word is related to its meaning. The meaning of a word is more than semantics or its roots; the meaning of a word involves phrases, discourse, genre, and most importantly, a historical context.   In sum, words often derive their meaning in a particular context; that context can be textual, literary, social or historical.

The roots of andragogy or a specific approach to adult education and learning can be found in the thoughts of J.A. Comenius who lived in the 17th century. Comenius is, in fact, regarded as the founder of andragogy although he did not actually use the term. He did, however, lobby for the establishment of institutions, forms, means, methods and teachers for work with adults (Savicevic, 1999).

While the term was first coined and used in 1833 by Alexander Kapp, a German grammar teacher who advocated the lifelong necessity to learn, andragogical concepts predate this event as Knowles (1989) and Savicevic (1999) locate early andragogical footprints or evidences in the ideas and thoughts of philosophers such as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle and in the ancient Jewish civilization among their scholars, namely, prophets and priests.

Andragogy as a Teaching Method

Following WWI, in Germany adult education spread in particular in regard to the workers' movement. In Germany, andragogy had taken a unique shape due to the rich traditions of German philosophical thought, the spreading of education within the workers' movement and the forming of organizational foundations for adult education (Savicevic, 1999, 2008). It was in this context that German author, Rosenstock (1925) argued that pedagogy was a method to teach children; while andragogy is the true method of teaching adults.

Fellenz and Conti (1989) never explicitly say that andragogy is a method of teaching adults. However, they make the following eight claims under the umbrella of adult education.

1. The focus of the adult education field is shifting from a field of practice to adult learning.

2. The G.I. Bill forced institutions to consider among other things new instructional vehicles to meet the needs of the influx of 'non-traditional' students.

3. Basic to any consideration of trends in adult learning is the attention presently given to learning that is relevant to the living tasks of the individual. The authors referred to this as 'real-life' learning – which is considering the individual learner's personal context and tailoring learning to that individual.

4. Dialogue is foundational in the learning process of adult learners.

5. The educator must carefully select learning strategies that promote or instill metacognitive, memory, and motivational strategies in the adult learner.

6. Getting adult learners into a participatory role rather than a passive role is vital.

7. Learning happens when praxis occurs; praxis accordingly is the alternating process of reflection and action. These authors borrowed Paulo Freire's construct of praxis from his work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Interestingly at the end of the 1970s, the Nottingham Andragogy Group (1983) adopted Freire's philosophy of andragogy but urged critical thinking among adult learners.

8. Adult educators would be wise to consider the culture and subcultures of their adult learners as one's culture is the lens by which a person interprets the world and the learning process. In other words, the application of andragogy is not contextual-less. Merriam (2001) cites this as criticism of Knowles' version of andragogy; that is, the learner's real life context was not considered.

Building on the work of Lindeman (1926) who explicitly stated that andragogy was the method for teaching adults, Malcolm Knowles, a student of Savicevic, has been the champion of developing the meaning and practice of the term in the American milieu (Knowles, 1990). According to Henschke (2009), Knowles was the first to conceptualize that adults learn differently from children. However, he would later argue that pedagogy was to be applied for

either the child or adult learner if unfamiliar content was involved; similarly, he proposed that andragogy was to be used for either the child or adult learner if the content was familiar. According to Knowles (1975), self-directed learning was considered the major method or workhorse to implement andragogy. However, Knowles did not label andragogy a teaching method. Rather, from his six assumptions, that formed the underlying basis for andragogy, he "proposed a programming-planning model for designing, implementing, and evaluating educational experiences with adults" (Merriam, 2001, p. 5).

For Knowles, andragogy was less a theory of adult learning and more of a helpful model of assumptions that serve as guide when facilitating adult learning. Frankly, it is better to regard andragogy of as a guide to practice (Merriam, 2001). Instead of a rigid set of teaching methods, andragogy became more defined "by the learning situation than by the learner" (Merriam, p. 6).

Savicevic (1999) argues that while American and European expressions of andragogy share some common elements, this "does not mean, [when] viewed comparatively, to understand andragogy uniformly or homogeneously" (p. 245). Moreover, Yugoslavian educator Savicevic (1999) would contend that andragogy is not a teaching method as evidenced in these criticisms leveled against Knowles' form of andragogy:

1. Knowles makes the mistake to define andragogy as science and art of helping adults learn. Savicevic considered this reductionistic in that andragogy is limited to being prescriptive.

2. Knowles makes the mistake of declaring andragogy as a model for teaching.

3. Knowles was inconsistent in determining andragogy and this caused much confusion and misunderstanding.

4. Knowles lacked creativity in that he defined andragogy as science and art following in the footsteps of Dewey who did the same thing with pedagogy.

5. Knowles emphasized an individualistic approach to learning and education with no consideration to the adult learner's attendant circumstances and education level.

Ironically, these criticisms of Knowles' version of andragogy did not diminish Savicevic's (2008) respect for Knowles as this statement testifies, "his contribution to dissemination of andragogical ideas throughout the USA is huge" (p. 375).   While Savicevic (1999) appears not to call andragogy a teaching method, he nonetheless, believes andragogy does answer the how and why questions with this statement, "it [andragogy] does not focus only on problems of 'knowing how' but also on 'knowing why'" (p. 251). Savicevic (1999) surveyed other European countries including Germany, France, Britain, Holland, Finland, Russia, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Poland to assess how they viewed andragogy. A few countries are noteworthy to mention.

1. In Russia in the first decades of the 20th century, E. N. Mediniski (1923) coined his theory as anthropogogy – the science of teaching people.

2. In France, the traditional break-down of disciplines studying education and learning does not include andragogy/adult pedagogy. The prevailing concept in France at the time of this publication was that of pedagogical education of adults.

3. In the Netherlands, Ten Have (1986) and his associates (namely, Ger van Enckervort, Bastiaan van Gent, Barry J. Hake) viewed andragogy not as a method but rather as a sort of integrative science which not only studies the educational process but also social work and other forms of direction and guidance.

4. In Britain and in contrast to the Nottingham Andragogy Group spoken of earlier,

C. Griffin (1983) described andragogy as a theory of adult learning, a theory of

practice.

Critiques of Andragogy

Cooke (1994) and Henschke (1998) refer to Knowles as the father of American

Andragogy. However, Knowles and his development of andragogy is not without its share of

criticism. This section will explore a few opponents and proponents of Knowles' andragogy.

Opponents. Brookfield (1986) questions Knowles' idea that when an adult transitions

from a dependent to an independent self-concept and to an exhibition of self-directed behaviors,

then he has transitioned to adulthood. Brookfield (1986) argues if this is true in reality then the

perpetual existence of totalitarian regimes would be inconceivable. Moreover, Brookfield (1986)

contends that not only does the existence of totalitarian regimes argue against the demonstration

of self-directed behavior among adults but many adults in contemporary democracies lack self-

directedness too. He cites this case study from Frankfurt as evidence where there was an

"unwillingness of individuals to confront the fact of their separateness and to embrace their

aloneness as the precondition of productive relationships resulted in a flight into political dogmas

and religious creeds" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 94). In other words, Fascist regimes and totalitarian

Communist societies exist because of a lack of self-directed adults. Brookfield (1986) concludes

his critique this way,

> While self-directedness is a desirable condition of human existence it is seldom

> found in any abundance. Its rarity, however, in no sense weakens the view that

> the enhancement of self-directedness is the proper purpose of education; instead,

it provides a compelling reason why educators should pursue this end with

unflagging zeal. (pp. 94-95)

Besides Brookfield, Jarvis leveled criticisms against Knowles' form of andragogy. For

instance, Jarvis (1984) dismissed andragogy as an expression of "romantic curriculum" that was

valid in its time but is now obsolete (p. 39). Jarvis (2006) also suggested that Knowles'

expression of andragogy stirred a number of debates about whether adults and children learn

differently. Thus, he argues that it is experience and not age that affects learning.

Finally, Grace (2001) offers yet another critique of andragogy. He felt that Knowles'

perspective is too much caught up with individualization, institutionalization,

professionalization, techno-scientization, self-directed learning, and the politics of exclusion,

maintenance and conformity. Other critics of Knowles' andragogy include Hartree (1984),

Rachal (2002), Baumgartner *et al.*, (2003) and Sheared (1996).

Proponents. Johnson (2000) believed that andragogy could be regarded as a theory but

believed that when andragogy was applied to most adult learning contexts it was a teaching

method. Henschke and Cooper (2001) contend that andragogy is to be modeled by the instructor

which suggests andragogy is a means to help adults learn. And this modeling does not go

unnoticed. For instance, one of Simmons' (2007) students expressed his appreciation that he

modeled adult learning.

Heimstra and Sisco (1990) argue that a dedicated facilitator with acumen who correctly

applies Knowles' andragogical approach to teaching and learning can have a positive impact on

the adult learner. Henschke and Cooper (n.d.) begin their work this way, "andragogy has been

used by some as a code word for identifying the education and learning of adults. For others, it

has been used to designate different strategies and methods that are used in helping adults learn"

(p. 1). For example, Gehring (2000) discovered that applying the principles of andragogy with mature inmates in a correctional facility context aided in their learning.

Henschke and Cooper (n.d.) write, "in andragogy, theory becomes practical deed; in the responsible word, in the crucible of necessity, however, practical deeds become the stuff of theory. Andragogy is not merely 'better' as an education method for this purpose, it is a necessity" (p. 25). Roberson (2002) seems to agree with Henschke and Cooper as he confidently asserts that Knowles' theory of andragogy is gnomic (or timeless) and applies to adult education in our multicultural world. And while Merriam *et al.* (2007) believe that andragogy warrants more research and development in five areas: (a) transformative learning; (b) spirituality and learning; (c) embodied learning; (d) neuroscience of learning; and (e) narrative learning, they still nonetheless contend that andragogy will exist in perpetuity.

What is the end of the matter? Is andragogy a teaching method? St. Clair (2002) contends, "as a guide to teaching adults, andragogy has a great deal more to offer when it is approached, as Knowles originally suggested, as a set of assumptions" (p. 3). Merriam, Caffarella and Baumgartner (2007) agree with St. Clair's assessment and further add, "the implications for practice that Knowles draws for each of the assumptions are also considered to be good instructional practice for all ages, especially adults" (p. 92). So, while some have predicted the demise of andragogy and while we may not call andragogy a teaching method, many adult educators nonetheless "find Knowles' andragogy, with its characteristics of adult learners, to be a helpful rubric for better understanding adults as learners" (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007, p. 92). Knowles' assumptions led to several implications for practice or methods including highly participative teaching/learning techniques, active learning techniques, active involvement, lifelong learning, dialogical, active practical engagement, discussion, active

teaching methods, self-directedness and learner-focused education (Henschke & Cooper, n.d.; Henschke, 2009).

Knowles' Andragogical Process and Assumptions

Knowles' andragogical framework is comprised of his eight andragogical process elements and six assumptions about the adult learner (and the corresponding teaching methods for each assumption). His framework was chosen for several reasons. First, Knowles is considered "a 'field builder' in adult education with his ideas on andragogy becoming a central core of his contributions to the theory and practice of adult education field" (Henschke, 2009, p. 4). And other researchers such as Allen (2008), Pohland and Bova (2000), Traore (2008) and Jorgensen (1998) recognized the usefulness and compatibility of Knowles' andragogical framework as it is often paired with other theories such as Merizow's transformational learning theory. Knowles' framework has been applied to learning circles (LCs) and it has influenced new movements in traditional theories such as the constructivist theory.

For instance, Allen (2008) recognized that the constructivist theory, which has enjoyed a certain level of popularity in higher education, has shifted from a pedagogical framework to a more andragogical framework.   Pohland and Bova (2000) complemented Merizow's transformational learning theory with Knowles' andragogical framework when conducting research in professional development. And Traore (2008) applied Knowles' andragogical framework to the notion of learning circles (LC); where LCs are defined as a "self-generated learning team that creates a dynamic learning environment" (p. 57). Jorgensen (1998) used several models and theories to develop a comprehensive andragogical process. That is, he combined the ideas of Knowles, Rogers, Jarvis and Ellen White as means to help Seventh-Day Adventist college students to critically question their faith and the implications of their faith.

Second, Knowles (1996) has applied his assumptions about the adult learner and his process elements in many contexts including leadership training with Girl Scouts, in his own classroom at Boston University, in religious education, in the design of organizational training programs, and in Human Resource Development. Ingalls (1976) added to the number of contexts in which andragogy was employed when he used it in the corporate setting.   In this setting, Ingalls identified nine dimensions of a manager and educator. These dimensions characterize a manager who facilitates his employees' learning and keeps his employees abreast of developments in their respective disciplines. These nine dimensions include: (a) creating a work environment in which each subordinate feels respected; (b) treating mistakes not as failures but rather as learning opportunities; (c) showing employees what they need to learn; (d) helping employees see learning opportunities in the day-to-day work situations; (e) encouraging subordinates to take responsibility for designing and executing their own learning; (f) engaging employees in self-evaluation and mapping out next steps for professional development and improvement; (g) permitting employees to challenge the status quo and to make changes if the changes are feasible; (h) being sensitive to each employee's developmental tasks and readiness-to-learn issues; and (i) inviting employees to the table to jointly isolate and solve problems.

Third, other adult and K-12 educators validated Knowles' andragogical framework in the classroom and in a wide range of settings (Henschke, 2009). Many of these other educators were located here in the U.S. and around the world. For instance, African adult educator Kabuga (1982) employed andragogy in Africa among adult learners and children. This is significant considering Kabuga deviated from the stricter and traditional adult educational processes and he had not previously tested andragogy with other adults. He used highly participatory teaching/learning techniques with not only children but adults too. Traore (2008) has found that

this andragogical framework is helpful and encouraged its use for family and consumer science professionals. And Simmons (2007) applied it when modeling adult learning with adult-ministry students at George Fox Evangelical Seminary.

Finally, Knowles is responsible for popularizing the term, andragogy. And once a staunch opponent and critic of Knowles' andragogy, Savicevic (2008) said this about Knowles' development of andragogy in the U.S.,

> Forty years in development of a science is not a long or ignorable period. I met professor Knowles four decades ago and argued on terms and on concept of andragogy. Since then, the term and the concept of andragogy enlarged and rooted in the American professional literature. There is no doubt that Knowles contributed to it, not only by his texts, but with his spoken word and lectures. (p. 375)

Andragogical Process Elements

Andragogy is the "art and science of helping adults learn" (Knowles, 1970, p. 38). Chief among the responsibilities of the andragog or adult educator to achieve this feat is designing and managing a suitable process for the adult learner to facilitate this learning. In other words, the andragog must concern himself with both content knowledge and process knowledge (Chapman, 1999). The former answers the why question and the latter answers the how question.

According to Knowles (1996) the andragog must "design and manage a process for facilitating the acquisition of content by the learners" (p. 258).   In his own application of andragogy to human resource development (HRD), Knowles (1989) offers these elements for the andragogical process: (a) preparing the adult learner; (b) setting the climate; (c) creating a mechanism for mutual planning; (d) diagnosing the participant's learning needs; (e) translating

learning needs into objectives; (f) designing and managing a pattern of learning experiences; (g) helping learners carry out their learner plans; and (h) evaluating the extent to which the objectives have been achieved.

Knowles (1990) makes a distinction in the content model and process model. He notes, "the content model is concerned with transmitting information and skills whereas the process model is concerned with providing procedures and resources for helping learners acquire information and skills" (p. 120). This section discusses Knowles' process elements. A discussion of Knowles' six assumptions about the adult learner will follow including the associated teaching methods for each assumption.

Preparing the Adult Learners. Adult learning actually takes place before the first class as this process step suggests. Preparing adults prior to the first class could take the form of announcing the class will be of a participatory nature and to encourage students to bring their questions, topics, and problems they hope the program will deal with (Knowles, 1995; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005). On the first day of class, the adult learner might want to conduct a brief experiential encounter with the concepts and skills of self-directed learning. Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (2005) offer these reasons: first, most adults experience a culture-shock because most students have been conditioned to depend on teachers to teach them and second, because andragogy assumes a high degree of responsibility on the part of the adult learner.

Setting the Climate. Another important process step is the classroom climate or environment. The adult educator will seriously consider both the physical and psychological aspects of the learning context. It is vital to consider the physical environment because as Rogers (1993) points out, "each person engages interactively with his/her physical and social

environment (which of course includes the teacher), creating knowledge for him/herself" (p. 2). According to Knowles (1990), "the physical environment requires provision for animal [human] comforts (temperature, ventilation, easy access to refreshments and rest rooms, comfortable chairs, adequate light, good acoustics, [frequency of breaks], etc.) to avoid blocks to learning" (p. 121). Interestingly, the color scheme of the room is also an important consideration (Knowles, 1990; Wilmes, Harrington, Kohler-Evans & Sumpter, 2008).

Other physical provisions include the size and layout of the physical space for learning. For instance, providing a room with round, oval or hexagon-shaped tables not only encourages participation from students and it also supports the "behaviorists' concept of immediacy of feedback, the importance placed on the learners having an active role" (Knowles, 1990, p. 121). The andragog must be aware that the physical environment can either help or hinder learning; and that the physical setup of the room communicates a message. For instance, if the chairs are set up in rows facing a lectern, this announces that the teaching-learning transaction will be primarily a one-way transmission (Knowles, 1995).

Equally important is the psychological climate to facilitate learning. For the andragog, this means creating an atmosphere where,

> Cultural differences are respected, in which anxiety levels are appropriately
> controlled, in which achievement motivations are encouraged for those who
> respond to them and affiliation motivations are encouraged for those who respond
> to them, and which feelings are considered to be as relevant to learning as ideals
> and skills. (Knowles, 1990, pp. 122-123)

In short, the task of the andragog is to create an atmosphere of adultness where individuals regard this climate as safe, caring, accepting, trusting, respectful and understanding (Knowles, 1989, 1990; Vella, 2002).

Creating a Mechanism for Mutual Planning. Mutual planning is another process step the andragog should consider. However, most importantly, the andragog must create a mechanism "for involving all the parties concerned in the educational enterprise in its planning" (Knowles, 1990, p. 125). Knowles supports this idea on the "basic findings of applied behavioral science research that says simply that people tend to feel committed to a decision or activity in direct proportion to their participation in or influence on its planning and decision making" (p. 125). Conversely, the andragog must remember that people will feel uncommitted to any decision if they perceive a decision is being imposed on them without any input.

Diagnosing Participant's Learning Needs. Working one on one with the adult participant to diagnose and identify learning needs is another vital process step. With the help of the individual student, the organizational and societal perceptions, the andragog can construct a model of desired behavior, performance or competencies for determining learning needs (Knowles, 1970, 1980, 1989, 1990). However, the andragog must be aware that students may or may not have the requisite abilities necessary for achieving the educational goals. Nevertheless, the resulting model is then an amalgamation of the perceptions of desired competencies from all these sources (Knowles, 1990). In cases where there are conflicting perceptions, the andragog must negotiate or resolve these conflicts. Knowles (1990) states that the preciseness or excellence of the model is not the most critical factor; rather,

The most critical factor is what it does to the mind-set of the learner. When

learners understand how the acquisition of certain knowledge or skill will add to

their ability to perform better in life, they enter into even didactic instructional

situations with a clearer sense of purpose and see what they learn as more

personal. (p. 128)

When assessing the adult participants' learning needs, careful listening is the chief skill

here for the adult educator (Vella, 2002). Vella (2002) asks a very poignant and instructive

question, "How do we listen to adult learners, before we design a course for them, so that their

themes are heard and respected" (p. 6)?

Translating Learning Needs into Objectives. Every adult student has a unique set of

learning needs. In this process step, the adult educator must be adept at converting these needs

into learning objectives. Knowles defers the formulation of objectives in adult education to

Brookfield (Knowles, 1990). Brookfield (1986) begins this process of translating learning needs

into objectives by warning against establishing objectives that focus primarily on learners

exhibiting specifically determined behaviors. Second, Brookfield (1986) thinks it is unwise to

formulate "prespecified learning objectives" which is at the forefront of institutional and

pedagogical models (p. 211). According to Brookfield (1986), "these objectives are the

programmatic pivot; they serve as the reference point and focus for the design of instruction, the

planning of course work, and the evaluation of program success" (p. 211).

Brookfield (1986) reminds the adult educator that pre-specified learning objectives

distinguish a student-centered approach to learning from a teacher-centered approach to learning.

The latter approach is common and traditional but it does not allow for the "continuous

negotiation and renegotiation" of goals throughout the process of learning which is what is

required for the student-centered approach to learning (Brookfield, 1986, p. 214). In other

words, Brookfield (1986) is suggesting that fixed pre-specified learning objectives go counter to

adult student-centered learning approach; an approach that requires knowledge of the context and contingency of knowledge. Moreover, Eisner (1985) adds,

> Life in classrooms, like that outside them, is seldom neat or linear. Although it may be a shock to some, goals are not always clear. Purposes are not always precise. As a matter of fact, there is much that we do, and need to do, without a clear sense of what the objective is. Many of our productive activities take the form of exploration or play. In such activities, the task is not one of arriving at a preformed objective but rather to act, often with a sense of abandon, wonder, [and] curiosity. Out of such activity rules may be formed and objectives created. (p.116)

Instead of predetermined objectives which fail to consider incidental learning or "personal learning-the kind that results from reflection on experiences and from trying to make sense of one's life by exploring the meanings others have assigned to similar experiences" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 213), he rather argues convincingly that the adult learner's needs assessment drives the goals and aims of an educational program; these goals and aims are then translated into specific objectives, curricula and evaluative criteria.

Designing a Pattern of Learning Experiences. Translating the needs of the adult learner into objectives serves as a precursor to this process step. This process element tailors a plan or pattern of learning to help the student to meet his learning needs. So, in this step, the andragog considers the

> problem areas that have been identified by the learners through self-diagnostic procedures and selecting appropriate formats (individuals, group, and mass activities) for learning, designing units of experiential learning utilizing indicated

methods and materials and arranging them in sequence according to the learners'

readiness and aesthetic principles. (Knowles, 1990, p. 133)

This element in general and the andragogical process in particular assume a high degree

of responsibility for learning to be taken by the learner. That is, this model is built upon the

concept of self-directed learning (Knowles, 1989, 1990). However, many adults are dependent

on teachers because they have been conditioned not to be autonomous learners. This means of

course that many adults have not learned to be self-directed learners. So andragogs may need to

explain what it means to be a self-directed student before class commences or on the first day of

class.

Helping Learners Carry Out Their Learning Plans. Like the adult educator assumes

different roles in the teaching learning exchange, the adult learner also assumes different roles.

During this process step, the adult learner assumes the role of administrator. This role

corroborates what Knowles has said about the andragog; he must "design and manage a process

for facilitating the acquisition of content by the learners" (Knowles, 1996, p. 258). So, the

emphasis is on managing the process for the benefit of helping the adult learners carry out their

learning plans (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005).

Evaluating the Objectives. An oft overlooked process step is evaluation. Using Donald

Kirkpatrick's (1971) conceptualization of evaluation, Knowles (1990) offers four steps to assess

if the objectives have been achieved.

Reaction evaluation – the andragog is tasked with collecting data about how the

participants are responding to the program as it takes place in real time – what they like the most,

what they like the least, what positive or negative feelings they have. The andragog is wise to

feed data collected from one session into the next session. Chain notes and classroom

assessment quality circles are a few tools an andragog might use to assess adult students' response and reaction to learning (Angelo & Cross, 1993).

Learning evaluation – here the andragog is interested in collecting what principles, facts and techniques were acquired by the adult participants. Pre-tests and post-tests are good devices for collecting such data. Performance tests – such as operating a machine, interviewing, speaking, listening, etc. – might be used for skill learning.

Behavior evaluation – the idea is to collect data that shows actual changes in what the learner does after the training or educational experience as compared to what he or she did before. Diaries, journals, and self-rating scales are useful instruments to gather this data.

Results evaluation – while organizations are mostly concerned with using objective measures (e.g., costs, quality control rejections, etc.) of learning outcomes, there is a trend in evaluation research that places emphasis on subjective evaluation or evidence – that seeks to find out what is really happening inside the participants and how differently they are performing in life (Knowles, 1990, 1996). However, the andragog asks a fundamental question here when thinking about ways to measure this objective: what procedures can I use to involve the learners responsibly in evaluating the accomplishment of their learning objectives (Knowles, 1996)?

Assumptions about the Adult Learner

Knowles (1989, 1990, 1996) makes several assumptions about the adult learner; assumptions that the adult educator must take into consideration when teaching adults. And these assumptions inform the teaching methodologies employed and the process elements implemented by the adult educator.

Adult learners are unlike child learners. Malcolm Knowles (1990), who has helped popularize the term, andragogy, and who also began writing about adult learners in the 1970s, identified six common traits or assumptions about the adult learner:

1. need to know

2. learner's self concept

3. role of learner's experience

4. readiness to learn

5. orientation to learning

6. motivation

Applying andragogy to many formal and informal educational contexts led to teaching methods. Thus, also treated below are the associated teaching methods for each assumption proposed and practiced by Knowles.

Need to Know and Teaching Methods. Adult learners are basically pragmatists. That is, they have a need to know the usefulness of learning information because they want to put the newly acquired information into practice immediately. In other words, this assumption about the adult learner simply boils down to the question of why? Adult educators must realize that in most instances adults' participation is voluntary. According to Galbraith (1991), if adults do not know why they are participating in an educational activity, "they will withdraw from the activity" (p. 6). In other words, adult learners ask - what is the utility of learning this material (Knowles, 1990; Rogers, 1993)? And the utility or immediacy of learning new material and a student's perseverance is directly related (Vella, 2002). Vella notes, "the immediacy perceived by learners will affect their determination to continue working" (p. 19).

Self-directed adults initiate new learning projects frequently, especially when they are persuaded of a need to know. Adult educators must show adult learners how what they learn might be put into practice in real life or how it might improve the effectiveness of the learner's performance or the quality of their lives (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998).

A teaching tool to facilitate this 'need to know' includes "real or simulated experiences in which the learners discover for themselves the gaps between where they are now and where they want to be" (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998, p. 65; Knowles, 1990, p. 58). For instance, field trips and role play exercises are excellent real and simulated teaching methods, respectively.

Learners' Self-Concept and Teaching Methods. Another assumption about the adult learner postulated by Knowles is that of the learner's self-concept. As a person matures in his self-concept, he moves from that of a dependent personality toward one of a self-directing human being. And while Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) believe that we become adult by degree, their definition of an adult is based on this notion of being self-directing when they write, "we become adult psychologically when we arrive at a self-concept of being responsible for our own lives, of being self-directing" (p. 64).

Motivation combined with initiative propels adult students to find the resources to become informed and to expand their understanding of new ideas or tasks (Schuster, 2003). Yet, the educator must also create learning environments that enable adult students to move from being dependent (which is based on their formal conditioning) to self-directing learners (Knowles, 1990; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998).

The teaching method most suitable is actually the adult educator's attitude. The adult educator must take a genuine interest in and respect his adult students. This interest and respect

is best illustrated two ways: (a) when the educator gets to know each learner by his first name and (b) when the adult educator views his students not as receivers of solely his wisdom or knowledge but rather as those who have much to contribute to the learning experience. In other words, like the educational worldview of Paulo Freire, the adult educator is not so concerned with adult learners banking education but rather creating an atmosphere where students can dialogue (Findsen, 2007; Mayo, 2005). In this way, the adult educator shows his respect by listening to what each student says (Knowles, 1970, 1980).

Role of Learners' Experiences and Teaching Methods. This assumption takes advantage of the vast life experiences of the adult learner. The longer adults live the more they accumulate a growing reservoir of experience; this reservoir should not be viewed as a threat to the adult educator but rather as a rich resource for learning. Rogers (1993) comments on the attitudes that adults bring to the teaching-learning enterprise,

> Since the expectations which adults bring to the learning process are at least as important as the experience they bring (indeed, the expectations which are frequently built on this experience may be even more influential in promoting or hindering learning), it seems essential to explore the nature of these attitudes, the way they have been built up and how they may be changed. (p. 1)

Implications for this fact include the following: (a) teachers must be aware as practical of their students' individual backgrounds and seek to tailor the learning process to accommodate what the learners bring to the learning enterprise; (b) course content should consider greatly students' previous experiences and incorporate such experience into the course activities; and (c) teachers should encourage student-to-student instruction. Finally, the adult educator should

consider beginning with the collective experiences of his learners and solicit their assistance in the planning process (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998; Knowles, 1990; Schuster, 2003).

Because of this characteristic of the adult learner, the adult educator is encouraged to emphasize experiential techniques – methods that tap into the full range of experiences of the learners. Experiential teaching methods include group discussion, debate, simulation exercises, problem-solving activities, case method and peer-helping activities rather than using strictly the lecture method (Knowles, 1970, 1980).

For example, Douglas (1999) creatively simulated a field-trip without leaving the classroom for his Methods for Facilitating Adult Learning course at the University of New Brunswick. Following the preparation phrase in which Douglas sought input from students about their objectives, he simulated a trip to Bosnia during this country's time of ethnic cleansing horrors. Douglas used a Canadian Forces soldier who had actual experience in the Balkans, photos showing the destruction of buildings and children and he dressed the students up in helmets and flack vests so that they might sense the danger of landmines. After the field trip, students shared what they experienced.

Field trips allow students to observe a natural setting first hand, make classrooms more meaningful, provide opportunities to gain new experiences, and learn through active participation (Coughlin, 2010; Douglas, 1999; Dupre, 2010). While tapping into the vast experiences of adult learners, Knowles, Holton and Swanson (1998) remind us of the drawbacks too when they write, "as we accumulate experience, we tend to develop mental habits, biases and presuppositions that tend to cause us to close our minds to new ideas, fresh perceptions and alternative ways of thinking" (p. 66). So, it is incumbent upon adult educators to help adults examine their habits, biases and presuppositions while challenging them to open their minds

(Knowles, Holton & Swanson, 1998). Reflection and mediation is one technique to achieve this end.

Readiness to Learn and Teaching Methods. This assumption, the readiness to learn, is closely related to the development tasks of a learner's social role. Savicevic (2008) states,

> The concept of development of adults is a key element of andragogy. The research in psychology and in andragogy shows that more or less intensive, this development, as well as learning, happens during the whole life. The developmental tasks are different for each phase of the development, but people encounter them and try to solve them. (p. 364)

An adult learner's life and role transitions provide timely teaching moments. For instance, "some of the developmental experiences that predispose adults for Jewish learning are associated with parenting, caring for aging parents, parental death, chronic and terminal illness, divorce and family reconfiguration, intermarriage, geographic relocation, job shift, and retirement" Schuster (2003, p. 144).

Therefore, the astute and observant adult educator will look for teaching moments that coincide with the learners' developmental stages. For instance, it is wise for the adult educator to consider or start with real-life questions of adult learners like where will I be working? With whom will I be working (Knowles, 1970, 1980)? The educator might also consider homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings of learners to work through real-life concerns together (Knowles, 1970, 1980).

Orientation to Learning and Teaching Methods. This assumption, which is closely related to the need to know, is based on the idea that there is a change in time perspective as people mature – from future application of knowledge to immediacy of application. Thus, as a

learner, an adult is more "problem-centered" (often wondering, "How will this material apply to my current life situation?") rather than "subject-centered" ("What is the scope of this content?"). In sum, adult learners are quite pragmatic in their view of education – that is, they are asking, "how will this information help me perform tasks or deal with problems that confront me on a daily basis?"

This assumption calls for the adult educator to minimize theory and maximize application-based teaching. In short, this assumption implies that learning new knowledge is best achieved in the context of application to real-life situations (Knowles, 1990; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998). For instance, for the adult Jewish educator, finding connections between an ancient document like the Torah and life today is of primary importance when teaching the Jewish adult learner (Schuster, 2003). Discussion, role playing, and case methods are useful teaching methods (Knowles, 1970, 1980).

Motivation and Teaching Methods. Motivation of adult learner is the final assumption that must inform the adult educator's practice. Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) write that "adults tend to be more motivated toward learning that helps them solve problems in their lives or results in internal payoffs" (p. 149). Merriam (2001) concurs when she purports that adults are "motivated to learn by internal rather than external factors" (p. 5). And Knowles (1970) acknowledges that the adult learner is "more deeply motivated to learn those things he sees the need to learn" (p. 42).

Nevertheless, sometimes this motivation to learn is blocked by barriers such as negative self-concept as a student, one's age or race, one's past experiences as a student, inaccessibility of opportunities or resources, and time constraints (Knowles, 1990; Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 1998). Other barriers to learning include low self-esteem (James, 2003), gender (Sizoo *et al.*,

2003), anxiety and self-efficacy (Sizoo *et al.*, 2008), physiological barriers such as "changes in vision, hearing, and cognition" with changes in age (Kim & Merriam, 2010, p. 439) and finances (Vass, 2010). In particular, Vass contends that as adults get older, money management gets increasingly more difficult.

The teaching methods employed must not only facilitate learning but also help students to transcend these barriers to learning. This assumption complements the process step of self-diagnosis where competencies or characteristics of what qualify as achieving an ideal model of performance are outlined and agreed upon by the adult learner. And adult learner's motivation is maintained once he has a clear idea what constitutes an ideal model of performance (Knowles, 1970). Teaching methods must be used then to provide diagnostic experiences whereby the learner can assess his progress in meeting the ideal. Critical incident processes, computerized games, laboratory methods and simulation exercises are suitable teaching methods (Knowles, 1970, 1980). These teaching methods afford the instructor real-time opportunities to give the learner feedback so that he can objectively assess his strengths and weaknesses (Knowles, 1970, 1980).

Chapter Summary

A review of rabbinic or Tannaitic Judaism revealed that the teaching of adults has taken place within the context of Judaism since antiquity. And since 70 C.E., Jewish adults have been taught Rabbinic Judaism. Many teachers were engaged in teaching Torah: including fathers, priests, scribes, prophets and rabbis of course. Many teaching techniques were employed including object lessons, the dramatic method, and mnemonics to aid and abet memorization, storytelling, question and answer, and discussion. In contrast, the lecture, discussion and project methods are used today in the adult classroom. While it is clear that teaching methods were used

in antiquity, it is not clear what process elements were used as the Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education was noted to be unsystematized. This is not surprising considering that,

> When we speak of the Rabbinic philosophy of education, we do not wish to imply that there is a systematic presentation of that philosophy in the Bible or the Talmud. While very useful attempts have been made to present the history of Jewish education in Biblical and Talmudic times, to the best of my knowledge no one has heretofore even tried to present either *the* or a Rabbinic *philosophy* of education. (Greenberg, 1969, p. 18)

Since the early first century rabbis have been the chief teachers of the Torah. Their influence on Judaism in the first century gave rise to Rabbinic Judaism which is practiced and taught today.

Knowles' andragogical framework (namely, the teaching methods associated with his six assumptions about the adult learner and his eight andragogical process elements) has been used in a variety of settings including religious contexts, corporate American and even Girl Scouts. This framework is situated within the Humanistic Philosophy of Adult Education. And educators with a humanistic slant have the propensity to use Knowles' andragogical framework and the associated teaching methods which are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Teaching Methods Associated with Knowles' Six Assumptions

Knowles' Assumptions	Associated Teaching Methods
Need to Know	Field trips and role play
Learner's Self-Concept	Adult educator's attitude – listening to each student, calling each by his name, etc. Use of dialogue.
Role of Learners' Experiences	Experiential teaching methods include group discussion, debate, simulation exercises, problem-solving activities, case method and peer-helping activities
Readiness to Learn	Asking real-life questions; using homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings
Orientation to Learning	Discussion, role playing and case methods
Motivation	Critical incident processes, computerized games, laboratory methods and simulation exercises

The next chapter will present the researcher's methodology for discovering if an alignment exists between the teaching methods and process elements employed by a second century rabbi and Knowles' andragogical framework. This qualitative research study will use historiography in general but historical research in particular as the primary methodology to uncover the teaching methods and process elements of second century rabbi, Rabbi Akiva. Why Rabbi Akiva was selected to study is also covered in Chapter 3.

Chapter 3 – Methodology

This chapter outlines the research design and the method that was employed in this qualitative inductive study that seeks to answer the following research question: Do the teaching methods and process elements used by a second century rabbi align with Knowles' andragogical framework – namely, the teaching methods that are associated with his six assumptions and his eight andragogical process elements?

Since this study concerns itself in part with historical events (i.e., a second century rabbi's teaching methods and practice/process elements), as well as the interpretation of those events, a qualitative approach was a natural choice. This choice is supported by Miles and Huberman (1994), who suggest that the use of qualitative methods has "always been the staple of some fields in the social sciences, notably anthropology, history, and political science" (p. 1).

This was an inductive study with the purpose of discovering if the teaching methods and process elements that a second century rabbi used align with Knowles' andragogical framework. Knowles' andragogical framework has been tested and validated in a number of educational contexts. These contexts include corporate, workplace, business, industry, healthcare, government, higher education, professions, religious education, and elementary, secondary, and remedial education.

The theoretical framework was used to keep the research focused and it was used during the data analysis process. From the analysis, the researcher inductively identified the teaching methods and process elements employed by R. Akiva, a second century rabbi. The researcher was the primary instrument of data collection and analysis.

Selection of Rabbi Akiva

Rabbi Akiva, a second generation tannaim that functioned from about 90 to 130 CE, was chosen to study for a number of reasons. First, a local rabbi and colleague in St. Louis suggested him. Second, Rabbi Akiva and his colleagues, Rabban Gamaliel II, who led the academy at Yavneh after Yohanan ben Zakkai and Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcannus, took the lead in reconstituting Jewish life in Palestine and gathering together the traditions of their pre-70 C.E. Pharisaic and tannaitic forbearers (Newsome, 1992). Third, the many commendations written about Rabbi Akiva in history make him a worthy candidate. For instance, Solomon (1998) and Wigoder (2002) write that Rabbi Akiva was a pre-eminent sage of the Mishnaic era. Rabbi Akiva is considered by many to be the father of Rabbinic Judaism (Solomon, 1998). In fact, Cohen (2008) added "he may be described as the architect of the plan of the Mishnah" (p. xxvi). Rabbi Akiva even has a street in Bnei Brak named in his honor (Efron, 2003).

The significance of Cohen's claim above cannot be underestimated as the Mishnah, an anthology of rabbinic reflection and law, became the primary authority for rabbis and their students in Palestine and Babylonia. The Mishnah had six orders or tractates which can be traced back to Akiva's organizational skill (Newsome, 1992; Solomon, 1998; Wigoder, 2002). These six tractates or divisions are:

1. seeds (*zeraim*) which deal with benedictions and daily prayers, then mostly with agricultural laws;

2. appointed time (*moed*) which deal with laws that govern observances of the Sabbath, festivals and fast days;

3. women (*nashim*) which relates to marriage and divorce as well as vows;

4. <u>damages</u> (*nezikin*) which provides teaching on civil and criminal law, punishment, idolatry and ethical teachings;

5. <u>Holy Things</u> (*kodashim*) which discusses ritual slaughter, sacrifices and offerings, the temple and its services; and

6. <u>cleanness</u> (*tohorot*) which relate the laws of ritual purity and impurity.

Fourth, Rabbi Akiva was most noted as a halakhist (Solomon, 1998; Wigoder, 2002). The word halakhist comes from the word *halakhah* which means walking or guiding one's life. So, Rabbi Akiva was one who helped Jews learn and practice Torah. Akiva suffered martyrdom under the Romans in 132 or 135 C.E.

Finally, Akiva was also an adult educator. He had students or disciples and a school. At one time it was reported that he had over 24,000 disciples (Dicker, 2007; Roth, 1996). Among his students were Rabbis Meir, Judah bar Ilai, Yose ben Halafta and Simeon Ben Yohai. It was Akiva's disciples' style of teaching that was to later form the Mishnah (Soloman, 1998; Patten, 1980). Akiva also established an academy at Bene Berak that drew a large number of students, many who were the leading fourth generation tannaim (Wigoder, 2002). Clearly Rabbi Akiva was an important figure in the Rabbinic Judaism history and community.

In the literature rabbi is often designated as "R." Alternately, the name Akiva is spelled as Akiba, Aqiva and Abiqa. The researcher will use the following spelling throughout this document: Rabbi Akiva or R. Akiva; however, the spelling of his name in any citations will be used verbatim.

Historiography

The research method employed was historiography. Danto (2008) writes that "historiography is the term used to describe the method of doing historical research" (p. 4).

Historical research, while one component of historiography is the purposeful collection and analysis of historical data. Wiersma and Jurs (2005) inform us that "Historical research is a systematic process of searching for the facts and then using the information to describe, analyze and interpret the past" (p. 223). And in particular, my research would employ the cultural history model. Danto (2008) explains that,

> Cultural history today explores popular ceremonies, local traditions, distinctive
>
> ways of living, indigenous interpretations of historical experience, and the written
>
> and oral descriptions of knowledge, customs, and arts. Music, dance, sports,
>
> television, fads and fashion, education, technology and architecture are some of
>
> the domains of the cultural historian. (p. 17)

Historical research was applied to plumb the depths of the ancient Jewish education of adults. And like field notes, "historical research is analytical in that logical induction is used in arriving at conclusions" (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005, p. 223).

The historical researcher endeavored to locate primary and secondary sources or locate documents that are close chronically to these sources. A primary source according to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) is "a record (e.g., a diary, a relic, a map, or a set of test scores) that was generated by people who personally witnessed or participated in the historical events of interest" (p. 537).   Wiersma and Jurs (2005) define a primary source as "'an original or first-hand account of the event or experience' and a secondary source is an account that is at least once removed from the event" (p. 226).

Gall *et al.* (2007) define a secondary document as one in which individuals give an account of an event at which they were not present. Most historians do not have access to primary sources of data and so one's accounting of the past is aided by the availability of other secondary

sources. And according to Gottschalk (1950), the further the secondary sources are from the time of the events of which they tell, the more reliable they are prone to be.   Gottschalk (1950) goes on to give the reason why, "that is true not only because impartiality [bias] and detachment are easier for remote periods of history but also because as time elapses, more materials are likely to become available" to corroborate the historicity and veracity of evidence (p. 116). Yet, Barnett (1997) adds this caution, "sources which are distant from the event and which cannot be shown to rest on data closer to it are to be treated with appropriate critical caution" (p. 26). So, in light of this caution the historian's initial task in any inquiry is to gather and assemble the documentary sources available with the subsequent step being the classification of the sources in categories of genre and relative proximity to the subject under study (Barnett, 1997).

Historical Criticism

When evaluating the documents for their usefulness, the researcher was concerned with his source documents passing historical criticism. The constituent parts of historical criticism are external criticism and internal criticism.

External Criticism. External criticism is concerned with the authenticity and credibility of documents. Specifically, in historical research external criticism evaluates the validity of the document and asks where, when, and by whom it was produced (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). "With written material, the status of the author in the context is important. Was the author an on-the-spot observer (like Josephus), if the document appears to be a primary source? Are factors such as time and place consistent with what is known about the event?" (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005, p. 231). So, this researcher was aware of ghostwriters – so what may appear to be the product of a direct observer may in fact be a secondary source (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005).

For instance, after locating the documents, this historian asked questions like; does the apparent or claimed provenance of the historical document correspond to its actual origin? In short, are they authentic or have they been forged? For example, if someone wanted to conduct some research on my friend's dad who was a Marxist, the researcher will soon discover that my friend's dad forged his birth date in order to serve in World War I. To arrive at his correct age, the historian must continue searching for other documents that lead to a correct birth date.

This researcher asked questions such as who wrote it? Where? Under what conditions? Or which parts of the documents are genuine? There are pitfalls here of course. One being the existence of variant sources. Variant sources are original documents that have been modified in some way.

Another pitfall was the authorship of a document. Oftentimes an author will use a pseudonym to conceal his or her identity. For example, Barzun and Graff (1985) write, "Voltaire himself is said to have published under 160 pseudonyms and Franklin under 57" (p. 142). One way to verify authorship is to identify the handwriting, signature, seal, letterhead, or watermark. Oftentimes an author's writing style and vocabulary will be similar from one document to the next. Not only was the historical researcher concerned with authorship of a document but also its date. Gottschalk (1950) advises that,

> Some guess of the approximate date of the document and some identification of
> its supposed author (or, at least, a surmise as to his location in time and space and
> as to his habits, attitudes, character, learning, associates, etc.) obviously form an
> essential part of external criticism. Otherwise it would be impossible to prove or
> disprove authenticity by anachronisms, handwriting, style, alibi or other tests that
> are associated with the author's milieu, personality and actions. (p. 138)

One way to distinguish an accurate dating from a fabricated one is to examine to see whether the documents are not anachronistic. In other words, the documents must be indicative of their time.   Dating of documents serves the study's validity and credibility.

The researcher employed the services of a "critical friend" to help mitigate these concerns – questions of authorship, dating, etc. Namely, the researcher relied on the services of Dr. Ron Moseley, founder of and instructor for the American Institute of Advanced Biblical Studies (Little Rock, Arkansas) to help validate the authenticity of documents used for this research.

Internal Criticism. Internal criticism, according to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007), is concerned with evaluating the accuracy and worthiness of the statements contained in a historical document. Wiersma and Jurs (2005) note that "a pertinent question of internal criticism is whether the author was predisposed, because of position or otherwise, to present a biased rather than an objective account" (p. 231). For example, "biographies and autobiographies may tend to shift the emphasis from the event to the person. Fictitious details may be included by the author because of some personal factor" (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005, p. 231). So, Wiersma and Jurs (2005) warn that "an analysis of the author's style and use of rhetoric is important for internal criticism" (p. 231). That is, internal criticism carefully examines the content of the document. So, the historian asked such questions as, how much of the authentic parts are credible and to what extent? Is it probable that people would act in the way described by the writer? Is it physically possible for events described to have occurred this close together in time? Internal criticism is a bit more complex and subjective than external criticism as Gall, Gall, and Borg state, "[internal criticism] includes the historian's judgment about the truth of the statements in a historical source and also an evaluation of the person who wrote them" (p. 542).

For example, the opening of the gospel according to Luke in the Christian Bible we find these words,

Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things that have

been accomplished among us, just as those who form the beginning were

eyewitnesses and ministers of the word have delivered them to us, it seemed good

to me also, having followed all things closed for some time past, to write an

orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may have certainty

concerning the things you have been taught. Luke 1:1-4 (English Standard

Version)

Internal criticism would ask questions such as, "Was Luke, as an author and historian,

credible?" "Can he be trusted?" "Were the eyewitnesses he consulted reliable?" So, the

historian was ready to combine one or more witnesses' accounts to resolve apparent conflicts and

to discover what actually happened. The historian was also aware of reports or accounts being

biased. Oftentimes, a biased report results from a person wanting to make a story more dramatic

or to exaggerate his role in the story. To mitigate this pitfall, Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) advise,

Historians often must examine such factors as the ethnic background, political

party, religious affiliation and social status of an observer [or witness] in an effort

to appraise the likelihood of the bias. The use of emotionally charged language,

whether positive or negative, is one sign of commitment to a particular position

on an issue. (p. 543)

For example, one source of data for the historical researcher is oral histories. If a person

lived through the Holocaust, he or she will tell the story in way to accentuate some facts while

minimizing others. So such accounts must be corroborated by other oral histories.

The researcher believes that this research exceeded internal criticism because "rabbis carefully handed over teachings about Judaism to disciples who, in turn, as teachers delivered the traditions to their disciples, generation by generation" (Barnett, 1997, p. 138). Patten (1980) adds that "the aim of the rabbinic writers was to preserve and expound tradition and in this way their work was very helpful" (pp. 171-172).

Accessibility.

The primary and other sources consulted in this study were in English and therefore accessible. No document had to be translated from Aramaic or Mishnaic Hebrew to English. Specifically, the researcher consulted the Babylonian Talmud (BT) because it was in English; the Palestinian Talmud (PT) was in Mishnaic Hebrew (C. J. Collins, personal communication, November 9, 2010) and thus was not consulted.

Mitigating Pitfalls.

Given the subjective nature of historical research including the interpretation and analysis of data, historical researchers must first clarify their own values, beliefs, and experience concerning a topic that they are investigating because these values, beliefs and experience will allow one to 'see' certain aspects of past events and not others. Being aware of one's analytic or interpretation framework, will allow an increased sensitivity to the possible interpretational leanings of other historians who have conducted research on the same or similar topics (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). Gottschalk (1950) remarks, "to judge the historical writings of others intelligently, the historian needs some philosophical and ethical rules" (p. 11). So, one needs to know if he is a liberal or conservative; religious skeptic or devotee; a male chauvinist or feminist; modernist or postmodernist for example. It is imperative to clarify one's framework because history involves interpretation or the application of hermeneutics (and exegesis).

And unless historical researchers are aware of their predispositions, they can be quite extreme in their re-interpretation of history and impose their views or opinions on an ancient document. The historical researcher can quickly use eiogesis (reading into) and not exegesis. For example, revisionist or reconstructionist historians not only practice eiogesis on historical documents but they can go to the extreme of discounting a historical event. Evidence of this can be seen in some revisionist historians who argue that the Holocaust never occurred (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007; Heath, 2008).

As an interpreter of the U.S. Constitution, Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas is quite aware of the danger or temptation of imposing one's own opinion on interpreting an ancient document. So, he understands his job this way, there is "a determination to put 'a firewall between my view and the way I interpret the Constitution'" (Rivkin & Casey, 2008, p. A25). One way to assure a sound interpretation of the facts is to employ a critical friend. Again, in this role, this person served as a 'checks and balance' to make sure too much latitude was not taken in the interpretative step and to guard against anachronistic tendencies. In Thomas' case, he is flanked by 11 other 'critical friends' for accountability.

Presentism. All historical artifacts are the creation of a different time and place. So, the historian was aware of presentism. According to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) "presentism is the interpretation of past events based on concepts and perspectives that originated in more recent times" (p. 546). The U.S. Supreme Court Justices must be aware of this idea of presentism as they interpret the Constitution – a 200 year old document. They must be careful not to impose their meanings of words nor their personal views upon the constitution as they seek to interpret it. When talking about interpreting the constitution, Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas was quoted as saying, "at bottom what it comes to, is to choose to interpret this document as

carefully and accurately and as legitimately as I can, versus inflicting my personal opinion or imposing my personal opinion on the rest of the country" (Rivlan & Casey, 2008, p. A25).

The researcher mitigated this pitfall by not imposing a 21st century definition of words on the Babylonian Talmud. Additionally, the researcher consulted leading Jewish scholars and rabbis who also interpreted these Jewish customs, words, etc. in their original historical, social, political and cultural context. Furthermore, Dr. Ron Moseley, who is a member of the researcher's dissertation committee, served as a 'critical friend' to assure proper interpretation too.

Use of Concepts. Historical researchers can develop concepts to organize and interpret the data that they have collected (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) define concepts as "terms that can be used to group individuals, events or objects that share a common set of attributes" (p. 543).   One pitfall is that concepts can place limits on the historical researcher's interpretation of the past. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) offer this example,

> A researcher conducting a historical study of teaching might assume that the defining attribute of the concept of teaching is 'paid work done by someone who holds a state certificate signifying completion of a college-level teacher education program. This definition of teaching will cause the researcher to study certain individuals from a certain historical period but exclude others-for example, teacher aides, school volunteers, resource personnel-who would be considered to be teaching if a different definition of the concept were used. (p. 544)

The researcher mitigated this pitfall by collecting, organizing and analyzing the data according to Knowles' andragogical framework – namely, the teaching methods associated with his six assumptions and his eight process elements. Specifically, Knowles' teaching methods

associated with his six assumptions and his eight processes were used as categories to sort, code and analyze the data collected (Merriam, 2009). Thus, as the researcher collected historical data on R. Akiva, he organized and analyzed the data according to Knowles' teaching methods associated with his six assumptions and his eight process elements.

Researcher's Beliefs, Values, and Assumptions

The researcher is keenly aware that history (the past) can inform the present and the future. The researcher also believes that historicity and veracity are inextricably linked together and careful historical research can unearth facts or truth about R. Akiva's teaching methods and process elements employed. The researcher knows that understanding history involves the science of interpretation and that interpretation is both objective and subjective. Because interpretation is subjective, the researcher was aware of the bias he brings to the interpretative task. The researcher's bias is informed by his own Christian background and past seminary training. So, in light of this bias, the researcher strove to maintain an emic perspective when reading and interpreting this historical data. Moreover, the researcher realizes that revisionist theories abound in this postmodern context and that these theories can influence this researcher. This potential risk was mitigated by the researcher's educational background. The researcher has been trained how to correctly handle and interpret historical documents (Biblical texts in Hebrew and in Greek) while matriculating at Covenant Theological Seminary (St. Louis, MO) where he earned a Master of Divinity with honors.

Researcher's Aims and Data Collection

The goal of historiography in this study was to craft a description of Rabbi Akiva's teaching methodology – namely, his teaching methods and his process elements used to facilitate learning. The historical research aim of this qualitative research study was history-as-record.

So, the aim is not using history-as-actuality (or perished history that actually happened) but rather history-as-record (surviving records of what happened). Gottschalk (1950) aptly states it is "verisimilitude with regard to a perished past - a subjective process - rather than experimental certainty with regard to an objective reality" (p. 47). This aim goes counter to the exactness or preciseness of methods used by the quantitative researcher.

Historiography and Jewish Literature: A Paradox

The purpose of this study was to collect and examine trusted source materials or those which will pass external and internal criticism, analyze these historical sources and then piece together a description of Akiva's teaching methods and process elements. Historiography in general and historical research in particular was employed to achieve this aim.

We turn again to the definition of historiography and the purpose of historical research. Danto (2008) writes that "historiography is the term used to describe the method of doing historical research" (p. 4). Historical research, while one component of historiography, is the purposeful collection and analysis of historical data. Wiersma and Jurs (2005) inform us that "Historical research is a systematic process of searching for the facts and then using the information to describe, analyze and interpret the past" (p. 223). And Berg states that historical research is the systematic "recapture of the complex nuances, the people, meanings, events, and even ideas of the past" (p. 297).

However, the nature of Jewish literature presented a paradox. Although R. Akiva belonged to the cadre of tannaim, Yadin (2010) stated it plainly, "tannaitic literature is, on the whole, disinterested in biography" (p. 582). In sum, the capture of biographies on sages such as R. Akiva was not a priority. On one hand, Goldin (1976) reminds us that Jewish historical sources "are not lavish with biographical detail; [however] there is enough to make us confident

that a full-length portrait of each of these remarkable persons would reveal more than one expression of character and attitude" (p. 149). Neusner (1984) is a bit more straightforward, "biography [of these rabbis] figures in literature that pays little attention to the 'lives' and contains no sustained biography" (p. 1). Goldin (1976) adds that of,

> The approximately 420 Tannaim and 3,400 Amoraim little biographical
> information is furnished. Not biography is the aim of the storyteller, but
> hagiographa; and sometimes not even that, but simply partial commentary by
> illustration. And although there is a good deal that may be learned from such
> narratives, legend and presumable actuality interpenetrate one another so
> thoroughly, [these sources ultimately] deprive us of any clues of development,
> just what the historian must know if his account is to have some correspondence
> with reasonable reality. (pp. 38-39)

Neusner (1994) continues, "we turn to writings rich in biographical materials yet presented anonymously, and we review private opinions claiming normative status, that is, sayings and stories imputed to individuals, preserved in writing denying that individuals matter" (p. 1). Neusner finally sums up the paradox this way,

> Rabbinic literature is built out of sayings attributed to individuals, and stories
> about them. So the literary character of the movement contradicts the essential
> quality of the documents. Books without named authors, speaking in general
> terms about what everyone should do and strive to become, feature individuals'
> words and deeds, which by definition, speak for one person at a time, though
> (self-evidently) merging with the collectivity that, in sum, we call Judaism. (p. 2)

Green (1978) gives us several reasons why documents such as the Talmud offer no systematic or coherent biographies of its important sages. First, many rabbinic documents contain a considerable amount of material that cannot be attributable to a single rabbi. And in some instances students of a teacher would derive sayings from the rabbi's teachings and then attribute that derivative saying to the rabbi. Second, a single rabbi's life is often buried or made subservient to the goals of the legal documents. Third, because discussions were arrived at collectively and communally, and through rabbinic circles (and not individuals), rabbinic literature preserved and primarily transmitted these legal decisions (Green, 1978; Neusner, 2006). This last fact bolsters internal validity since authorship is not credited to a single rabbi but to multiple rabbis after reaching a consensus.

Biographical material from legal material or from non-legal material on sages was also limited because anonymity was the price a rabbi paid for inclusion in the circle to debate and to render decisions on legal matters (Neusner, 2006). Tradition dictated this anonymity. All Rabbinic literature emerged anonymously. Acceptance of this discipline of tradition gave rabbinic literature its transcendent and authoritative quality. What was of chief importance was the preservation of tradition; namely, the tradition to orally pass down authoritative teachings/instructions or interpretations/reinterpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures from master to student.

Rabbis believed that this oral tradition commenced with God's revelation to Moses at Sinai which was both public and oral. Rabbis (in C.E.) believed they stood in this tradition. Not only did these rabbis' oral supplements stand on the same authoritative ground as the original Hebrew Scriptures (the written law) but so did the rabbis' life (Gottwald, 1985; Neusner, 2006; Segai, 1996). The preservation of biographies and exaltation of individual names was not a

preoccupation of the rabbis as this would undermine this sacred practice of oral tradition which consisted of preserving and perpetuating God's authoritative words while the rabbi's identity remained cloaked in anonymity. Although legal material like the Talmud contains a huge corpus of stories about rabbinic sages, they are not complete; they are rather brief and partial stories about rabbis (Neusner, 2006). So, complete stories about rabbis rarely exist.

On the other hand, many Jews regard the "period of the tannaim [as] a heroic age." So, tannaim like R. Akiva would likely have later stories [or aggadah] written of them. However, some of these stories were embellished. That is why Freedman and Wald (2007) argue that some historical sources might be viewed as pseudoepigraphic at best. So many of the accounts are merely traditions and therefore possess no historical reliability or veracity. Freedman and Wald offer this sobering assessment, "given the number and complexity of the traditions surrounding the figure of R. Akiva, it will in all likelihood be some time before it will be possible to evaluate their relative historical value and the religious, social and literary tendencies imbedded in them" (p. 563). However, this is confounded by R. Mintz (personal communication, December 16, 2010) who contends that, "aggadic material is historical."

Despite this paradox, Agus (1962) notes that such rabbinic sources as the Mishnah, the Tosefta and Midrash came after the great slaughter of the Bar Kochba revolt (132-135 C. E.) and

> the motivation for both the act of composing books and their preservation was
> always the same: to save from oblivion any remnant of rabbinic learning that had
> been studied orally by hundred of teachers and students immediately before the
> catastrophe struck. (p. 9)

So, the single focus of these rabbis of antiquity as Neusner (1984) observes was not the making of a name for themselves; rather, "in the corpus of rabbinical writings, stories about holy men [such as the rabbis] proposed to illustrate and exemplify a standard applicable to all Israelites and to provoke a single effect among them" (p. 3). And R. Akiva, a second century tannaim, stood in that tradition of faithful transmission, preservation of what was delivered at Sinai by Moses – the first rabbi (Helmreich, 1982).

Based on this paradoxical nature of Rabbinic literature, the best the researcher was able to do in the words of Goldin (1976) was to attempt to construct "a profile, rather than a portrait, of Akiva" (p. 39). Finally, although less is affirmed about Akiva, a rabbinic biography is not so important for the study of Judaism because the subjects on which all authorities [rabbis] spoke are not defined by the idiosyncratic interests of the individual, but rather by the exceedingly well defined program of the document itself (Neusner, 1987).

Primary Sources

In light of the paradoxical nature of Rabbinic literature and the recommendations of leading rabbis and prominent Jewish scholars and universities the researcher opted to use the Babylonian Talmud (BT) as the primary source which includes the Gemara, Mishnah and Tosefta. The BT was consulted as a primary source for a number of reasons. First, Goldman (1975) offers this observation about the Talmud,

> The Talmud, which comprises the Mishnah and the Gemara, constitutes, after the
> Bible, the second greatest source for our knowledge of Judaism. It represents the
> best thought of the greatest teachers in two of the most creative centers of Jewish
> life in all of Jewish history, Palestine and Babylonia. (p. 43)

Goldman goes on to say that the "scholastic activities of many centuries, and of more than a thousand scholars, was turned into one book – the Talmud" (p. 43). The BT dates back to 600 C.E. and the original languages of the Talmuds were in Aramaic (Moore, 1960; Wald, 2007). However, the researcher used an English version of the Talmud. The Mishnah dates back to 240 C.E. (Helmreich, 1982). Second, most sources after these literary documents were appended with more aggadic tales. For example, according to Learner (1987) the Avot de Rabbi Nathan, a minor tractate, has been "appended from the Mishna[h] and Talmud" (p. 377). Three, the Babylonian Talmud is the actual record of what rabbis taught, preached, lectured and argued on. And four, when Jews refer to the Talmud they typically have the Babylonian Talmud in view (Goldin, 1960).

The Talmud is divided into major and minor tractates. For example, Avot DeRabbi Natan is a minor tractate while Sanhedrin is a major tractate. So, citations from the Babylonian Talmud are designated 'BT tractate name' as in BT Shabbath. The word Bavli also refers to the Babylonian Talmud. While the BT was the primary source, the researcher does include a few citations from the Palestinian (Yerushami) Talmud (PT). The Spertus Institute of Jewish Studies in Chicago, IL provided these few PT sources in English.

The researcher consulted the Soncino-English translation of the Babylonian-Talmud (Version 2.2). Note, the researcher downloaded this pdf file for free but the flash drive went bad; so he joined Spertus Institute of Jewish Studies Online Library which gave him access to the Babylonian Talmud.

Other Data Sources

Historiography and specifically historical research, while valid a research method, must meet stringent criteria to pass the external and internal criticism of historical research and to

overcome pitfalls already noted. So, this researcher contacted leading Jewish scholars to mitigate this concern. These scholars are listed below and the resources they recommended.

- Dr. Richard Kalmin Professor, Talmud and Rabbinics at the Jewish Theological Seminary (New York, NY) suggested the most recent edition of the *Encyclopedia Judaica*.

- Bruce Neilson of the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania recommended the *Encyclopedia Judaica* and works by Avigodr Shin'an.

- Jewish Scholar Jacob Neusner and Mark Washofsky, Professor of Talmud/Rabbinics at Hebrew Union College recommended Louis Finkelstein's *Akiba: Scholar, Saint and Martyr*.

- Dr. Ron Moseley, of American Institute of Advanced Biblical Studies in Little Rock, Arkansas, suggested *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* and works by David Flusser and S. Safari. He also recommended works about Rabbi Eliezer b. Hyrcanus who was one of R. Akiva's teachers.

- Mark Washofsky, Professor of Talmud/Rabbinics at Hebrew Union College, recommended *The Book of Legends* by Bialik and Ravnitzky.

- Priscilla Pense of Biblescholars.org recommended *Jesus the Rabbi (and his Rabbinic Method of Teaching)* by Roy B. Blizzard, Ph.D.

- Bruce Neilson of the Center for Advanced Judaic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, recommended *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* by Hermann L. Strack.

- R. Mintz recommended the Bavli Talmud which is another name for the Babylonian Talmud.

So, in addition to Palestinian Talmud and Babylonian Talmuds some of these sources were consulted too.

Data Analysis

An analysis of the data was based on these two assertions: (a) an educator's beliefs and assumptions inform practice (teaching methods and process elements employed), and (b) a theoretical framework is required to interpret the collected data. If an educator's beliefs and assumptions inform practice (what he or she does in the classroom, what teaching methods and process elements he uses, etc.), then the converse is true: practice illumines or points to beliefs and assumptions that the educator has about the adult learner.   This means of course, by studying R. Akiva's practice, we might understand more about the Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education (RPAE).

The importance of a clear theoretical framework cannot be underestimated. A clear theoretical framework according to Caliendo and Kyle (1996) enables the author (or researcher),

> to undertake two very important processes: (1) to inform the reader of the
> underpinnings and assumptions implicit in the work; and (2) to consider whether
> and how the model, research design, operationalization of concepts, and/or data
> analysis flow logically and soundly from the theory. (p. 225)

It is the second benefit that comes into play when doing data analysis because the researcher's theoretical framework, namely Knowles' andragogical framework, facilitated a data analysis that flowed logically and soundly. So based on these two assertions the historical raw data collected on Rabbi Akiva's teaching methods and process elements were analyzed according to teaching methods that are associated with Knowles' six assumptions for the adult learner and his eight andragogical process elements. The researcher used the concepts or

categories associated with Knowles' andragogical framework to analyze the data. For example, when the researcher found among the historical data Akiva's teaching method of debate, he sorted and analyzed this method according to Knowles' teaching method of debate.

Data Analysis Comparisons

Data collected from the historical research was processed analyzed through the grid above. Emerging from this analysis was an answer to the research question: Do the teaching methods and process elements used by Rabbi Akiva (second century rabbi) align with Knowles' andragogical framework –namely, the teaching methods that are associated with his six assumptions and his eight andragogical process elements. The results of this side by side comparison are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4 – Data and Analysis

The importance of education and therefore, study and learning is stressed all throughout the Torah – in both the Written and Oral Law. And the holiest Jewish prayer, the *Shema*, succinctly captures this sentiment. The *Shema*, which is recited several times a day by observant Jews, is,

> Hear, O Israel! The Lord is our God, the Lord alone. You shall love the Lord your
>
> God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your might. Take to
>
> heart these instructions with which I charge you this day. Impress them upon
>
> your children. Recite them when you stay at home and when you are away, when
>
> you lie down and when you get up. Deuteronomy 6:4-7 (Tanakh)

From this prayer, many Jews conclude and are convinced that the command to learn was divinely ordered and that knowledge itself had a divine origin (Drazin, 1940; Helmreich, 1982). Moreover, "the study of Torah was declared to be among those functions of the religious life upon which there is no fixed limit, like acts of loving-kindness and equal in import to all others taken together" (Commission of Jewish Education, 1927, pp. 6-7). Every Jew, no matter his station in life, knew he was obligated by the Law to study Torah.

This obligation to study Torah was coupled with the fact that learning the Torah was highly esteemed. Ginzberg (1928) illuminates the value of studying Torah, "the Torah is a crown and raises its wearer to the highest rank of society. But the crown of the Torah has value only if the man that wears it joins to it the crown of good deeds" (p. 57). That is, the study of the law or the Torah was the chief concern or it was the sole curriculum for rabbis and lay people

alike. And further, Ginzberg's statement also implies explicitly that learning went hand-in-hand with practice or doing the Torah.

Isaacs (1925), Blizzard (2004) and Lassner (1999) take it a step further as they all agree that study of the Law was not a utilitarian idea or a means to an end; rather, it was a regarded as a highly meritorious act and a form of worship. Isaacs (1925) succinctly states, "Torah-study is worship because it brings the Jew and his God into closer contact" (p. 6).

Rabbis were under obligation to teach and to learn and not to teach was considered absurd. This idea is captured in this statement by Rabbi Yose ben Halafta in the second century of the Common Era, "To learn and not to teach - there is nothing more futile than that" (Midrash Rabbah Ecclesiastes 5:7; Midrash Rabbah Leviticus 22:1). Simply put, rabbis wholly devoted themselves to the study and teaching of Torah.

There have been many commendations ascribed to Rabbi Akiva (see Chapter 3). Additionally, Fendel (1981) writes that Rabbi Akiva, who is dubbed the "prince of Torah", taught over 24,000 students or disciples (p. 166). For example, Ginzberg (1928) cites one such disciple of Akiva was Rabbi Meir, who was considered "the most distinguished disciple of R. Akiva and the greatest scholar of his time" (p. 53). Rabbi Simeon ben Yohai was another disciple of R. Akiva. The commendations about R. Akiva and his role as an educator in antiquity are numerous and remarkable considering two facts. First, Akiva was ignorant of the law and hostile toward Rabbis until the age of 40 (Fendel, 1981; Strack, 1931). And second, Akiva had an utter disdain for learned men like rabbis. Before Akiva became a learned man himself, he wanted to maul scholars or rabbis like an ass. He said this,

When I was an 'am ha-arez (unlearned), I said: I would that I had a scholar

[before me], and I would maul him like an ass. Said his disciples to him, Rabbi,

say like a dog! The former bites and breaks the bones, while the latter bites but

does not break the bones, he answered them. (BT Pesachim 49a-b)

Chapter Outline

The findings in this section relate to the period immediately before Akiva taught adult

learners in his yeshiva or academy. Additionally, this section relates specifically to teaching

methods and process elements used by Akiva. Interestingly, many of the methods and process

elements used predate Akiva and his contemporaries. This section also presents the findings on

work unique to Akiva. Moreover, this section presents findings about the origin of the yeshiva,

the yeshiva's curriculum, the literary output of the yeshiva, the oral instructional culture of the

yeshiva and the instructor's sitting position. The curriculum, the oral instructional culture and

the instructor's sitting posture were common across all yeshivas; and with each age, yeshivas

produced rabbinic literature. Finally, the findings about Akiva, the person are presented before

relating the findings of Akiva as an adult educator.

The Yeshiva: Origin and Operation

The destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. disrupted the Jewish nation (Helmreich, 1982).

And Goldman (1975), Ginzberg (1928) and Bacher (1901) remark that it was after the

destruction of the Temple and the 480 accompanying synagogues in Jerusalem that the study of

the Torah became much more intensive. Emerging from this aftermath was the emergence of

academies or yeshivas or its Aramaic cognate, *metivta* (BT Gittin 60b). And Goldman (1975)

contends that the start of these academies or schools of higher learning (or bet ha-midrash) was

located in "the injunction of Yose ben Joezer (early second century B.C.E): 'Let thy house be a

regular meeting place for learned men' – *a bet vaad la-hakhamin*" (p. 24). [Where] the term *bet*

vaad means 'a stated place of meeting', which denotes "a meeting place of scholars, or a school,

not the place where a congregation gathered for prayer or worship" (Goldman, p. 24-25). In other words, these yeshivas were distinct from the synagogue.

The yeshiva was "an autonomous rabbinic institution" (Levine, 2000, p. 450). R. Pappa and R. Joshua b. Levi clearly distinguishes the synagogue from the academy in their respective claims. R. Pappa claims that it is permissible to turn a synagogue into an academy but not vice versa, while R. Joshua b. Levi states that one can sell a synagogue in order to buy an academy but not vice versa (BT Megilah 26b-27a).

Similarly, the Bavli also makes a distinction where Torah study is promoted or the house of study (bet ha-midrash) and a place where prayer is promoted or the house of prayer (beth ha-tefillah) which occurred in the synagogue (BT Megilah 27a). It is important to note that while the Temple and many synagogues were destroyed in 70 C.E., Gutmann (1975) cites that the synagogue would nonetheless emerge as the replacement for the Temple and serve as the "official religious institution of Pharisaic-Rabbinic Judaism" (p. 40). This is not to say that the rabbis did not use the synagogues for their own purposes.

Yeshiva means to sit, dwell or remain (Brown *et al.*, 1997). Indeed, second century sages like Akiva warmly recommended "the practice of exiling oneself to a place in which the Torah is taught" (Ginzberg, 1928, p. 69). Or practically and literally, the yeshiva "denotes a place in which people sit together, namely, scholars who expound the biblical text and the sacred law, issue authoritative rulings concerning the interpretation and application of the law, and decide legal and religious question submitted to them" (Lassner, 1999, p. 264).

The sole activity of these yeshivas was the study and elaboration of the Five Books of Moses or Torah (Helmreich, 1982). In the worldview of these rabbis law must facilitate an improvement of society and public welfare or the sake of human flourishing (Goldin, 1960). So,

learning Torah indeed had a goal: to change society so that all humans might flourish. These academies were not to be regarded as retreats for intellectual exercises; rather, law was being developed at these places of study. And this law was meant be applied to positively affect every citizen of society. For these teachers and students there was no dichotomy between the lecture hall (the place of learning) and the market place (the place of application) (Goldin, 1960).

While the word, *yeshiva*, is commonly associated with the word academy, Goodblatt (1975) argues to assume this was a formal institution like today would be anachronism. Rather, Goodblatt suggests that in the 2 C.E., yeshiva meant primarily an academic or legislative activity. So he suggests that yeshivah "is a session that is either judicial or academic" (p. 71). This means an academy or session could be held anywhere where rabbi and disciples were. In fact, it was not uncommon for Torah study at the yeshiva to take priority over all other matters. For instance, from the Babylonian Talmud (BT) are these words, "What should a man do in order to become wise? Let him increase in yeshivah and decrease in commence" (BT Nidah 70b). Literally, this means for the one who wants to become wise, let him sit for a long period of time in study or with a group of colleagues and sages (BT Nidah 70b; Goodblatt, 1975).   Even poverty was no excuse for neglecting the study of Torah (Drazin, 1940).

Instead of regarding yeshiva as an academy per se the best option according to Goodblatt (1975) and Rubenstein (2003) is to regard yeshiva as a study session. And in our case, R. Akiva was the head of the session (or rosh yeshivah). Sometimes these sessions took place in a study hall (*bet ha-midrash*) of a yeshivah (Hartman, 1999; Levine, 2000). Alternatively study halls can be regarded as lecture halls (Finkelstein, 1928-1930; Goldman, 1975). At other times, a study session occurred in open air (Bulcher, 1914; Krauss, 1948) or at the home of the master (BT Avoth 4:12).

While these academies surfaced in late first century, Helmreich (1982) and Goldman (1975) contends that the training or schooling of patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob which came prior to the revelation at Mt. Sinai, took place in the yeshivas of their day. However, despite this tradition, the establishment of the study houses did not come until much later in Jewish history around early second century B.C.E.

These houses of study or *bet ha-midrash* were the places where students gathered to listen to Midrash - the discourse on or exposition of the Torah (Goldman, 1975). These study houses or houses of study could be a room within a rabbi's private house or apartment or room within a building that had been donated by wealthy donors (Heszer, 2001). It is important to note that these academies or study houses were not only located in an enclosed space but wherever one found a rabbi and his students, he found an academy. In this context, one found young and old members who devoted most or all their time to study (Safrai, 1976). In addition to these study houses for those who belonged to the rabbis' immediate disciple circle, there were also public study houses for those who could spare the time (Hezser, 2001).

This was chiefly an interpretative culture and the object of the rabbis' scrutiny was the Torah – a body of material that was studied and analyzed (Hartman, 1999). And in this culture all views were welcomed and encouraged. In word words, alternative opinions were not only welcomed but were retained and studied and in some cases became law later. Accepting other dissenting views facilitated the rich creativity of the sages' moral imagination (Hartman). In fact, Goldin (1960) contends that all the sages "insisted that in each generation scholars were entitled to search the Torah thoroughly and with the assistance of reason and logic, derive new meanings and new legal prescriptions" (p. 131). This process employed was dubbed the midrashic process or a process of discovery.

First Yeshiva

The academy at Jabneh (or Jamnia), which was west of the fallen Jerusalem, was the first to be established by Rabbi Johanan ben Zakki and at the end of the first century other academies sprung up in Pekiin, Lydda, and Bene-Barak (Ginzberg, 1928; Lassner, 1999; Helmreich, 1982). Under the leadership of R. Zakki, "teaching and research were zealously conducted" (Goldin, 1960, p. 148). At the Jabneh, "the roots of literature of tradition – the Midrash and Mishnah, Talmud and Haggadah were nourished and strengthened" (Bacher, 1901, p. 147). Yet, the notion of an academy even predates this time as Bacher (1901) argues that the ruins of Ezra's academy were discovered near Nehardea.

Yeshiva Curriculum

The development of the intellect was of chief importance to the rabbis when teaching their students as the Talmud puts it, "He who has knowledge, has everything; he who lacks knowledge, lacks everything" (BT Nedarim 41a). And a Jew did not want the label 'am ha-arez. Literally, this phrase means people of the land but in Babylonian Talmud it means an ignorant and uncultured person (Ginzberg, 1928). Thus, the curriculum of the yeshiva was the means to this end – the development of the intellect.

The curriculum delivered at these yeshivas during the tannaitic period was quite simple. The main object of study was the Oral Law. The Oral Law had three primary disciplines: (a) Midrash (also called Talmud) which is the higher investigation of the meaning of Scripture; (b) Halakhah which are the formulations of Jewish oral law; and (c) Aggadah (Goldman, 1975; Safrai, 1976). Not all rabbis dealt with all these disciplines in equal measure; yet, the great sages left their mark on all three disciplines and some sages specialized in a few. R. Akiva mostly left his mark on the halakhah material as he is often noted as a halakhist. In addition to these

subjects, students also learned astronomy with the accompanying subject of math and mystical and philosophical speculation (Safrai, 1976). Furthermore, to rabbis like Akiva "all of life is a religious experience; since the division between religious and secular does not exist" (Goldin, p. 160). Therefore, rabbis studied elements of botany and physiology for ritual problems and problems related to civil law (Goldin, 1960).

Literary Output of Yeshivas

These academies sought to interpret the Law so that it could address every aspect of life. In the mind of the Talmud authors no aspect of the human condition was unworthy of divine concern and investigation (Hartman, 1999). And perhaps unique to Jewish people is this insight by Agus (1962), "every so-called flowering of literary composition was not the result of a great upsurge in cultural activity but rather the aftermath of a great tragedy" (p. 9). Finally, the material accumulated was assembled in two comprehensive collections – the Palestinian (or Jerusalem) and the Babylonian Talmud (Commission of Jewish Education, 1927). The Talmud, a term sometimes used to include the Mishnah as well, became the authoritative source of Jewish religion and law and formed the main object of study in the Jewish schools (Commission of Jewish Education, 1927; Lassner, 1999).

Oral Learning Culture

Teaching, preaching (or expounding), translating and praying in the yeshiva culture was strictly an oral or auditory one. Indeed, "everything a [disciple] knew, he derived orally from the mouth of his teachers" (Agus, 1962, p. 12). However, this oral culture had implications. For example, writing or note taking was forbidden (Safrai, 1987). At least two reasons were given for this prohibition. First, Hezser (2001) explains that advantage of oral teaching over book learning (or what was written) afforded the student the "opportunity for a creative adaptation and

development of the memorized tradition" (p. 100). Oral teaching gave students the freedom to interact and think about what was heard. And this prohibition on writing facilitated further formulation of the law and its application instead of being saddled with note taking which was not considered trustworthy of historical reminiscences (Hezser, 2001). There are a few examples of note taking (e.g., Tosefta Shabbath 1:13) but primarily the memorization and adaptation of one master's oral rulings and teachings took priority.

Second, the prohibition on note taking was because sages understood oral literary activities as a continuation of and manifestation of the Oral Torah which was given audibly by God to Moses at Mount Sinai. Thus, written halakhot was not authoritative; in contrast, oral halakhot was authoritative or binding.   Not only was writing forbidden but no written manuscript was even allowed in the academy. This prohibition is captured in the Babylonian Talmud, "Things that are written you may not say orally; things that are oral you may not say from writing" (BT Gittin 60b).

Another reason given for this prohibition on note-taking and having a written text in the academy was protection against fixity. In the minds of sages, only the words recorded in the Pentateuch and the prophetic books of the Bible were fixed texts. Consequently, this prohibition allowed for a living Torah – a Torah that was created, studied and passed on to future generations not in books but in the milieu of lively and vociferous discussions were rabbis and students understood plainly that they were defending a human point of view and not the final word of God (Hartman, 1999; Safrai, 1987).

In this view, rabbis believed that using fixed notes or wording would stifle live discussions and the fluidity of their tradition and thus, preclude change and development.   It was during the Amoraic period that a process of writing down the oral Torah had officially began.

However, during the time of R. Akiva or the Tannaitic period, the prohibition of writing and not having manuscripts was still in effect.

Instructor's Teaching Position

Before discussing Akiva's teaching methods in detail it is interesting to note that R. Akiva like many rabbis before him stood to read the Torah but sat to teach the Torah. For example, one tractate states,

Once, as R. Akiva sat teaching his disciples and recalling what he had done in his youth, he exclaimed:

I give thanks unto You,

O Lord my God,

That You have set my portion

Among those who sit in the house of study

And have not set my portion

Among those who loiter at street corners in the marketplace. (BT Avot de Rabbi

Nathan 21)

Safrai (1976) informs us that "the sage who taught sat either on a pillow or a chair (*cathedra*), or like his disciples on the floor or on mats" (p. 968). Decades earlier, Rabbi Jesus read from the scroll of Isaiah and then sat down to teach or preach (Luke 4:20 English Standard Version). And Levine (2000) writes, "in rabbinic society, a sage would sit in front of his students while teaching" (p. 324). The Babylonian Talmud speaks of R. Akiva having a special seat on which he sat (BT Yevamoth 98a).

One of Akiva's teachers, R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus sat on a stone in his study hall (Nadich, 1998; Renov, 1975). For a teacher to sit or to have a special seat can be traced back to Moses, a

teacher of Jewish law (Midrash Exodus Rabbah 43.4). Nadich (1998) also reports that the study hall of Eliezer was shaped like an arena – which was oblong with seats on both sides. Whether R. Akiva emulated his instructors is uncertain, but one thing was certain, Goldman (1975) writes, "teachers were reminded that they must emulate the master teacher of Judaism, Moses" (p. 54).

Akiva: The Person

Adult education is indeed a personal experience. That is, information is exchanged from person to person in the educational context. And in the Rabbinic Judaism tradition, the rabbi, was the center of this information exchange. As such, who exactly is the person behind R. Akiva?   While this section will focus on and examine Akiva as a shepherd and adult learner, several comments are worth mentioning that provide some insight into Akiva the person. Specifically, Akiva exuded kind-heartedness. He was also genuine, generous and sensitive to his disciples and he was a humble educator. Finally, Akiva was organized.

Kind-hearted

Many of Akiva's disciples recognized his kind-heartedness. However, most notably God recognized his kind-heartedness. As an illustration of Akiva's kind-heartedness, one example will suffice. All of Israel was suffering due to lack of rain and nation-wide fasts were of no avail. Rabbi Eliezer [teacher of Akiva] recited twenty-four prayers but he was not answered. Then Rabbi Akiva stepped up after him and he simply offered this prayer: "Our Father, Our King, we have no King but You. Our Father, Our King, for Your sake, have compassion upon us," and immediately the rains fell (Nadich, 1998, p. 15). Why wasn't the master's prayers answered and why was the disciple's prayers answered. (Note, in this account, Akiva is the disciple; while R. Eliezer is the master.) The explanation came from a heavenly voice that said,

"Not because Rabbi Akiva is greater than Rabbi Eliezer but because he is more kind-hearted" (BT Ta'anith 25b; BT Yoma 23a).

Genuine

Akiva was quite observant of and genuinely cared for his disciples. Nadich (1998) gives this account, "One day Rabbi Akiva's students was sitting with a long face and the rabbi asked him the reason for it" (p. 24). On another occasion one of his students became ill. While many sages did not attend to this student, Rabbi Akiva not only went to visit his student but cleaned the student's room and took care of the student's needs. When the sick man recovered, he said to Rabbi Akiva, "Rabbi, you have saved my life." Thereafter, Rabbi Akiva taught, "Whoever does not visit the sick may be guilty of shedding blood" (BT Nedarim 40a; BT Shabbat 127a).   Rabbi Akiva knew that the Talmud valued visiting the sick.

Generous

R. Akiva was wealthy like his contemporary R. Tarfon. But unlike R. Tarfon, R. Akiva was generous with his wealth. From the Midrash we get this account,

Once Rabbi Tarfon gave Rabbi Akiva six hundred centenaria of silver and said to

him, "Go and buy a field so that we may labor in the Torah and be supported by

the income from the field." He took the money and gave it away to poor scribes,

teachers, and others who labor in the Torah. After some time had passed, Rabbi

Tarfon and Rabbi Akiva were together again and Rabbi Tarfon asked his friend,

"Did you buy the field as I asked you to do?" "Yes," he replied. "Can you show it

to me?" "Yes," answered Rabbi Akiva and he took him to see the poor scribes,

teachers, and those who labor in the Torah. Rabbi Tarfon asked him, "Does a

person give something away for nothing? What do I get for my money?" Rabbi

Akiva replied, "It is with David, king of Israel, of whom it is written, He gives freely to the poor, his beneficence lasts forever; his horn is exalted in honor (Psalms 112:9). This means that in this world his horn is exalted in honor and in the World to come his beneficence lasts forever. (Rabbah Leviticus 34:16)

Sensitive

While Akiva considered erudition of primary importance, he was nonetheless always sensitive of his disciples' obligation to their families. Finkelstein (1990) recounts this illustration of Akiva's mindfulness, "two of the young men who sat before him, Simeon ben Yohai and Hanina ben Hakinai, had left their homes to devote themselves entirely to their studies. One day Akiva said to Hanina, 'Your daughter must be of marriageable age; go home and get her married'" (p. 175).

Humble

R. Akiva was not only kind-hearted, genuine, generous, and sensitive but he was a humble man. One illustration will demonstrate his humility. A matron loaned Rabbi Akiva a large sum of money that was needed for the school house. Akiva gave her his word that the money would be paid back but he got ill and that delayed prompt payment. When Akiva recovered, he brought the matron the money and apologized for its tardiness. Akiva's apology to a woman is significant considering that women were low on socio-economic ladder in antiquity.

Akiva's kind-heartedness, genuineness, generosity, sensitivity and humility speak to his character. Below is a discussion of his organizational acumen which had far reaching implications for many generations posthumously.

Organized

Akiva was organized as he is "commonly attributed with the systematization of the

Halakah" (Moore, 1960, 87). This was no small feat as the halakah is the corpus of legal and

authoritatively binding rulings of the oral and written law (Cohen, 2008; Moseley, 2000). Not

only did Akiva bring organization to the halakah but he also, as previously stated, was the

architect of the Mishnah. That is, the six orders or tractates of the Mishnah can be traced back to

Akiva's organizational skill. Additionally, it was Akiva's ability to classify the vast array of

knowledge contained in the oral law into a specific pattern. And this pattern was not only used

for the compilation of the Mishnah by Akiva's distinguished student, R. Meir but it also used for

a specific pattern of Mechilta, Sifra, Sifrei and aggadah (Fendel, 1981; Strack, 1931).

Akiva's Beginning in Torah Study

Three historical accounts are typically told about Akiva's beginnings in the study of

Torah. While these three accounts do not necessarily agree on many details, they nonetheless

share one common denominator, that is, there is uncertainty when Akiva started learning Torah.

For example, the Palestinian Talmud describes Akiva's early years as a student of Rabbis Eliezer

and Yehoshua (Joshua) as undistinguished – which means we are not sure when he started (PT

Pesachim 6.3, 33b).

Historical Account 1

This story is based on BT ARNA (BT Avot de Rabbi Nathan A) Chapter 6 and BT

ARNB (BT Avot de Rabbi Nathan B) Chapter 12. This first story relates Akiva standing by the

mouth of a well in Lod, his native hometown. He asks a reflective question, "Who hollowed out

this stone?" He is told that "water wears away stone" according to Job 14:19 (Tanakh). Akiva

responded to himself that if something like water which is soft can penetrate a hard stone, then

certainly the words of Torah can penetrate my heart with is like iron. Afterwards, Akiva seeks

out an elementary school and approaches a *melamde ha-tinokot* or teacher of little children and

requests, "Master, teach me Torah" (Avot de Rabbi Nathan A Chapter 6 and Avot de Rabbi

Nathan B Chapter 12). R. Akiva took one end of the tablet and his son took the other end and

the teacher wrote down *aleph bet* and Akiva learned it. The teacher wrote down *aleph tav* and he

learned it. Finally, Akiva learned the next curricular piece for children, the book of Leviticus.

Historical Account 2

Unlike the first account, this narrative is based on BT Ketuboth 62b and BT Nedarim

50a. Following the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, many Jews sought work for

sustenance. Akiva, son of Joseph (a recent convert to Judaism), was no exception. Although a

convert to Judaism, Akiva hated Torah scholars. At the recommendation of a neighbor who was

impressed with Akiva's sharp mind and wisdom, a wealthy Kalba Savua interviewed Akiva to

serve as "supervisor to oversee the shepherds and take charge of his herds and flocks, as well as

other affairs of the estate" (Lehmann, 2003, p. 4).

Savua asked Akiva under what conditions he would be willing to work for him? Akiva

was hired after he answered, "I will ask you to pay me according to the value of my labor. I am

certain that you will not underpay me" (Lehmann, 2003, p. 5). Before departing to greet another

guest – the son of a childhood friend who Savua hoped would marry his only daughter, Rachel,

and become his son-in-law, he asked Akiva to govern his duties per the Halachah. However,

because Akiva was never encouraged to learn he had no idea what the Halachah required and

was cynical as evident by his reply, "All those sages together were not able to save the Holy City

from destruction" (Lehmann, p. 6). Again, this statement shows Akiva's disdain for rabbis or

learned men.

Akiva's supervision proved very beneficial for Savua. Lehmann (2003) comments, "the flocks and herds were thriving under his supervision and the shepherds did not dare neglect their duties" (p. 15). Yet, Akiva's disdain for rabbis and their learning persisted as he considered them out of touch with the practical world. Rachel, the daughter of Savua, noticed how modest and teachable Akiva was and offered him this proposal, "I will marry you if you study Torah" (p. 23). Akiva leaves his wife, Rachel, and attends to the study of Torah with his teachers, Rabbis Eliezer, Joshua and Nachum of Gimzo. When he returns to his family after twelve years of study with 12,000 of his own students, he over hears his wife Rachel speaking with a neighbor. Rachel said to the neighbor, "Were he to listen to me, he would stay away and study another twelve years." When Akiva heard this conversation in secret, he returned and spent another twelve years in study and accumulated another 12,000 students. For the wife to give permission for men to leave home for a place of learning was not unusual for rabbis like Akiva (Safrai, 1976).

Historical Account 3

Finally, this narrative is based on PT Nazir 7.1, 56a. While on a journey, Akiva came across a cadaver and he carried it over three miles until he discovered a cemetery. Once there, Akiva buried the body. His teachers Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua (also spelled Yehoshua) interpreted this incident as follows, "Every step you took is reckoned against you as if you had shed blood." Akiva responded, 'If, in a case where I intended to perform a meritorious act I have made myself liable like a wicked person, how much more will I deserve punishment when I have no meritorious intent." It was from this moment on that Akiva did not forfeit an opportunity to sit at the sages' feet to learn.

Harmonization of the Narratives

Yadin (2010) rendered and Hezser (2001) offers cogent arguments to dismiss the ARN accounts as historical. For example, Yadin argued that the biographical narrative of Akiva in ARN's account is basically a mosaic that is drawn from early rabbinic sources. Boyarin (1993) adds that the practice of leaving one's wife for more than a month at a time was in conflict with the moral boundaries of both early Palestinian and Babylonia supreme authorities. Finally, Boyarin continues that the romance between Akiva and Rachel was Babylonian Talmud's attempt at a "utopian resolution and justification for local practice" (p. 150).

Moreover, Yadin stated that "Avot de Rabbi Nathan's assumption that there were schools during R. Akiva's lifetime that instructed the general public in everything from the *aleph bet* to the interpretation of Leviticus and beyond is anachronistic" (p. 581). Similarly, the ARNB is anachronistic because instead of attending a rabbinic or public elementary school, Akiva and his son likely attended a scribal academy (BT Ketuboth 2.10; BT Sukkah 2.6). Furthermore, Friedman (2004) argues that the theme of [a] shepherd laboring to earn his wife in marriage, as Jacob did for Rachel in Genesis 29-31 (Tanakh), is not found in the ARNB or the ARNA. Again, rabbinic biographies are not complete or precise enough to describe Akiva's beginnings in Torah education and stories beyond the Mishnah and Talmuds are at best embellished and reverent hagiographic accounts (Yadin, 2010).

Akiva as Adult Learner

Rabbis in antiquity often studied under more than one rabbi. Akiva learned from R. Eliezer but he also learned from Rabbi Joshua and Nahum of Gimzo (Goldman, 1975). It has been documented that when R. Akiva studied under R. Eliezer he did not understand what he learned; but when he studied under R. Joshua he did understand it (BT Sanhedrin 68a).

Finkelstein (1990) makes this observation about Akiva, "during the eight or ten years which Akiva spent under the tutelage of Joshua ben Hananya and Nahum of Gimzo, he had become completely transformed" (p. 94). Akiva was quite analytical and inquisitive, as this minor tractate of the Talmud states,

> During these years [of study], when they would tell R. Akiva the explanation of a Mishnah, he would go off by himself and analyze what he had be told. Then he would return to R. Eliezer and R. Joshua with his questions, bringing to light new points that had not been discussed explicitly. (BT Avos DeRabbi Nassan 6:2)

> Likewise for each letter of the Hebrew alphabet, Akiva wondered and asked "why was it

so written?" His teachers Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua could not answer (Nadich, 1998). At the end of 13 years of study away from home, Nadich (1998) records, "he [Akiva] taught Torah to multitudes" (p. 2).

Nadich (1998) relates this parable by fifth generation tanna Rabbi Simon ben Eleazar which illustrates how much Akiva learned from his teachers,

> To what may this be compared? To a stonemason quarrying stones on a mountain. One day he took his pick in his hand, went out and sat on the mountain and chipped away small stones. When people came and asked him what he was doing, he told them, "I plan to cut away the mountain and throw all the pieces into the Jordan." They told him, "That is impossible." Nevertheless, the continued chipping away until the mountain was reduced to the size of a large stone. He bent down beneath it, loosened it, moved it out of its place, and cast it down into the Jordan, saying, "Here is not your place, but there is where you should be."
> (pp. 4-5)

This parable illustrates Akiva's tenacity and patience to learn Torah – he chipped away at learning Torah as one chips methodically and tenaciously away at a mountain. And Akiva beat some tremendous odds – he was poor and ignorant but mastered the Torah which is illustrated by the mountain in the parable (Avot DeRabbi Natan 6:2). Rabbi Tarphon, Akiva's contemporary, ascribed Job 28:11 from the Tanakh to Akiva, "He dams up the sources of the streams, so that hidden things may be brought to light." Lastly, this parable shows Akiva's obsession with learning the Torah; and this obsession would carry over to his obsession with teaching Torah too. The duty of teaching was of utmost importance to Akiva, as a story that Nadich (1998) illustrates.

> When Rabbi Simon, the son of Rabbi Akiva, fell ill, the latter did not interrupt his instruction in the academy but kept inquiring about him by means of a messenger. The first messenger came and reported, "He is very ill." Rabbi Akiva said to his students, "Continue to ask your questions." Then a second messenger came and reported, "He has grown worse." Rabbi Akiva continued with the study of Torah. A third messenger came and reported, "He is dying," and Rabbi Akiva said to his students, "Continue to ask your questions." A fourth messenger came and reported, "He is dead." Rabbi Akiva then arose, removed his tefillin, rent his garments and said to them, "Our brothers of the house of Israel, listen to me! Until now we had the duty to study the Torah. But from now on we have the duty to occupy ourselves with honoring the dead. (p. 44)

Rabbi Simon was survived by his parents Akiva and Rachel, another son and two daughters (Finkelstein, 1990). Ben Azzai, one of Akiva's disciples, married one of Akiva's

daughters and like Rachel provided for Akiva during his studies at the academy, Akiva's daughter did likewise for Ben Azzai during his studies (BT Ketuboth 63a).

Akiva as Adult Educator

Teaching happens in a context. Akiva's students were taught in his school or academy (Levine, 2000). These schools were designated as 'school of Rabbi X' where X was the first name of the Rabbi. For example, 'school of Hillel' or 'school of Akiva' are two such schools. This section will provide a history of the academy or yeshiva and then an examination of R. Akiva's methodology as an adult educator – namely, his teaching methods and process elements employed. And a hint of his philosophy of adult education is captured in one of his maxims, "Who is a true sage? He who learns from every man" (Mishnah Avoth 4.I).

Akiva's Yeshiva

Many rabbis like Akiva had an academy; again he was the head of the session (or rosh yeshivah). The academy or yeshiva of Akiva was located in Bnei Brak (or Bene-Barak or Benei Beraq) near Jaffe (Gilbert, 2002; Ginzberg, 1928; Goodblatt, 1975). Akiva was so prominent among the scholars and their academies that Talmud claims that the "rabbis taught that the verse, "Justice, justice, shall you pursue (Deuteronomy 16:20) means, follow the scholars to their academies. Follow Rabbi Akiva to Bnai Brak" (BT Sanhedrin 32b).

Akiva, who preferred lecturing in the shade of a broad-leaved fig tree, attracted a diverse student body from all parts of the country. Among Akiva's disciples included R. Meir (an enigmatic and distinguished scholar), Eleazar ben Shammua (the priest), R. Simeon b. Yohai (a wealthy Galilean), R. Yose b. Halafta (the humble tanner), Nehemiah (the potter), Johanan (the cobbler), Benjamin (the Egyptian proselyte), Hanina ben Hakinai (the mystic), and Judah ben Ilai, who was so poor that he and his wife shared a single over-garment (Finkelstein, 1990;

Freedman & Wald, 2007).   Within the halls of Torah all men were considered equal according to Ginzberg (1928). So, rabbis, like Akiva, welcomed this diversity and rabbis also welcomed adults to enter the academy and sit at the rear in order to listen in on the discussion (Drazin, 1940). A rabbi's professionalism did not get in the way because rabbis did not view themselves as professional scholars. In fact, every workman or merchant was expected to devote part of his time to education and thereby be something of a scholar too (Commission of Jewish Education, 1927)

Akiva had complementary manners of an adult educator too. His manner with his students is summed up with two words: charm and courtesy. And as a result he won the affection of his students. Simeon was especially impacted by Akiva's kindness. So much so that he said this to his disciples years later, "My children, study my principles, for I have gleaned them carefully from those handed to me by my master, Akiva" (BT Gittin 67a).

Interestingly, for women studying the Torah was off limits (Neusner, 1987; Streisand, 1983). This is fascinating considering Rabbi Akiva use to say, "Beloved is man [humanity] in that he was created in the image of God. But it was by an even greater love that it was made known to him that he was created in the image of God, as it is said, For in His image did God make man (Genesis 9:6)" (Nadich, 1998, p. 51). Although women were not allowed at the study sessions many mothers did encourage their sons to study Torah (Neusner, 1987).

Akiva's Teaching Methodology

Akiva's teaching methods might be categorized in terms of passive and active teaching methods. Modeling the Torah represents Akiva's passive teaching method. While debate, story-telling (mashal), lecture or sermon, and the use of rules represent his active teaching methods. Additionally, individual and group learning took place. The latter took place in the context of

study-partners. Other teaching method or aids are covered last. Note that in some cases the

researcher has provided examples of R. Akiva's teaching methods. In other cases, he has

provided examples of other rabbis because rabbis imitated each other.

Modeling

We begin with the rabbi because Rabbinic Judaism revolved around this personality. The

rabbi was revered and respected. The rabbi's ruling was regarded as halakah. For example,

consider this discussion about when a blessing or invocation should be given.

> R. Jose the Galilean says: the formula of invocation corresponds to the number
>
> assembled, as it says: bless ye god in all assemblies, even the lord, ye that are
>
> from the fountain of Israel.
>
> Said R. Akiba: what do we find in the synagogue etc. And what does R. Akiba
>
> make of the verse cited by R. Jose the Galilean? — He wants it for the following
>
> lesson, as it has been taught: R. Meir used to say: Whence do we learn that even
>
> children [yet unborn] in their mothers' womb chanted a song by the Red Sea? —
>
> Because it says, Bless ye the Lord in full assemblies, even the Lord, ye that are
>
> from the fountain of Israel. What says the other [R. Jose] to this? — He derives
>
> the lesson from the word 'fountain'. Raba said: The halachah is as laid down by
>
> R. Akiba. (BT Berachoth 50a)

So the master or rabbi was worthy of being listened to and his life emulated. His main

task was in teaching the Torah. The rabbi accomplished this orally and by modeling the Torah.

Rabbis were qualified to model Torah because the "master was the living Torah" (Neusner,

1987, p. 35). And "the disciple revered the master as the living Torah and humbled himself

before him as before God" (Neusner, 1987, p. 78). But, the rabbi did not seek to create robots or

clones; rather, the rabbi was expected to nurture and enhance the creative facilities of his disciples and to do good deeds and his conduct had to be exceptionally moral. Safrai (1976) offers the reason why, "he was expected to be the kind of person whose example the pupils would wish to follow [or model]" (p. 963).

Thus, this time period, learning did not just happen in the classroom because some laws could not be studied theoretically but had to be demonstrated by the teacher. "Learning" writes Safrai (1976) "by itself did not make a pupil, and he did not grasp the full significance of this teacher's learning in all its nuances except through prolonged intimacy with his teacher, through close association with his rich and profound mind" (p. 964). A rabbi's disciples accompanied him as taught, as he sat in the law court, and as he was engaged in helping the poor, redeeming slaves, collecting dowries for poor brides and burying the dead (Safrai). A good example of rabbis being an embodiment of the Torah is seen in this story,

> One day Rabbi Akiva came late to the hall of study, so he sat outside. A question arose within, "Is such-and-such the law?" They said, "The law is outside." Again, a question arose, and they said, "The Torah is outside." Still another question was asked, and they asked, "Akiva is outside, make way for him." (Nadich, 1998, p. 14)

As a junior rabbi, Akiva was esteemed and could have insisted on his rights and entered the crowded study hall but rather exhibits modesty by sitting outside. Akiva's disciples observed him and Akiva observed his teachers. For example, Nadich (1998) notes that "Rabbi Akiva once went into a privy after Rabbi Joshua to watch his behavior. He noticed that he entered the privy only on the side, exposed himself only after he had sat down to evacuate and wiped himself only with the left hand" (p. 15). Akiva asked his teachers, Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua, "what is the

reason that we do not wipe with the right hand?" Rabbi Eliezer responded, "Because one eats

with it." And Rabbi Joshua responded, "Because one writes with it."

Debate

This *akedah* mode of reasoning or argumentation method has its origin in Genesis, the

first book of the Torah, as Hartman (1999) explains, "The God of Abraham, therefore, takes two

very different forms in the book of Genesis: a God who demands total surrender to His command

and a God who invites independent moral critique and judgment" (p. 14). In other words, since

learning in the Talmudic tradition is involvement with the interpretation of the law in

community, this mode of teaching and learning was actually encouraged to rightly interpret the

Torah before practice (Hartman, 1999).

Rabbi Akiva and other rabbis used this method to give Jews permission to live with

ambiguity. This ambiguity is captured in metaphor in the Tosefta,

> Make yourself a heart of many rooms and bring into it the words of the House of
>
> Shammai and the words of the House of Hillel, the words of those who declare
>
> unclean and the words of those declare clean. (BT Sotah 7:12)

Rather than diminishing, Hartman (1999) adds that in this interpretative tradition, an

awareness of the validity of contrary positions enhances the vitality and enthusiasm of religious

commitment. Hartman states that a Torah scholar's test of excellence consisted of his ability to

read and analyze a Talmudic text, explain and defend both sides of a disagreement while offering

imaginative and compelling reasons for both sides. Rabbi Akiva demonstrated acumen in this

area of argumentation or debate. R. Tarfon, a contemporary of Akiva, once referred to Akiva as

a ram. This means that Akiva, like a ram, was relentless in this area of debate (Bialik and

Ravnitzky, 1992).

Moreover, Bornstein and Guttmann (1928) recall this anecdote of a teacher, who sought to describe Akiva's teaching methods,

Telling of Moses on high asking God why He had affixed the decorative

"crowns" [or tagim] to some of the letters of the Torah. God replies that after

many generations there will arise a man, Akiva b. Joseph by name, "who will

expound, upon each tittle, heaps and heaps of law." Moses then asks permission

to see Akiva and is transported across time to enter Akiva's academy where he is

unable to follow the arguments. Moses is distressed but is later comforted when

Akiva replies to the question of his disciples: "Whence do you know this?" by

stating, "It is a law given to Moses at Sinai." (p. 7)

This quote reveals three important facts. First, rabbis deflected attention from themselves and often referred to what a rabbi said in the past. This practice of referring to what a rabbi said in the past is called attribution (Neusner, 1984, 1994). In this case, R. Akiva defers to the law given to Moses at Mount Sinai. Second, R. Akiva was relentless in his pursuit of Torah study (Fendel, 1981; BT Kethuboth 63a). Akiva's relentless pursuit of learning Torah was partly because he viewed the Bible as an intimate love letter (Hartman, 1999).

And third, R. Akiva presented arguments which imply his skill in debate or argumentation. Rubenstein (2003) refers to this skill as dialectical debate or the ability to give cogent arguments. One's skill in dialectical debate either earned a rabbi the designation of "lion" – or "fox" where "lion" was "the master of debate" (p. 41) and "fox" was "the weaker animal indicating inferior knowledge-when he fails to demonstrate dialectical prowess" (Rubenstein, p. 40). Although Akiva's study house was open to any adult male Jew, he needed some prior

knowledge of Torah and the ability to engage in discussions because these debates were not for the weak of heart (Heszer, 2001).

To say that these debates were lively is an understatement as these rabbis argued, they discussed, they disagreed with fierce intensity, but they also understood that they were defending a human point of view, not the final word of God. So, any academic divergence was never permitted to disrupt the peace and unity (Goldin, 1960). Rather, the very goal of Rabbinic dialectics was: balanced opinions, rationality of dispute, cogency of theology and of law as a whole (Neusner, 2006). Interestingly, in these Talmudic debate sessions, rabbis were not bold to make the claim that their view was the only valid truth (Hartman, 1999).

And these rules of debate made allowances for sense of humor and therefore, humility. Yet, it is important to note that these rabbinic exchanges were so intense that a combative ethos existed in the academy. These debates were so intense at times that Rubenstein (2003) remarks that they seemed "more suited to spiteful enemies than colleagues dedicated to a common religion and worldview" (p. 54). The violent tenor of these rabbinic interactions does have a context and failure to understand this context would lead to presentism. That is, this violent and militant imagery detailed in Babylonian rabbinic sources is in part attributed to the oral cultural milieu. And it is important to note that while these rabbis were indeed combative in this hostile academic environment, they did not behave violently (Rubenstein, 2003).

Once such violent debate took place between Akiva and his master, Rabbi Eliezer. The debate centered on what duties (e.g., slaughtering, cooking and carrying) associated with the Passover could override the restriction of no work on the Sabbath.

These things in [connection with] the Passover offering override the Sabbath: its

Shechitah and the sprinkling of its blood and the cleansing of its bowels and the

burning of its fat. But its roasting and the washing of its bowels do not override the Sabbath. Its carrying and bringing it from without the tehum and the cutting off of its wart do not override the Sabbath. R. Eliezer said: they do override [the Sabbath]. Said R. Eliezer, does it not follow a fortiori: if Shechitah, which is [usually forbidden] as a labour, overrides the Sabbath, shall not these, which are [only forbidden] as a shebuth, override the Sabbath? R. Joshua answered him, let festival[s] rebut (prove) it, wherein they permitted labour and forbade a Shebuth. Said R. Eliezer to him, what is this, Joshua, what proof is a voluntary act in respect of a precept! R. Akiba answered and said, Let Haza'ah (the sprinkling of the waters of purification) prove it, which is [performed] because it is a precept and is [normally forbidden only] as a Shebuth, yet it does not override the Sabbath; so you too, do not wonder at these, that though they are [required] on account of the precept and are [only forbidden] as a Shebuth, yet they do not override the Sabbath. Said R. Eliezer to him, but in respect of that [itself] I argue: if Shechitah, which is a labour, overrides the Sabbath, is it not logical that Haza'ah, which is [only] a Shebuth, overrides the Sabbath! Said R. Akiba to him, or on the contrary: if Haza'ah, which is [forbidden] as a shebuth, does not override the Sabbath, then Shechitah, which is [normally forbidden] on account of labour, is it not logical that it does not override the Sabbath. Akiba! Said R. Eliezer to him, you would erase what is written in the Torah, [let the children of Israel prepare the Passover sacrifice] in its appointed time, [implying] both on week-days and on the Sabbath. Said he to him, Master, give me an appointed time for these as there is an appointed season for shechitah! R. Akiba stated a general rule:

work which could be done on the eve of the Sabbath overrides the Sabbath;

Shechitah, which could not be done on the eve of the Sabbath, does override the

Sabbath. (BT Mishnah 6 - Pesachim 66a)

Another debate occurred between Johanan and Akiva over the matter of divorce. Akiva

argued that it was okay to divorce one's wife who is the subject of gossip even if there is no

proof of infidelity. However, the Talmud records this successful protest by Johanan as he

countered,

If we accept your opinion, Johanan ben Nuri said, not a single daughter of

Abraham will be safe with her husband. Yet the Torah says that a woman shall be

divorced only if the husband finds some unseemly thing in her (Deuteronomy

24:1). And again we read, at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three

witnesses, shall a matter be established. (Deuteronomy 19:15; BT Gittin 90a)

Akiva would continue debates with Eliezer and his own students, like Ben Azzai (his

son-in-law). Akiva's debates with Eliezer focused on matters related to law and public policy.

Debates of this nature were welcomed between teacher and student and between student and

student because as Drazin (1940) claims that there was mutual respect and trust between rabbi

and pupil. Rabbis not only learned from their colleagues but they learned most from their

disciples (BT Makkoth, 10a). This is an instance in which R. Joshua successfully presented an

argument and Akiva retracted his argument as the BT records, "R. Akiba agrees with R. Eliezer

where he hangs it on a clothes frame, and with R. Joshua, where he puts it behind the door" (BT

Shabbath 29b).

In another instance, this account shows that R. Akiva was never hesitant to jump into the

debate. This debate centered on the question of should priests eat firstlings,

The firstling is eaten by priests. Our rabbis taught, how do we know that a firstling is eaten during two days and one night? Because it is said, and the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave-breast and as the right thigh: the writ assimilated it to the breast and the thigh of a peace-offering: as a peace-offering might be eaten during two days and one night, so may the firstling be eaten during two days and one night. And this question was asked of the sages in the vineyard of yabneh: for how long may a firstling be eaten? Whereupon R. Tarfon replied: during two days and one night. Now a certain disciple was present, who had come to the beth hamidrash for the first time, by the name of R. Jose the Galilean. Master, said he to him, whence do you know this? My son, replied he, a peace-offering is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity, and a firstling is a sacrifice of lesser sanctity: as a peace-offering is eaten during two days and one night, so a firstling is eaten during two days and one night. Master, he objected, a firstling is the priest's due, and a sin-offering and a guilt-offering are the priest's dues; [then let us argue,] as a sin-offering and a guilt-offering [may be eaten] during one day and one night, so a firstling [may be eaten] one day and one night? Said he to him: let us compare the two objects, and then deduce one from the other: as a peace-offering does not come on account of sin, so a firstling does not come on account of sin; [hence,] as a peace-offering is eaten two days and one night, so is a firstling eaten two days and one night. Master, he objected, let us compare the two objects, and then deduce one from the other: a sin-offering and a guilt-offering are priestly dues, and a firstling is a priestly due; as a sin-offering and a guilt-offering cannot be brought as a vow or a freewill-offering, so a firstling cannot be a vow

or a freewill-offering: [hence,] as a sin-offering and a guilt-offering are eaten one

day and one night, so may a firstling be eaten one day and one night? R. Akiba

then leaped [into the debate], and R. Tarfon withdrew. (BT Zevachim 57a)

Akiva was not outvoted or lost very often in the academy and he did manage to win

Eliezer's affections (Finkelstein, 1990). Not only did Akiva win his masters' affection and

admiration but he won the hearts of his colleagues by his dialectic genius and humility. But

more importantly it was his sense of humor and wit that especially won their hearts. The

Mishnah records this famous saying of Akiva, "Laughter protects one's honor" (BT Avoth 3:13).

Akiva would continue to correct his masters' traditions and he allowed himself to be corrected

by his disciples; again, Ben Azzai is an example.

Everything was a matter or fodder for debate. For instance, Talmud recounts the debate

of three schools - Shammai, Hillel and Akiva - over the sufficient conditions of divorce.

The School of Shammai say: A man may not divorce his wife unless he has found

unchastity in her, for it is written, 'Because he has found in her indecency in

anything.' (Deuteronomy 24:1; BT Gittin 9:10)

The School of Hillel say: [He may divorce her] even if she spoiled a dish for him,

for it is written, 'Because he has found in her indecency in anything.'

(Deuteronomy 24:1; BT Gittin 9:10)

R. Akiva said: Even if he found another fairer than she, for it is written, 'And it

shall be if she finds no favor in his eyes…' (Deuteronomy 24:1; BT Gittin 9:10)

R. Eliezer and R. Akiva debated whether a beautiful captive should either have her nails

pared or let them grow (BT Yevamoth 48a). Akiva opted for the latter opinion. Neusner (1987)

observed that rabbis "debated the traits most desirable for a rabbi" (p. 26). For instance, Levine

(2000) writes that "the *Shema* was to be recited in a fixed way: antiphonally or responsively" (p. 523). But this is where the agreement ended as sages disagreed on how this was to be done. The Tosefta records these various proposals,

> the Israelites would repeat Moses' words phrase by phrase as would a pupil reciting the Hallel in school (R. Akiva); the people would repeat the opening refrain each time as would one reciting the Hallel in the synagogue (R. El'azar, son of R. Yosi the Galilean) or they would respond as would the people reciting the Shema in the synagogue, where the congregation and prayer leader recite alternate verses aloud. (BT Sotah 6:2-3)

It is important to note that experiencing shame or losing face after being ill-prepared for a debate or losing a debate or the inability to answer a direct question before sages and student witnesses was never flattering. Shame or humiliation was like a social death (Rubenstein, 2003). To suffer shame or humiliation was however, a great motivator to be prepared for subsequent debates. This humiliation shows the seriousness of how the rabbis regarded those skilled and unskilled in debate.

Storytelling

R. Akiva, like rabbis before him, used parabolic stories or *mashal* (plural form, *meshalim*) to teach. Garber (1986) offers the "evocation of a mood" for the aim of such storytelling (p. 42). The storyteller seeks to awaken within the audience a response (Garber, 1986; Young, 1998). Parables did just that. Blizzard (2004) informs us that the word, *parable* is "from the Greek *pare* plus *ballein* (to place things side by side)" (p. 41). A parable then is short story that likens two or more things and often from different sides of the world for the sole purpose of teaching a moral lesson (Blizzard).

Young (1998) adds that "the parables of Jewish haggadah present a spiritual reality in pictures and they take the abstract world of spiritual values and enable the audience to visualize them in concrete terms" (pp. 14-15). Barrs (2009) reminds us that on "one level most of the parables seem to be simple stories, often drawn from everyday life, that capture the imagination of the listener" (pp. 57-58). But they also, on the other hand, were stories that according to Barrs communicated profound truths - theological and moral. Similarly, Stern (1991) reminds us that parables operated "surreptitiously as literary forms, expressing allusive messages through indirect means" (p. 5).

However, this teaching method did not originate with Jesus or R. Akiva; rather, this teaching method was used in the Old Testament. For example, Cleveland (1987) informs us that parable is seen as a prophetic figurative discourse in Numbers 23:7 and Numbers 23:18 (Tanakh). The prophet Ezekiel used the word as a parable in Ezekiel 17:2 and 24:3 (Tanakh). In Psalms 78:2 refers to the parable as a "dark saying" (Tanakh).

Forms of Mashal

The three forms of rabbinic mashal are mashal as illustration, mashal as secret speech, and lastly, mashal as rhetorical device. This section will explain each form and provide a corresponding illustration.

Mashal as illustration. Stern (1991) explains that "this view of the mashal sees the literary form as a device for illustrating abstract ideas or beliefs through narrative examples that are concrete, familiar, and thus more easily comprehended" (p. 48). The Midrash offers an example of an illustrative type mashal,

What did Abraham resemble? A bottle of balsam with an airtight lid that was off

in a corner, and its perfume could not spread. But once it was moved, its perfume

began to spread. Similarly, the Holy One, blessed be He, said to Abraham: Move

yourself from place to place so that your name will grow great through the world.

Hence: "Take yourself…" (Rabbah Genesis 39.2)

Stern (1991) explains the purpose of this illustration, "the purpose of the likeness is clear-

to illustrate the reason God commanded Abraham to leave his home: so that his sweetly aromatic

fame, Abraham's "name," would waft and spread through the world" (p. 48).

Rabbi Akiva offered this illustrative parable to a Jew named Zonin who once said to him,

We both know in our hearts that there is no reality to an idol; yet, we see crippled

people enter a shrine to an idol and come out cured. How can that be? [Rabbi

Akiva answered] "I will tell you a parable to which the matter may be compared.

In one city there was a trustworthy man with whom the townsmen used to deposit

their money without any witnesses. One man came and deposited his money with

him but with witnesses. On another occasion he forgot and made his deposit

without witnesses. The wife of the trustworthy man said to her husband, 'Come,

let us deny that he made this deposit.' He replied, 'Because this fool acted in an

unworthy manner, shall I destroy my reputation for trustworthiness?' So, too,

with afflictions. At the time they are sent upon a person and oath is imposed upon

them, 'You shall not come upon so-and-so until such and such a day, nor shall

you leave this person except on such and such a day, and at such an hour, and

through such and such a medium, and through such and such a remedy.' When

the time comes for the affliction to depart, it so happens that the person decides to

go to an idolatrous shrine. The affliction argues, 'It is right that I should not leave

this person under these circumstances; but because the fool acts in an unworthy

way shall I break my oath?' (BT Avodah Zarah 55b)

Mashal as secret speech. Stern (1991) explains that this "parable is related to the

position that identifies the mashal with allegory. [Specifically, this] marshal is an implicitly

esoteric mode of communication, an interpretive event that separates 'insiders' from 'outsiders'

– those who understand from those who don't – and restricts its understanding to a select, or

elect, few" (p. 50). When the Roman Emperor Hadrian issued a decree that forbade the Jews to

teach, study and practice the Torah, R. Akiva was found publicly holding teaching sessions in

which he busied himself with Torah. Curious Pappus ben Judah asked Akiva, "are you afraid of

the government?" (Bialik & Ravnitzky, 1992, p. 238). According to Bialik and Ravnitzky Akiva

answered Pappus with this secret parabolic explanation,

> A fox was walking on a river bank and, seeing fishes hastening here and there,
>
> asked them, "From whom are you fleeing?" They replied, "From the nets and
>
> traps set for us by men." So the fox said to them, "How would you like to come
>
> up on dry land, so that you and I may live together the way my ancestors lived
>
> with yours?" They replied "You-the one they call the cleverest of animals-are in
>
> fact a fool. If we are fearful in the place where we can stay alive, how much more
>
> fearful should we be in a place where we are sure to die!" So it is with us. If we
>
> are fearful when we sit and study the Torah, of which it is written, "For that is thy
>
> life and the length of the days" (Deuteronomy 30:20), how much more fearful
>
> ought we to be should we cease the study of words of Torah! (p. 238)

Afterwards, Rabbi Akiva responded to his old antagonist Pappias, "Our element [to

survive] is the Torah. If we forsake it, we destroy ourselves" (BT Berachoth 61b). This was said

in defiance to Hadrian's decree that all public Torah teaching should cease because disobedience meant instant death (Fendel, 1981). Fendel goes on to report that Akiva "died joyfully, with the *shema* on his lips, despite the terrible torture he was subjected to as his body was raked with iron combs" (p. 169). Dying as a martyr at the hands of the Romans is remarkable considering Akiva and others expressed great interest in the Roman community. For instance, Gamaliel II, Elezar ben Azariah, Joshua ben Hananiah and Akiva often discussed religious subjects with heathen and Christians alike (Moore, 1960).

   Mashal as rhetorical device. Unlike the mashal as illustration or mashal as secret speech, Stern (1991) suggests that mashal as rhetorical device works as a "story that turns allusiveness to effect in order to persuade its audience of the value of a certain idea or approach or feeling" (p. 51). The nature of this mashal requires the audience to deduce the message for themselves (Stern, 1991). This story of a king who was robbed illustrates how the mashal was used rhetorically.

> It is like a king whom bandits robbed. But the king was a clever man. He said: If
> I rise up against them now, they will say: What stolen goods have you found in
> our possession? I know that in the future they will rob me three times. Afterward,
> I will rise against them and slay them. Similarly: The king is the Holy One,
> blessed be he, the bandits are the gentile nations…the place broken into is
> Jerusalem…and the Holy One, blessed be He, will emerge and battle against
> them, as it is said, "Then the Lord will come forth and make war on those
> nations…" (Midrash on Psalms 118.13; Zechariah 14:3).

   The concluding message of this mashal relates to theodicy. That is, it justifies God's behavior in allowing the Gentile nation to attack Israel three times before disciplining them.

However, the mashal's rhetorical message is chiefly communicated through "joint praise and blame-praise of the king for his wisdom; blame of the gentile nations for both their acts of banditry and their knavery" (Stern, 1991, p. 56).

It is important to note that sometimes teachers of Torah acted parabolically to teach a point. For example, from the Tanakh, the prophet Isaiah, to give force to his message to king Hezekiah not to join with Egypt against Assyria, for three years "posed as a prisoner of war on the way to captivity, going naked and barefoot (probably wearing only an undergarment); [by doing so Isaiah]…symbolized the captivity of Egypt and Ethiopia at the hands of the Assyrians" (Bullock, 1986, p. 140).

And equally bizarre and shocking is the record of R. Akiva's behavior when he expressed joy over the Temple's destruction (Midrash Rabbah Lamentations 4:11). This is shocking and bizarre when we remember Wright's (1996) words, "Temple, Sabbath, circumcision and purity of food were thus crucial marks of Jewish identity" (p. 387). So, what was expected was lament over the lost of the Temple but instead Akiva expresses joy. Rabbi Akiva could express joy in the midst of this destruction because by using Lamentations 4:11 as the very source of their hopelessness, it also described the very condition for hope (Stern, 1991).

Lecture or Sermon

Lecture and sermons were yet another method used by Rabbi Akiva. Finkelstein (1928-1930) argues that "tannaitic sources clearly distinguish between midrash, which is the expounding of Scripture or formulated traditions" (p. 56). Midrash was another name for sermon or lecture. And Bettan (1939) remarks that the purpose of the sermon (or midrash) - a type of discourse - was "to interpret and apply establish truth" (p. 4). In other words, the lecture or sermon was authoritative. And interestingly, Beer (2007) comments and BT Sanhedrin 7b

illustrates that students actively participated in his master's lectures. For example, it was the duty of the students to raise objections when they believed their teacher had erred in judgment in the law (BT Shevu'oth 31a).

Goldman (1975) and Safrai (1976) reminds us that the phrase *bet ha-midrash* literally means *house of study*, or the place where students young and old devoted most or all of their time to study and to gather to listen to Midrash, the discourse on, or exposition of, the Torah. And before the Temple's utter destruction, a sermon was part of the synagogue practice as "in connection with the public reading of the Torah, the practice of interpreting and then explaining at greater length led to the development of the sermon" (Isaacs, 1925, p. 21). However, sermons continued to be used after the destruction and rebuilding of the temple. Safrai (1976) reminds us that "sermons were not only addressed to the students, but the wider public which included women and children, irrespective of whether they took an active part or only came to listen" (p. 967). During the tannaitic period, rabbis gave sermons twice on every Sabbath, once on Friday evening service and at the Saturday morning service. These public sermons were meant to be educative and they were meant to arouse the Jewish people so that they would want to seek more knowledge of the Torah and also faithfully observe it. Bettan (1939) notes that the sermon to the public took the form of a homily and it was meant to edify and acquaint those who could devote little time for study of Torah with some of the laws pertaining to the proper observance of the Sabbath, the Holy Days, and other special occasions.

The idea of sermons being delivered is also evident in the term *bet ha-midrash* itself. For instance, Finkelstein (1928-1930) states that, "the term bet ha-midrash occurs for the first time in Ben Sira about the beginning of the second century B.C.E., and may freely be translated in that

context as 'lecture hall'" (p. 55). Simply put, the etymology of the phrase *bet ha-midrash* suggests lectures and sermons were delivered in the lecture hall.

Furthermore, Rabbinic literature provides proof that sermons were given. For example, the aggadah (or haggadah) contained fable, history, epigram, prayer, *sermon*, meditation, theology, folklore and science (Goldin, 1960). This teaching method would continue in the third century and often with consequences. For instance, in the third century, a rabbi preached passionately against the patriarch and his house who had disregarded their duties and this sermon put him in such danger that he asked leading scholars to appease the patriarch on his behalf (Ginzberg, 1928).

Akiva used lectures and sermons (Nadich, 1998). A lecture generally began with a call for information (Finkelstein, 1990). So, Akiva might begin this way, "Anyone having any information on the question before us today is requested to give it and if a student volunteered a tradition he had heard from some other master, Akiva would ask him to defend it" (Finkelstein, p. 175). This was not meant to embarrass the student but rather Akiva's aim was to sharpen his pupils' dialectic.

Akiva was a noted halakist; however, he also used preaching to teach. The Talmud often uses the word expounding as a synonym for preaching. Here are two excerpts to substantiate that Akiva expounded or preached,

On that same day *R. Akiba expounded*: It is written: And every earthen vessel, [whereinto any of them falleth, whatsoever is in it] shall be unclean [yitma]. (BT Chullin 33b)

Our Rabbis taught: On that day *R. Akiba expounded*: At the time the Israelites ascended from the Red Sea, they desired to utter a Song; and how did they render

the song? Like an adult who reads the Hallel [for a congregation] and they

respond after him with the leading word. (BT Sotah 30b)

And because his audience sometimes got sleepy he frequently resorted to antics (Levine,

2000; Midrash Rabbah Song of Songs 1:15, 3). For example, the Midrash notes this,

Wishing to wake them, he remarked, 'Why did Esther deserve to be queen over a

hundred and twenty-seven provinces? The explanation is this: Let Esther,

descendant of Sarah who lived one hundred twenty-seven years, come and reign

over one hundred twenty-seven provinces. (Rabbah Genesis 58:3; Rabbah Esther

1:8)

What antic did Rabbi Akiva employ from this account? He lied because Esther was not

over these provinces; rather her husband, Ahasuerus, king of Persia, ruled these provinces.

Falsehoods like this were not only used in preaching but in teaching also for the purposes of

exciting interest and sharpening students' wits (Drazin, 1940). Akiva preached while standing

on a bench at his son's funeral (Nadich, 1998).

In addition, the Talmuds add that R. Akiba, R. Meir and others would cross-question or

examine their pupils during a lecture and/or sermon, so as to sustain their attention and sharpen

their wits (BT Eiruvin 13a-b; Drazin, 1940; Goldman, 1975). Sometimes Akiva in the presence

of his disciples would say something for the "sole purpose of exercising the wits of [his]

students" (BT Eiruvin 13a). Akiva was not so impressed with the student who answered quickly

but rather the one who supported his views (Tosefta Zabim 1.5).

It is certain that R. Akiva preached or expounded the Torah. However, Levine (2000)

adds it is not certain if the context was the academy or synagogue or both for such sermons.

There is certainly a wealth of this type of midrashic material in many rabbinic compilations. But

it is unclear whether these texts were redacted or created literary creations by one or many editors or if these texts actually bear testimony to what was actually in front of a synagogue or academy audience (Levine, 2000).

Rules (middot)

Shinan (1990) maintains that the sages or rabbis developed techniques to extract everything they possibly could from Bible verses. One technique they created was called middot or rules. Blizzard (2004) credits Hillel, the famous contemporary of [Rabbi] Jesus, for applying and documenting seven rules to use in halakic exposition. Moreover, Goldin (1960) tells us that Hillel (predecessor to Akiva) believed that "analogy, inference, deduction from context were indispensable for the jurist and student" (p. 131). Rabbi Jesus is mentioned because he was close to the circles of the Galilean sages and consequently there are similarities between the words of Jesus and the sayings of the sages. So, Jesus teachings mirrored the teachings of the study-halls of his time (Shinan, 1990).

For example, Jesus' words recorded in Matthew 6:34 and the sages' words recorded in BT Berachoth 9b are similar. Likewise, Rabbi Jesus' words in Matthew 7:5 and those of the sages in BT Bathra 15b are similar. See Table 2 for a comparison.

Table 2 Jesus' Words vs. Sages' Words

Jesus	Sages
Sufficient for the day is it own trouble. (Matthew 6:34, English Standard Version)	He said to Him: Lord of the Universe, sufficient is the evil in the time thereof! (BT Berachoth 9b)
You hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of your own eye: and then shall you see clearly to cast out the mote out of your brother's eye. (Matthew 7:5, English Standard Version)	Take out the splinter from your teeth. And he answered: Take out the beam from your eyes. (BT Bathra 15b)

The commonality between these sayings among rabbis and Jesus are helpful because of historiography's emphasis on internal criticism. Internal criticism, according to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007), "involves evaluating the accuracy and worth of the statements contained in a historical document" (p. 542). In particular, "because early composition of the New Testament (in the Tannaitic period) and the fairly reliable dating of its various component parts, they are valuable for research into the literature of the Sages" (Shinan, 1990, pp. 132-33). In other words, the reliability of the New Testament documents bolsters the reliability of the literature of the Sages. Interestingly, Shinan (1999) adds that "later, in the Amoraic period [220 to 370 C.E.], discussion of the interrelations between Judaism and Christianity is joined by the Church Fathers" (p. 133). Moreover, Church Fathers, such as Origen (185-254 C.E.), produced works belonging to different genres including theological treatises, commentaries on the Bible, sermons, polemical and historiographical essays, etc. But most importantly, their "books are full of material originating among the Jewish people and its Torah, both direct borrowings and what was more important in this period, for the requirements of rejection and polemic. (Shinan, p. 133)

While Jesus, Hillel and R. Akiva used these rules, Buzzard (2004) is quick to point out that these rules were applied to reading the Old Testament long before Hillel used them. However, Shinan (1990) and Finkelstein (1990) ascribe one rule to R. Ishmael. This rule or mode of argument went like this: if A, which is a relatively easy and simple matter, should be treated in this or that way, then B, which is a much more serious matter than A, should clearly be treated at least in the same way. This rule was called the *middah* of *kal vahomer* or *a fortiori*, a *middah*. An example where *a fortiori* was used to reach a conclusion is found here,

R. Akiva recognized like his teacher R. Eliezer, the appropriate time to use *a fortiori*,

The residue of the blood etc. What is the reason? — Scripture saith, [And all the remaining blood of the bullock shall he pour out] at the base of the altar of burnt-offering [which is at the door of the tent of meeting]; Our Rabbis taught: 'At the base of the altar of burnt-offering', but not at the base of the inner altar; 'at the base of the altar of burnt-offering': the inner altar itself has no base; 'at the base of the altar of burnt-offering': apply [the laws of] the base to the altar of burnt-offering. Yet perhaps that is not so; rather [it intimates]: let there be a base to the altar of burnt-offering? Said R. Ishmael [This would follow] a fortiori: if the residue [of the blood of the sin-offering], which does not make atonement, requires the base; then surely the sprinkling itself of the [blood of the] burnt-offering, which makes atonement, requires the base! *Said R. Akiba [too: This would follow] a fortiori*: if the residue, which does not make atonement and does not come for atonement, requires the base; is it not logical that the sprinkling itself of the [blood of the] burnt-offering, which makes atonement and comes for atonement, requires the base? If so, why does Scripture state, 'at the base of the altar of burnt-offering'? To teach: apply [the laws of] the base to the altar of burnt-offering. (BT Zevachim 51a)

The other six rules are:

1. *Gezerah shavah* (equivalence of experience). This *middah* maintains that "one can deduce something new from the very fact that two different verses contain the same word" (Blizzard, 2004; Shinan, 1990).

2. *Binyan av mikatuv echad* (building a "family" from a single text). If a principle is found in several passages a consideration found in one applies to all.

3. *Binyan av mishnay ketuvim* (building a "family" from two or more texts). A principle is established by relating two texts together and applying that principle to other texts (Blizzard, 2004).

4. *Kelal ufrat* (the general and the particular). A general rule maybe restricted by a particularization of it elsewhere or a particular rule may be extended into a general principle (Blizzard, 2004).

5. *Keyotze bo mimakom achar* (analogy made from another passage). Two passages may seem to conflict until compared with a third (Blizzard, 2004; Finkelstein, 1990).

6. *Davar halamed meinyano* (interpretation deduced from the context). The total context, not just the isolated statement must be considered for an accurate exegesis (Blizzard, 2004).

This *middah* was applied to both aggadah and halakhah material (Shinan, 1990). This suggests that both aggadic and halakic material was interpreted and taught to R. Akiva's disciples and to the general populace. Following is an example of *gezerah shavah.*

The Burning of the fat, etc. But [the Mishnah] does not mention the eating of the Passover offering. This would point to a contradiction [with the following Baraitha]: The duty of the recital of the Shema' in the evening, and of the Hallel on the night of the Passover, and of the eating of the Passover sacrifice can be performed until the break of the dawn? — R. Joseph says: There is no contradiction. One statement [the Mishnah] conforms with the view of R. Eleazar b. Azariah, and the other with the view of R. Akiba. For it has been taught: And they shall eat of the flesh in that night. R. Eleazar b. Azariah says: Here it is said:

'in that night', and further on it is said: For I will go through the land of Egypt in

that night. Just as the latter verse means until midnight, so also here it means until

midnight. R. Akiba said to him: But it is also said: Ye shall eat it in haste, which

means: until the time of haste? [Until the break of the dawn]. [Said R. Eleazar to

him,] If that is so, why does it say: in the night? [R. Akiba answered,] Because I

might think that it may be eaten in the daytime like the sacrifices; therefore it is

said: 'in the night', indicating that only in the night is it eaten and not in the day.

We can understand why according to R. Eleazar b. Azariah, whose opinion is

based on the Gezerah shawah, the word 'that' is necessary. But according to R.

Akiba what is the purpose of this word 'that'? — It is there to exclude another

night. For, since the Passover sacrifice is a sacrifice of minor sanctity and peace-

offerings are sacrifices of minor sanctity, I might think that just as the peace-

offerings are eaten for two days and one night so is also the Passover-offering

eaten for two nights instead of the two days, and therefore it might be eaten for

two nights and one day! Therefore it is said: 'in that night'; in that night it is

eaten, but it is not eaten in another night. And R. Eleazar b. Azariah? He deduces

it from the verse: And ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning. R.

Akiba? — If [you deduced it] from there, I could say that 'morning' refers to the

second morning. And R. Eleazar? — He answers you: 'Morning' generally means

the first morning. (BT Berachoth 9a)

Modeling, debate, shame, storytelling, lecture and sermon, and rules were teaching

methods not only used by R. Akiva but also his contemporaries. It was also noted that Akiva's

predecessor, R. Hillel and R. Jesus employed some of these methods as well. Additional teaching methods included individual and group learning which are discussed below.

Individual and Group Learning

Individual learning was not only a method employed by the teacher of Torah but also the student. This individual learning method took the form of memorization which required constant repetition (Blizzard, 2004). Yet, whether in individual or in group study, adult learners often read aloud.   Because according to Safrai (1976), "this was the only way to overcome the danger of forgetting" (p. 953). Thus, reading the text out loud was also considered an individual learning method.

Group learning took place in the form of study-partners (Hezser, 2001). Rabbis taught that private study stultifies and leads to folly (BT Ta'anith 7a). Joshua ben Perahyah, in the middle of the second century B.C.E., summarizes the importance of having a study partner when learning Torah, "Provide thyself a teacher and take to thyself a fellow student" (BT Avot 1:6). Study-partners were especially helpful due to the rabbis' high regard for dialectics. Partners were encouraged to engage each other in dialectical argumentation as a way to sharpen each other (Rubenstein, 2003). The absence of a study-partner was comparable to death. The Bavli relates this story that "Levi used to 'sit with' (or study together with) R. Efes. When the latter died, Levi 'had no one to sit with' and therefore left Palestine and came to Babylonia" (BT Kethuboth 103b). Rubenstein (2003) illustrates the advantage of having a partner and condemning solitary study,

> R. Hama b. Hanina said: What is the meaning of the verse, As iron sharpens iron,
>
> so a man sharpens the wit of his friend (Proverbs 27:17)? Just as in the case of

iron, one [piece] of iron sharpens another, so scholars sharpen each other in legal
[debate].

Rabba bar bar Hama said: Why are words of Torah compared to fire…? To teach
you: Just as fire does not ignite by itself, so words of Torah do not endure for [one
who studies] by himself. (p. 52)

Both scholars suggest that by debating back and forth two scholars *sharpen* each others'
minds. The goal of this learning is so that scholars can improve their analytical skill.

Other Teaching Aids

Other aids to study included repetition, studying out loud, chanting and mnemonics.
Most students did not have access to an actual written text so instructors taught in a strictly an
oral medium. In this setting, one of the primary aims of the teacher was to encourage active
participation. One such means for encouraging participation was allowing pupils to ask
questions. In sum, "to a large extent the teaching took the form of question and answer" (Safrai,
1976, p. 966).

Repetition

In the eyes of the rabbis, repetition was the key to learning. Rabbis like R. Akiva would
have subscribed to the belief that, "One who repeats this lesson a hundred times is not like him
who repeats it a hundred and one times" (BT Chagigah 9b). In this oral culture, R. Akiva
affirmed this method of instruction.

R. Akiba stated: Whence is it deduced that a man must go on teaching his pupil
until he has mastered the subject? From Scripture where it says: And teach thou it
to the children of Israel. And whence is it deduced that it must be taught until the

students are well versed in it? From Scripture where it says. Put it in their mouths.

And whence is it inferred that it is also his duty to explain to him the reasons? It

has been said: Now these are the ordinances which thou shalt put before them.

(BT Eiruvin 54b)

Putting Torah in his disciples' mouths required repetition. This oral educational milieu

also impacted reading. So, "reading", Safrai (1976) writes, "could only be learned by repeating

the reading of the teacher and auditive memory" (p. 950). The oral tradition was prominent

because no manuscript was allowed in school and the teacher quoted from memory and the

students were therefore required to memorize the halakot. Manuscripts were used by rabbis in

their private study (Moore, 1960).

Therefore, a teacher of Torah had to have patience and perseverance as he had to teach

and explain the lesson at least four times; and if this be insufficient, he has to repeat it even more

times, until the student knows it well (Goldman, 1975; Gollancz, 1924). Patience was observed,

for instance, when the rabbi paused after each lesson to give students time to reflect and ponder

the material to better understand it (Drazin, 1940). There was precedence for such repetition

when Moses repeated to Aaron four times the explanation of the Torah he had received from

God (Goldman, p. 54). "Constant repetition", was urged according to Goldman, "because one

can so easily forget what has been studied" (p. 56). In fact, the sages taught that "he who studies

Torah and forgets is like a woman who gives birth and then buries her offspring" (BT Sanhedrin

99a).

Shouting

Another aid to memory and effective study was to shout the Scriptures out loud (Drazin, 1940; Hezser, 2001). An illustration of this point is recorded in the Talmud.

Samuel said to Rab Judah: "Keen scholar! Open your mouth and read the Scriptures; open your mouth and learn the Talmud that your studies may be retained and that you may live long, since it is said, 'For they [the words of the written and oral Torah] are life unto those that find them and a healing to all their flesh [Proverbs 4:22]; read not 'to those that find them' but 'to him who utters them with his mouth.' (BT Eiruvin 54a)

Another illustration, albeit a milder instance of loud study, is when reading the Scriptures. The Scriptures were read out loud even when reading alone. For example, we find an Ethiopian eunuch, a person interested in Old Testament Scriptures reading them out loud (Acts 8:28 English Standard Version). The word for 'reading' (*anaginosko*) in this text implies reading out loud.

Chanting

Chanting or sing-song and swaying the body were other aids for studying or memorizing Torah (Gollancz, 1924). For instance, Rabbi Shefatiah said in the name of R. Yohanan (or the saying was attributed to R. Yohanan),

If one reads the Scripture without a melody [i.e., as indicated by the singing accents] or repeats the Mishnah without a tune [i.e., to aid the memory], of him the Scripture says, "Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good and ordinances whereby they should die [Ezekiel 20:25]. (BT Megilah 32a)

This practice of singing while studying the Talmud is evident even in the 20th century (Hartman, 1999). Technically, this is called cantillation or intonation and is the reciting of a text in a singing matter (Lassner, 1999). Interestingly, "on seeing such people swaying and singing, one might mistakenly believe them to be praying, when in fact they are engaged in a profound intellectual activity" (Hartman, p. 47).

So singing or chanting was not only a means to remember a vast amount of material but it was also an outward expression of the joy one found in studying or grappling with the Talmud and the expansive corpus of legal and aggadic material. The Talmud purports that Akiva exhorted his students, "sing continuously, sing" (BT Sanhedrin 99a).

Mnemonics

Books and manuscripts were scarce, so it was imperative to rely upon one's memory. So, an entire system of mnemonics was developed to facilitate memorization. One method employed by tanna like Akiva to facilitate memorization and to help students retain learning would be to combine the study of many different subjects that had one common feature. For example, "First Adar differs from Second Adar only in the reading of the Scroll in giving gifts to the poor. A Festival-day differs from the Sabbath only in preparing of necessary food" (BT Megillah 1, 4-11). This mnemonic uses the month of Adar repetitively to aid students to distinguish two different activities allowed; similarly, the mnemonic helps the learner distinguish and remember the difference of what is allowed on two holy days, the Sabbath and the Festival-day, namely the preparation of food. Another example of the mnemonic – chains, his cheeks, tables graven - is found in this exposition by R. Eleazar,

R. Eleazar said; what is the purport of the Scriptural text: And chains about thy

neck? If a man trains himself to be like a chain that hangs loosely upon the neck,

and is sometimes exposed and sometimes concealed, his learning will be

preserved by him, otherwise it will not. (BT Eiruvin 54a)

One last example of a mnemonic is "dabar, wa-arayoth, ganab" or "a thing, and incest,

theft" (BT Sanhedrin 26b).

The Mishnah sums up the teaching methods employed by tannaim like R. Akiva and their

requisite character traits,

Greater is the Torah in [the form of] forty-eight things, and these they are in: [the

form of] study, attentive listening, ordered presentation [of one's study-matter]

with [one's] lips, reasoning of the heart, intelligence of the heart, awe, fear,

humility, joyousness, ministering unto the sages, painstaking examination [of a

subject,] together with [one's] colleagues, fine argumentation of disciples,

[knowledge of] scripture, [knowledge of] the oral learning, moderation in sleep,

moderation in gossip, moderation in [worldly] pleasure, moderation in hilarity,

moderation in worldly intercourse, long-suffering, a good heart, the

conscientiousness of the sages, [uncomplaining] acceptance of [divine]

chastisements. [the possessor of torah is one] who claims no credit for himself, is

loved, loves the all-present, loves [his fellow] creatures, loves righteous ways,

welcomes reproofs [of himself], loves uprightness, keeps himself far from

honour[s], let's not his heart become swelled on account of his learning, delights

not in giving legal decisions, shares in the bearing of a burden with his colleague,

uses his weight with him on the scale of merit, places him upon [a groundwork of]

truth, places him upon [a groundwork of] peace, composes himself at his study,

asks and answers, listens [to others], and [himself] adds [to his knowledge],

learns in order to teach, learns in order to practice, makes his teacher wiser, notes

with precision that which he has heard. (BT Avoth 6:5-6)

Akiva's Process Elements

Students – children and adults alike – of Rabbinic Judaism had one sole curriculum. That

curriculum was the Torah, the Talmud, Halakic and Aggadic material. So, in this chiefly text-

oriented worldview, the text was the priority yet it was taught orally and it was modeled. Thus,

Judaism [Rabbinic] education had one primary goal: learning Torah and appropriating its truths.

Appropriating its truths meant living it out in practice. The process elements that Akiva

employed may be summarized as intellectual preparation and the creation of a conducive

learning environment.

Intellectual Preparation

The house of study was quite rigorous intellectually; so, thus to attain any degree of

competency in an intellectually demanding program required patience and many years of study

for the student (Goldman, 1975). This meant according to Goldman that, "only a small

proportion of those who went through the elementary school, or even of those who took time for

the study of Mishnah – the oral tradition – had either the ability or the opportunity to become

masters of the Law" (p. 27). Or Moore (1960) puts it this way, a thousand men may enter Bible

school but only one will successfully make it through the study of Mishnah and the study of

Talmud to arrive at rabbinic ordination. So it seems either you were prepared for the rigors of the

house of study or you were not. And it is important to highlight, that this actual process element

of intellectual preparation began as a child. However, rabbis did teach those not prepared for the rigors of yeshivah or the populace.

Creating a Conducive Learning Environment

Another process element R. Akiva used was creating a conducive learning environment for his students. Because of the hot Palestinian climate, rabbis often held class under the shade. We find in the Talmud, "the students of the academy were seated in rows like [trees in] a vineyard" (BT Berachoth 4:7). This is supported by Krauss (1948), who explains "the reason why the scholars of Yabneh assembled in a vineyard is evident: in the hot Palestinian climate they required a shaded place and this was provided in the vineyard" (p. 82). In antiquity, the prophets would address the people on the Temple Mount or even in the shade of the Temple Gates which were of some height (Buchler, 1914; Krauss, 1948).

Before the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E., Jokanan b. Zakkai taught in Jerusalem in the shade of the Temple walls (Buchler, 1914; Krauss, 1948). The reason why shade was sought was obviously because of the hot Palestinian climate. This explains why the Talmud reports that "in the gate of R. Joshua's house, four of his disciples sat and discussed some questions" (Tosefta Berachoth 4:18). Again, sitting at the gate of R. Joshua's house provided shade from the hot months.

R. Tarfon, a contemporary of R. Akiva, and his disciples sat in the shade of a dove-cot in Jamnia discussing a biblical subject (Tosefta Berachoth 4:16). On another occasion Buchler (1914) reports that "during religious persecutions, R. Akiva once taught and expounded the law at his table under an olive-tree" (p. 487). R. Akiva and others taught in the open air and under a tree to guard their students against the hot rays of the sun. However, it is also true that it was a common occurrence to hear the sounds of Torah coming from houses at night (Safrai, 1976).

Akiva created a conducive learning environment by three other specific ways. One, he moved his disciples from place to place. In this way, Akiva's disciple circles were quite mobile. And two, Akiva fostered inclusivity. Akiva's propensity to include and teach males from different backgrounds and mentalities is a feature throughout the history of teaching Torah. Finally, Akiva's learning environment appealed to psychology too.

Mobile Disciple Circles. A mobile disciple circle is evidence of R. Akiva's focus on promoting a conducive learning climate. Evidence of disciple circles is an indication that learning took place in community. However, while learning took place in community; it did not negate hearing and accepting the Torah from within one's own human reality. Hartman (1999) writes, "learning moves the individual beyond collective solidarity to individual appropriation" (p. 53). Those who succeeded the tannaim or Babylonian amoraim also taught small disciple circles in various locations (Rubenstein, 2003). For example, one such location where disciple circles gathered was in the teacher's home (Goodblatt, 1975). Many of these academies, therefore, had no walls. So, wherever one found a rabbi and his disciples, he found an academy.

> Study was not confined to the school or the synagogue, but was also carried on in the vineyard, in the shade of a dove-cote, in fields, on paths under fig-trees and olives and in the market. It was not uncommon for a sage to conduct discourses and discussions with his pupils in the town-square or in the market place, with the townspeople gathering around them and listing, irrespective of whether they were able to understand all or only part of the discussion. (BT Berachoth 4:16)

And the Mishnah points out that there is evidence that students dined with their master too during Sabbaths and holidays and that this may have been part of what it meant to study with

him (BT Eiruvin 73a; Safrai, 1976). Goodblatt (1975) has dubbed this gathering of the master

and his disciples a disciple circle; that is, the teaching of students in the master's house.

There was one sole need or goal for all learners – the study and application of the Torah

to one's life. This goal is captured in the *Shema*, one of the holiest Jewish prayers,

And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be upon they heart; and

thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when

thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest

down, and when thou risest up. (Deuteronomy 6:6-7)

This exhortation was given by Moses centuries before the first yeshiva. And from

this exhortation one can see the trajectory of Jewish scholarship; namely, the

commandment to learn Torah was of divine origin, as was knowledge itself (Heimreich,

1982).

Inclusivity.   Rabbinic Judaism was not esoteric religion but rather it was meant for all

men. This inherent feature of Rabbinic Judaism worked in concert with another feature of this

learning environment, namely inclusivity. This feature of inclusivity of Jewish education and

tradition could be one of the reasons why the Torah has been able to address many types of

individuals regardless of their differences in background and mentality (Hartman, 1999).   This

inclusivity feature explains why among Akiva's disciples he attracted and taught such a diverse

group of men. Again consider Akiva's pupils: R. Meir (an enigmatic and distinguished scholar),

Eleazar ben Shammua (the priest), R. Simeon b. Yohai (a wealthy Galilean), R. Yose b. Halafta

(the humble tanner), Nehemiah (the potter), Johanan (the cobbler), Benjamin (the Egyptian

proselyte), Hanina ben Hakinai (the mystic), and Judah ben Ilai, who was so poor that he and his

wife shared a single over-garment (Finkelstein, 1990; Freedman & Wald, 2007).   In these study

halls, all men were considered equal (Ginzberg, 1928).

Psychology. Akiva employed a process element that had psychological dimensions.

Drazin (1940) argues that R. Akiva applied psychological principles of education. This process

element albeit subliminal was reiterated frequently. For example, the Talmud reports that Akiva

advised his students, "when you teach your son, teach him out of the corrected book" (BT

Pesachim, 112a). Likewise, R. Judah warned, "be heedful in study, for an unwitting error in

study is accounted deliberate transgression" (Mishnah Avoth 4:13). In this case, this process

element emphasized the great importance of using the correct teaching materials, namely, the

Torah and avoiding errors in study.

Analysis

The analysis section of this study will serve two purposes. One, this section will apply

Knowles' andragogical framework as a grid to analyze the data collected. In particular, the data

collected was sorted and categorized per Knowles' andragogical framework, namely, his

teaching methods that coincide with his six assumptions and his eight process elements.

Secondly, the researcher will re-visit the demands of historical research to pass external and

internal criticism and give examples how these demands were satisfied.

Comparisons of Teaching Methods and Processes

This study sought to discover if there was alignment between Akiva's teaching method

and process elements to those of Malcolm Knowles'. This section will compare the teaching

methods and process elements used between these two adult educators. Table 3 below outlines

the comparisons between Knowles' and Akiva's teaching methods.

Table 3 Knowles' Teaching Methods vs. Akiva's Teaching Methods

Knowles' Assumptions	Knowles' Teaching Methods	Akiva's Teaching Methods
Need to Know	field trips and role play	Not applicable
Learner's Self-Concept	Adult educator's attitude – listening to each student, calling each by his name, etc. Use of dialogue.	Akiva showed care for his students by visiting them when sick, etc.
Role of Learners' Experiences	Experiential teaching methods include group discussion, debate, simulation exercises, problem-solving activities, case method and peer-helping activities	Akiva used debate, and group discussion; study-partners are viewed as a peer helping activity; parables were used as case methods or exercises to reach possible resolutions.
Readiness to Learn	Asking real-life questions; using homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings	Akiva encouraged questions and taught that questions were raised by his students
Orientation to Learning	Discussion, role playing and case methods	Akiva used discussion and parabolic case studies
Motivation	Critical incident processes, computerized games, laboratory methods and simulation exercises	Not applicable

From this analysis, it appears that some of Akiva's teaching methods did align with Knowles' teaching methods of discussion, problem-solving, question-answer, debate and peer-helping activities. While it is not conclusive that there is alignment across the board, we can say that both Akiva and Knowles aimed for active learning over passive learning.

Comparison of Process Elements

While there is some alignment in teaching methods between Akiva and Knowles, Table 4 indicates minimal alignment between their process elements.

Table 4 Knowles' Process Elements vs. Akiva's Process Elements

Knowles' Process Elements	Akiva's Process Elements
Preparing Adult Learner	Not applicable; it was presumed that the adult learner was ready for the academy
Setting the Climate	Akiva created a conducive learning environment; he also considered the physical and psychological aspects
Creating a Mechanism for Mutual Planning	Not applicable
Diagnosis of Learning Needs	Not applicable
Translating Learning Needs into Objectives	Not applicable
Designing a Pattern of Learning	Not applicable
Helping learners carry out learning plans	Not applicable; while there were no formal learning plans, Akiva did help the adult learner carry out the learning and appropriating of the Torah
Evaluating the objectives	Not applicable

It appears R. Akiva did create an environment conducive for learning. However, no one-to-one comparison between R. Akiva's processes and Knowles' other seven processes were found. In fact, of the eight process categories, only setting the climate was explicitly used by R. Akiva. For example, as noted earlier, he like many rabbis before and after him, was concerned with the physical accommodations of his disciples. This is exactly why he sought shade during the hot summer months in Palestine. In short, the task of the andragog is to create an atmosphere

of adultness where individuals regard this climate as safe, caring, accepting, trusting, respectful and understanding (Knowles, 1989, 1990; Vella, 2002).

And like Knowles considered the psychological aspects of the learning context, Akiva did likewise. Akiva created learning environment characterized by adultness and where differences among adults were managed. However, Akiva was also mindful of another psychological aspect of the teaching environment. This aspect is captured in the Talmud, "when you teach your son, teach him out of the corrected book" (BT Pesahim, 112a). Likewise, R. Judah warned, "be heedful in study, for an unwitting error in study is accounted deliberate transgression" (BT Avoth 4:13). This psychological aspect focused on avoiding errors in the study of Torah.

No instances where found whereby R. Akiva was concerned with creating a mechanism for mutual planning, diagnosing the participant's learning needs, translating learning needs into objectives, helping learners carry out their learning plans, designing a pattern of learning; and evaluating the extent to which the objectives have been achieved. However, while there was not an official process of designing a learning plan for each student; there was a prescribed learning plan for each student that also allowed for individuality. The prescribed learning plan included the following: (a) students were taught by several rabbis; (b) students were assigned a study-partner; (c) the curriculum was standard; and (d) learning took place in community. Yet, a student's individuality was respected and regarded too. That is, a characteristic of Rabbinic Judaism was to move the story from a collective *we* to individual appropriation. Hartman (1999) writes, "learning moves the individual beyond collective solidarity to individual appropriation" (p. 53). So, it appears that some learning strategies had to be tailored to the student. For

instance, in the film, *Yentl*, we find a rabbi giving one on one instruction to a student while in the rabbi's house.

From the data collected, it seems that R. Akiva did consider the instructional climate that is, he encouraged questions and he considered the physical comfort of his students. He was inclusive in drawing a diverse student body to his academy. From this data there does not seem to be any hint of R. Akiva employing Knowles' other process elements.

Historiography and Historical Criticism

Historiography is a recognized research method. However, the researcher must assure that this method passes historical criticism or scrutiny. The following criteria must be met: external criticism, internal criticism, the successful mitigation of two pitfalls: presentism and use of concepts. Chapter 3 outlined how the researcher mitigated the risks associated with presentism and the use of concepts.

This section will focus on how this study exceeded the criteria of historical criticism. The researcher believes this study has met and exceeded the historical criticism for several reasons. One reason the researcher can claim compliance to the requirements of historical criticism is chiefly because of the ancient Jewish leaders emphasis on faithful transmission and preservation of the sacred teachings of Moses – the first adult educator or rabbi.

Faithful Transmission and Preservation. External criticism is concerned with the authenticity and credibility of documents. Specifically, in historical research external criticism evaluates the validity of the document. Namely, external criticism asks where, when, and by whom was the document produced (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). Similarly, internal criticism, according to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007), is concerned with the accuracy and worth of the statements contained in the document. Wiersma and Jurs (2005) note that "a pertinent question

of internal criticism is whether the author was predisposed, because of position or otherwise, to present a biased rather than an objective account" (p. 231).

Historical accuracy or meeting external and internal criticism is inherent in the Talmud and Mishnah because sages adhered to the charge to preserve the teaching of the oral law. We see this first in the Tanakh (2000), "Everything that I command you, you shall be careful to do. You shall not add to it or take from it" (Deuteronomy 13:1). In this charge to Moses, the first rabbi, God charges him to preserve it and every rabbi after Moses not only assumed that charge but perpetuated that charge. Barnett (1997) emphasizes the careful transmission of the oral tradition "rabbis carefully handed over teachings about Judaism to disciples who, in turn, as teachers delivered the traditions to their disciples, generation by generation" (p. 138). This process of carefully handing teachings over originates with Moses. The Talmud states,

> Our Rabbis learned: What was the procedure of the instruction in the oral law? Moses learned from the mouth of the Omnipotent. Then Aaron entered and Moses taught him his lesson. Aaron then moved aside and sat down on Moses' left. Thereupon Aaron's sons entered and Moses taught them their lesson. His sons then moved aside, Eleazar taking his seat on Moses' right and Ithamar on Aaron's left. R. Judah stated: Aaron was always on Moses right. Thereupon the elders entered and Moses taught them their lesson, and when the elders moved aside all the people entered and Moses taught them their lesson. It thus followed that Aaron heard the lesson four times, his sons heard it three times, the elders twice and all the people once. At this stage Moses departed and Aaron taught them his lesson. Then Aaron departed and his sons taught them their lesson. His sons then departed and the elders taught them their lesson. It thus followed that everybody

heard the lesson four times. From here R. Eliezer inferred: It is a man's duty to teach his pupil [his lesson] four times. For this is arrived at a minori ad majus: Aaron who learned from Moses who had it from the Omnipotent had to learn his lesson four times how much more so an ordinary pupil who learns from an ordinary teacher. (BT Eiruvin 54b)

Secondly, this research exceeded internal criticism because "rabbis carefully handed over teachings about Judaism to disciples who, in turn, as teachers delivered the traditions to their disciples, generation by generation" (Barnett, 1997, p. 138). Meticulous documentation was a focus; one such example involves the public fast (Levine, 2000). Patten (1980) adds that "The aim of the rabbinic writers was to preserve and expound tradition and in this way their work was very helpful" (pp. 171-172).

Thirdly, included in the corpus of rabbinic literature were instructions about how to preserve the tradition. For example, consider James (2011) who elucidates this fact,

In the Mishna Avot we have a record of how the oral law was passed down from generation and which sages were charged with preservation and teaching of the oral law, demonstrating an unbroken chain. The history of the subsequent transmission of the Oral Torah and the creation of the Talmud was recorded in the Iggeret Rav Shirer Hagaon, a letter from the head of the famous Babylonian academy of Jewish study at Pumpedesia (now a part of Baghdad) which had a continuous history dating back to the destruction of the First Temple through a generation or two after Rav Shirer died (1000 C.E.). This letter is cited in Maimonides' introduction to the Mishna Torah. In the letter Rav Shirer explains

that the oral law was faithfully and accurately transmitted, with no disputes among

the rabbis, until the time of the Roman conquest of Israel.

The Talmud contains the scholarly pursuits of more than 1000 scholars. And because

having one's name associated with authorship was foreign to these rabbis, all we know is that

unnamed amoraim compiled and redacted the Talmud (Wald, 2007). Assaf *et al.* (2007) simply

says, "the academies in Erez Israel and Babylonia in which the Mishnah was studied by the

amoraim and which produced the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmud" (p. 315). There was a

collective we that compiled and redacted the Talmud. Thus, we can be confident of its

historicity, and thus, its authenticity and credibility.

One way to vouch for the authenticity, veracity and credibility of rabbinic literature like

the Torah and the Talmud is to ask, what did later authors do with these rabbinic sources? For

instance, what did the church fathers like Origen do with these rabbinic sources? Shinan (1990)

offers an answer,

> Works of the Church Fathers were written in several different languages: Greek,
>
> Latin, Syriac, etc., and they include works in various literary forms and having
>
> different characteristics: theological treatises, commentaries on the Bible, sermons,
>
> polemical and historiographical essays etc. Their books are full of material
>
> originating among the Jewish people and its Torah, both direct borrowing and what
>
> was more important in this period, for the requirements of rejection and polemic.
>
> (p. 133)

In short, Shinan (1990) reminds us that various Church Fathers like Origen used material

that originated with the Jewish people including the Torah and the Talmud.

Finally, rabbinic students relied on the accuracy of the Talmud. Agus (1962) thus provides another reason to be confident in the Talmud's trustworthiness as he writes,

> the scholars of this period could rely implicitly on the Babylonian Talmud, since they possessed a very accurate text whose exact wording was not only attested to by written manuscripts but also by an uninterrupted tradition of oral transmission and a well cultivated memory. (pp. 10-11)

In other words, the Talmuds have internal evidence of their reliability. As Shinan (1991) notes, "oral transmission was not a matter of preference but an explicit requirement" (p. 355). This unwavering commitment to faithful oral transmission bolsters the reliability of the Talmuds and all halakah literature. Compliance with external and internal criticism is inherent in the Talmuds.

Conclusion

Akiva excelled beyond his colleagues and masters in the matter of understanding and teaching Torah. Teaching was of utmost importance to him. In fact, Akiva argued that one must continue to teach even in old age per Ecclesiastes 11:6 (Tanakh, 2000; BT Tanhuma 6). Akiva valued the role of being a teacher to his pupils and captured this value in three beautiful similes. Rabbi Akiva gives these three similes after his teacher, Rabbi Eliezer, had remarked that he had received much from his teachers. Finkelstein (1990) then records Akiva's remarks,

> I cannot even say that I have taken from my teacher even so much as he admits. What I received amounts to the fragrance given off by the citron, and the light take from one candle to another, and the water drawn from a brook. The beneficiary enjoys the color, increases in light, and is refreshed by the water; but the giver has lost nothing! (p. 176)

Chapter 5 – Findings and Conclusions

Chapter 4 presented an analysis of the historical data using Knowles' andragogical framework. This final chapter further elaborates on the findings. The chapter ends with some recommendations for future research and a conclusion.

This inductive qualitative study sought to discover if the teaching methods and process elements of a second century rabbi aligned with Malcolm Knowles' (1970, 1980) teaching methods and processes. Prior to this such a study had not been done. Thus, the purpose of this qualitative research study is to identify the teaching methods and process elements employed by R. Akiva when teaching adult learners and to discover if his teaching methods and process elements aligned with Knowles' andragogical framework; the teaching methods that are associated with his six assumptions and his eight andragogical process elements.

Review of the Methodology

The methodology used in this study was historiography in general and historical research in particular. With any historical research study, one must be aware of the associated pitfalls and satisfactorily address external and internal criticism. The researcher believes this study has satisfactorily met the demands of external and internal criticism.

Second century R. Akiva was chosen to study for several reasons. Among other things, Rabbi Akiva and his colleagues, Rabban Gamaliel II, who led the academy at Yavneh after Yohanan ben Zakkai and Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, took the lead in reconstituting Jewish life in Palestine and in gathering together the traditions of their pre-70 C.E. Pharisaic and tannaitic forbearers (Newsome, 1992). The many commendations written about Rabbi Akiva in history make him a worthy candidate. For instance, Solomon (1998) and Wigoder (2002) write that Rabbi Akiva was a pre-eminent sage of the Mishnaic era. Rabbi Akiva is considered by many to

be the father of Rabbinic Judaism (Solomon, 1998). In fact, Cohen (2008) added that "he may be described as the architect of the plan of the Mishnah" (p. xxvi).

Similarly, Knowles' andragogical framework-methods and process elements-were chosen because he is regarded as the father of American andragogy and he has contributed much to the development and practice of andragogy in America. His andragogical framework was used to sort, code, and analyze the data and to identify alignment between Akiva's teaching methods and processes and Knowles' teaching methods and process elements. Namely, the researcher coded the historical data of Akiva's teaching methods and process elements in accordance with Knowles' teaching methods and process elements. Once the data was coded, an alignment analysis was done.

Research Questions

The primary research question was: Do the teaching methods and process elements used by R. Akiva align with Malcolm Knowles' andragogical framework – the teaching methods that are associated with his six assumptions and his eight andragogical process elements? Secondary questions that were explored included:

1. What teaching methods did R. Akiva employ in teaching the Torah?

2. Did R. Akiva use process elements such as preparing the learners for the program, setting the learning climate, creating a mechanism for mutual planning, diagnosing the participant's learning needs, translating learning needs into objectives, designing a pattern of learning, helping learners carry out their learning plans, or evaluating the extent to which the objectives have been achieved?

3. How does R. Akiva's teaching methods and process elements compare and contrast with Malcolm Knowles?

4. Did R. Akiva operate from a rabbinic philosophy of adult education?

Similarities and Differences between Teaching Methods and Processes

As noted in the literature review, fathers and parents in antiquity used stories and modeling to teach morals and ethics. Likewise, Akiva used stories and modeling to teach the Torah. Soferim or scribes like Erza (fifth century B.C.E.) emphasized and used methods to facilitate memorization when teaching the sacred writings of the Torah. For instance, soferim or scribes like Ezra used methods such as, parable, discussion, lectures and question and answer. Similarly, Rabbi Akiva used methods to facilitate memorization. So, Akiva used parables, discussion, lectures and question and answer as teaching methods. Later in Jewish history, prophets used preaching as a form of teaching. Akiva used expounding the Torah or preaching as a teaching method. And among the teachers of Torah, rhetoric and literary devices such as mnemonic devices were used to aid rote memorization. These aids include alliteration, repetition, cantillation, question and answer, parables (mashal) and debates. R. Akiva employed these same devices when teaching his adult learners. Not only did most of the data collected on R. Akiva's teaching methods find agreement with the literature search but also the data collected on the existence of study houses cohere with the literature.

While there were instances where the teaching methods employed by Akiva corroborated with the literature, there were also some occasions where there was not coherence. For example, Akiva used rules (middot) and shouting as a teaching technique. Finally, like the literature search, this study gave very little articulation to the processes used by Akiva and his contemporaries and those rabbis that proceeded and succeeded them.

Similar Teaching Methods and Process Elements

On one hand, the researcher found the Tanakh (2000) to be true, "There is nothing new under the sun" (Ecclesiastes1:9). Thus, there were some similarities in Akiva's teaching methods and process elements and those of Knowles' teaching methods and process elements. In short, both men strongly favored active and participatory learning over passive learning and both men sought ways to achieve that end. On the other hand, there were some differences in these two educators' methods and process elements.

Similar Teaching Methods

Akiva and Knowles employed debate as a teaching method. Akiva and rabbis before and after him used debate because as Green (1978) explains, "the mode or style of argumentation is hardly a concern of ordinary people, but it is a matter of practical importance for people whose principal activity is thinking" (p. 6). It is worth noting that debating among rabbis and rabbis and students was passionate and quite intense. Study-partners debated in the yeshiva and as they walked and were engaged in daily tasks. This practice apparently existed until the early 20th century because in the film, *Yentl*, which is situated in Eastern Europe 1904, there are several such debates depicted between the older rabbi Avigdor and the younger rabbi student Anshel. Debate aligns with Knowles' philosophy of adult education and its emphasis on intellectual development. For Akiva, these study-partnerships led to close relationships and Greenberg (1969) declares that forming close relationships with colleagues was "indispensible to a proper education" (p. 28).

Both men also used group discussion and questions and answers as teaching methods. In fact, Akiva taught in such a way that provoked questions from his students. Finally, another feature of R. Akiva's methodology was an emphasis on the whole person. That is, Akiva

endeavored to engage all the faculties of his students. He used teaching methods that engaged the mind, imagination, body and heart.

Similar Process Elements

The only process element of Akiva that strongly aligned with Knowles is the setting of the classroom environment. Akiva established an environment conducive for learning in several ways. Akiva employed many factors to create this learning environment. One, he genuinely cared for his students. For example, in accordance with the Torah, he visited his disciples when they were ill. Second, he was sensitive to the fact that disciples had other obligations like family. Third, he sought shelter for his study sessions during the hot climates of Palestine. Knowles likewise cared for his students and this is captured in his assumption of learner's self concept. According to Knowles, the educator helps the learner become more self-aware by his or her attitude or mannerisms. Inherent in this assumption is that the teacher is the chief teaching method. Knowles' other process elements were not as explicit in Akiva's methodology and an attempt to make an alignment would be a forced one.

Methodological Differences

While there are similarities, there are also some differences in Akiva's and Knowles' approach to teaching. First, Akiva aimed for a lively classroom environment. From the research, it appears that the rabbinic classroom was quite noisy and animated. For example, Akiva encouraged his students to engage the sacred texts of the Oral and Written law by singing and swaying. Second, the motivation to learn Torah was a lifelong passion and obsession of rabbis in particular and Jewish people in general. Drazin (1940) tells us why, "Jewish education was synonymous with life, it unfolded life, giving it direction and meaning" (p. 12). Jewish education was chiefly for transforming character. And this has been the character of Jewish

education form earliest times through the era of the tannaim. Hartman (1999) adds that "the rabbis became the shapers of revelation. That is, they became an interpretive community" (p. 33). Learning Torah was their obsession and passion and they stopped at nothing to help students understand the sacred text. In fact, even today the student sings the words of the text and dances with the scrolls of the law (Hartman, 1999).

Akiva taught in a strictly oral educational culture; no note-taking was allowed. This required patience on Akiva's part because as stated in Chapter 4 he sometimes had to repeat a lesson four times to assure his students understood and grasped the material. Additionally, this oral culture permitted more fluid and dynamic give-and-take discussions. Of course, this required that students were quite attentive to their rabbis' instruction.

For rabbis like Akiva, learning was not a means to an end; learning was a form of worship because in learning the Torah, the Jew came face to face with the God in the Torah. Akiva argued that one must continue to teach even in old age per Ecclesiastes 11:6 (Tanakh). So, like Knowles, Akiva not only believed in life-long learning but life-long teaching too. In fact, it was Akiva's teaching in defiance of a Roman edict that ultimately cost him his life.

Discussion

The adult Jewish education in yeshivas or study sessions was quite lively, animated and noisy. For example, in one scene in the film, *Yentl*, rabbis are animated when discussing Torah at a table and students, Avigdor and Anshel, are animated while discussing Torah as they walk a dirt path. By animated the researcher means, arms are flinging and volume levels of voices rise and fall to make a point. Rabbis appealed to their disciples' imagination, head and heart. The Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education appears to have been a wholistic affair that involved one's hearing, heart, body and mind. Gollancz (1924) picks up this idea when he writes,

"education must take all the faculties into consideration, and not one at the expense of the other. Of what value is it to possess a vivid imagination and a reliable memory, if reasoning power and clear judgment be wanting?" (p. 52) And rabbinic literature served this end of teaching that touched on all students' faculties including their imagination (Neusner, 1987). The aggadic stories appealed to the heart and the imagination while the halakic portions of the Torah appealed to the mind.

Anatomy of the Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education

Malcolm Knowles subscribed to and practiced a clearly articulated and formalized Humanistic Philosophy of Adult Education (HPAE). On the contrary, Cohen *et al.* (1974) and Greenberg (1969) contend that a Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education is not formalized or clearly articulated. Dr. Robert Vasholz, an Old Testament Hebrew scholar, points out that articulating a PAE was not the focus of rabbis (personal communication, April 25, 2011). And Marilyn Kincaid who holds a M.A. in Jewish Studies adds,

> I am certain Rabbi Akiva did not think in terms of a 'philosophy of adult education.' Learning was a basic concept--it was for everyone (or at least every male). It was just something that you did as much as you were able. You had to make a living, of course, but during your 'off time,' you studied Torah; this in a broad sense. (personal communication, May 16, 2011)

However, all adult educators operate via a philosophy of adult education because beliefs inform practice and vice versa (Chambliss, 2009; Elias & Merriam, 1995, 2005; Tisdell & Taylor, 2000). Therefore, the researcher argues that while a formalized RPAE may not have existed, R. Akiva did practice from one because some features emerged from this study. One such feature was the fundamental acknowledgement of human dignity (Hartman, 1999). Thus

coupled with this feature of human dignity was that rabbis believed that male adults could learn. Another characteristic of the RPAE that emerged was that rabbis sought to teach to the whole person. Additionally, rabbis sought to inculcate the belief that Torah can be applied in the social sphere. The Torah was to be lived out in the daily affairs of life. In other words, although students learned in a communal atmosphere, they nonetheless were required to appropriate the teachings of Torah individually.

In this teaching culture, the rabbi was esteemed but students nonetheless debated with their rabbis because this honoring of their masters did not require self-abnegation. Rather, this debating back and forth nurtured and enhanced the creative faculties of the students (Neusner, 1987).

Another feature of the RPAE was the rabbis' aim to create an interpretative culture. This interpretative culture or comprehensive framework was to help the Jewish laity to interpret their experience, to provide a discipline of religious practice in communal life and to ultimately help guide their actions in a hostile world. So, RPAE sought to bring theory and practice together. Lastly, other features of the RPAE included an emphasis on developing the intellect of students and on engendering a love for the Torah and for life-long learning and teaching.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study has merely scratched the surface of learning more about adult education and practices in the Rabbinic Judaism tradition in antiquity. Thus, more research can be done within this rich context. For example, recommendations for future research include examining more documents and literature to give more shape and formalization to the Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education. Additionally, more research is needed to discover,

- what present day adult educational contexts might benefit from the use of rote memorization and the use of chanting and mnemonics as a teaching methods;

- what place storytelling has in andragogy since Merriam *et al.* (2007) believe that andragogy warrants more research and development in narrative learning;

- how studying the Torah with the intent of arriving at and practicing the truth intersect with our postmodern context in which all truths are relative;

- how might online learning (or heutagogy) overlap with active teaching methods such as debate and discussion which are quite effective face-to-face;

- how might modern day adult educators better achieve inclusivity or achieve a sense of equality among students of different backgrounds, ethnicities, etc.;

- what insight other world religions, like Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam, might offer on teaching adults;

- how might the teaching methods and process elements of other adult educators, like Savicievic, compare to those of R. Akiva; and finally,

- why of all Knowles' process elements did he and R. Akiva only share the process element of setting the climate?

Conclusion

Based on the findings from this study, some effective teaching methods and process elements transcend time and culture. Rabbinic Judaism presents an excellent resource for learning best practices from rabbis who were revered because they stood in succession of the first Rabbi, Moses. Rabbis taught, expounded, embodied and lived out the Torah. However, many of the teaching methods employed by R. Akiva and those before and after him were used by other teachers of the Torah, namely, fathers, scribes, and prophets. One such teaching method

that most rabbis used was asking questions. Kershner (2010) quotes Rabbi Adin Stinsaltz who said, "asking questions, is both the secret of science and the essence of the Talmud, the dialectic forming the character of the Jewish people" (p. A9).

So it appears that not only was the law orally transmitted to generation to generation but also teaching methods were passed on from generation to generation. Simply put, Rabbi Akiva and his contemporaries emulated the teaching methods and process elements of their predecessors. And one feature of the Rabbinic Philosophy of Adult Education was the engagement of the whole person in the educational process. As a result, a student's faculties - his mind, his heart, his body, and his imagination - were exercised in the educational process for the sole reason of inculcating Torah to ultimately practice Torah in public. The auditory, vision, imagination and mind were especially engaged in this process. R. Akiva's teaching practices and process elements were worth considering and perhaps adapting in our modern adult educational context.

Knowles (1989) and Savicevic (2000) suggested that within ancient Jewish educational circles, andragogical institutions were the first to be established. However, neither adult educator mentioned R. Akiva by name in their work. This study presented a name or personality which substantiates their claim.

As we look to the future of adult education and the teaching methods and process elements used, more than likely, we will notice some of the same techniques which were used in antiquity employed in today's adult classroom. It appears that regardless of the context, some teaching methods and processes or best practices will never become obsolete and transcend both time and culture.

References

Agus, I. A. (1962). The oral traditions of pre-crusade Ashkenazic Jewry. In M. Ben-Horin (Ed.),

   Studies and essays in honor of Abraham A. Neuman (pp. 1-16). Philadelphia, PA:

   Dropsie College.

Allen, M. (2008). Promoting critical thinking skills in online information literacy instruction

   using a constructivist approach. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, *15*(1 & 2), 21-38.

Anfara, V. A., & Mertz, N. T. (Eds.) (2006). *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research*.

   Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques*. San Francisco, CA:

   Jossey-Bass.

Armstrong, J. L. (2007). Seven keys for small group success. *Adult learning*, *15*(1-2), 34-35.

Assaf, S., Breuer, M., & Steinsaltz, A. (2007). Yeshivot. In F. Skolnik, *Encyclopadia Judaica*

   (2nd ed., Vol. 21, pp. 315-317). Detroit, MI: Gale.

Bacher, W. (1901). Academies in Babylonia and Palestine. In I. Singer (Ed.), *The Jewish*

   encyclopedia, (Vol. 1, pp. 145-148). New York, NY: Funk and Wagnalls.

Barnett, P. W. (1997). *Jesus and the logic of history*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Barrs, J. (2009). *Learning evangelism from Jesus*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.

Basser, H.W. (1989). *Adult learning: Theory and practice*. In Z. Garber (Ed.), *Methodology in the academic teaching of Judaism*. New York, NY: University Press of America.

Baumgartner, L., Lee, M., Birden, S., & Flowers, D. (2003). Adult learning theory: A primer. *Information Series*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Bayer, H. (n.d.). *The "synoptic phenomenon" and the date of the canonical Gospels and Acts*. Unpublished manuscript, New Testament Department, Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO.

Beer, M. (2007). Academies in Babylonia and Erez Israel. In F. Skolnik (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 347-351). New York, NY: Thomson-Gale.

Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Berger, N. O., Caffarella, R. S., & O'Donnell, J. M. (2004). Learning contracts. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods* (pp. 289-319). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Bettan, I. (1939). *Studies in Jewish preaching*. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College Press.

Bialik, H. N., & Ravnitzky, Y. H. (1992). *The book of legends*. New York, NY: Schocken Books.

Bigge, M. L. (1976). *Learning theories for teachers*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Blizzard, R. (2004). *Jesus the rabbi and his Rabbinic method of teaching*. Austin, TX: Biblescholars Press.

Boccaccini, G. (2002). *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An intellectual history, from Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Bornstein, D. J., & Guttmann, M. (1928). Akiva. In J. Klatzkin and I. Elbogen (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Vol. 1, pp. 7-22). New York, NY: Thomson-Gale.

Boyarin, D. (1993). *Carnal Israel: Reading sex in Talmudic Culture*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Brameld, T. (1971). *Patterns of educational philosophy: Divergence and convergence in culturological perspective*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Brookfield, S. D., & Preskill, S. (1999). *Discussion as a way of teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. D. (2004). Discussion. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods* (3rd ed., pp. 209-226). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Broudy, H. S. (1962). Implications of classical realism and philosophy on education. In H. W. Burns & C. J. Bruner (Eds.), *Philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Ronald Press Company.

Brown, F., Driver, S., & Briggs, C. (1997). *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Brown, J. S. (2006). New learning environments in the 21st century: Exploring the edge. *Change*, 18-24. Retrieved from http://www.johnseelybrown

Bruce, F. F. (1977). *Paul: Apostle of the heart set free*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Buchler, A. (1914). Learning and teaching in the open air. In C. Adler & S. Schechter (Eds.), *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, *4*, 485-491.

Bullock, C. H. (1986). *An introduction to the Old Testament prophetic books*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Butts, R. F. (1952). Historical and philosophical foundations of education. *Review of Educational Research*, *22*, 5-13. doi:10.3102/00346543022001005

Carlson, A. (2005). Adults' experiences in learning a foreign language in a university classroom. In M. Cooper (Ed.), *Adult education: Working for you*, *A CD Proceedings of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education*. Pittsburgh, PA: American Association for Adult and Continuing Education.

Carson, D. A. (1996). *Exegetical fallacies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Chambliss, J. J. (2009). Philosophy of education today. *Educational Theory*, *59*, 233-251. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.2009.00316.x

Chapman, B. S. (2000). Praxis: An adult education practicum. *Adult Learning, 11*(1), 14-17. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Chilton, B., & Neusner, J. (2004). *Classical Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism: Comparing Theologies*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Cleveland, H. Z. (1987). Parable. In J. Douglas & M. Tenney (Eds.), *The new international dictionary of the Bible,* (pp. 750-751). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing.

Cohen, G. D., Finkelstein, L., Gordis, D. M., Greenberg, S., Holtz, A., Lieber, D., & Silverman, D.W. (1974). Towards a Rabbinic philosophy of education. *The Samuel Friedland Lectures: 1967-1974, USA*, 11-30.

Cohen, A. (2008). *Everyman's Talmud*. Miami, FL: BN Publishing.

Cohen, S. (1988). Roman domination: The Jewish revolt and the destruction of the second temple. In H. Shanks (Ed.), *Ancient Israel: A short history from Abraham to the Roman destruction of the temple* (pp. 205-259). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Commission of Jewish Education. (1927). *Adult Education in Judaism* (Issue No. 308358). Union of American Hebrew Congregations: Author.

Conti, G.J., & Kolody, R. C. (2004). Guidelines for selecting methods and techniques. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods* (pp. 181-192). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Cooke, J. C. (1994). *Malcolm Shepherd Knowles, the father of American andragogy: A biographical study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, Denton, TX.

Coughlin, P. K. (2010). Making field trips count: Collaborating for meaningful experiences. *Social Studies*, *101*(5), 200-210. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Cranton, P. (2006). Integrating perspectives on authenticity. In P. Cranton (Ed.), *Authencity in teaching* (pp. 83-88). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, *11*, 83-87. doi:10.1002/ace.230

Crenshaw, J. (1998). *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the deadening silence*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Curren, R. (Ed.) (2007). *Philosophy of education: An anthology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Daines, J., Daines, C., & Graham, B. (1993). *Adult learning, adult teaching*. Department of Adult Education, Loughborough, Leicestershire, University of Nottingham.

Danker, F. W. (Ed.) (2000). *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Danto, E. A. (2008). *Historical research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Davies, W. D. (1955). *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. London, England: SPCK.

Dicker, A. (2007). Hanoder Min Hamevushal. In H. Goldwum (Ed.), *Tractate Nedarim* (2nd ed., Vol. II, pp. 49a-53b). Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah Publications, Inc.

Dobson, J. F. (1963). *Ancient education and its meaning to us*. New York, NY: Cooper Square

    Publishers, Inc.

Douglas, B. (1999). Simulated field trips: Facilitating adult learning in and out the classroom.

    Adult learning, 11(4), 7-8. Retrieved from http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/

Draves, W. A. (1984). *How to teach adults*. Manhattan, KS: Learning Resources Network.

Drazin, N. (1940). *History of Jewish education from 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore, MD: The

    John Hopkins Press.

Dumbrell, W. J. (1984). *Covenant and creation: A theology of the Old Testament covenants*.

    Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press.

DuPre, C. (2010). Alternative break service trips. *About Campus*, *15*(3), 25-28.
    doi: 10.1002/abc.20026

Edwards, J. (2002). *The gospel according to Mark*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing.

Efron, N. J. (2003). *Real Jews*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Eisenberg, J., & Scolnic, E. (2001). *The JPS Dictionary of Jewish Words*. Philadelphia, PA:

    The Jewish Publication Society.

Eisner, E. W. (1985). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school*

    programs. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Elias, J. L., & Merriam, S. B. (1995). *Philosophical foundations of adult education* (2nd ed.).

    Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Elias, J. L., & Merriam, S. B. (2005). *Philosophical foundations of adult education* (3rd ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Epstein, I. (1959). *Judaism: A historical presentation*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin.

Farrah, S. J. (2004). Lecture. In Michael W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods*, (pp. 227-252). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Fellenz, R. A., & Conti, G. J. (1989). *Learning and reality: Reflection on trends in adult learning*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Fendel, Z. (1981). *Legacy of Sinai*. New York, NY: Hashkafah Publications.

Findsen, B. (2007). Freirean philosophy and pedagogy in the adult education context: the case of older adults' learning. *Stud Philos Educ, 26*, 545-559. doi: 10.10007/s11217-007-9063-1

Finkelstein, L. (1928-1930). The origin of the synagogue. *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (Vol. 1, pp. 49-59). American Academy for Jewish Research, Philadelphia, PA.

Finkelstein, L. (1990). Akiba: scholar, saint and martyr. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Fitzgerald, K. (2006). Teaching methods and instructional setting. In S. B. Bastable (Ed.), *Essentials of Patient Education* (pp. 319-347). Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Foley, G. (2001, January-April). Radical adult education and learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *20*(1/2), 71-88.

Fordjor, P. K., Kotoh, A. M., Kpeli, K. K., Kwamefio, A., Mensa, Q. B., Owusu, E., & Mullins, B. (2003). A review of traditional Ghanian and Western philosophies of adult education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *22*, 182-199. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Freedman, H., & Wald, S. G. (2007). Akiva. In F. Skolnik, *Encyclopadia Judaica* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 562-563). Detroit, MI: Gale.

Friedman, S. (2004). A good story deserves retelling: the unfolding of the Akiva legend. *Jewish Studies, an Internet Journal*, *3*, 55-93.

Furniss, W. T., & Graham, P. A. (Eds.). (1974). *Women in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council of Education.

Gall, M.D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gehring, T. (2000). A compendium of material on the pedagogy-andragogy issue. *Journal of Continuing Education*, *51*(1), 151-163.

Gilbert, M. (2002). *Letters to Auntie Fori: the 5000-year history of the Jewish people and their faith*. New York, NY: Schocken.

Ginzberg, L. (1928). *Students, scholars and saints*. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America.

Goldin, J. (1960). The period of the Talmud (135 B.C.E.-1035 C.E.). In L. Finkelstein (Ed.), *The Jews: Their history, culture and religion* (3rd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 115-215). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Goldin, J. (1976). Toward a profile of the tanna, Aquiba ben Joseph. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, *96*(1), 38-56.

Goldman, I. M. (1975). *Lifelong learning among Jews*. New York, NY: Ktav Publishing House, Inc.

Gollancz, H. (1924). *Pedagogics of the Talmud and that of modern times*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Goodblatt, D. (1975). *Rabbinic instruction in Sasanian Babylonia*. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill.

Gottschalk, L. (1950). *Understanding history: A primer of historical method*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gottwald, N. K. (1985). *The Hebrew Bible: A socio-literary introduction*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Grabbe, L. (1996). *An introduction to first century Judaism*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, LTD.

Grace, A. P. (2001). Using queer cultural studies to transgress adult educational space. In V. Sheared & P. A. Sissel (Eds.), *Making space: merging theory and practice in adult*

education (pp. 257-270). Westport, CN: Bergin & Garvey.

Graff, H. F., & Barzun, J. (1985). *The modern researcher*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace

    Jovanoch.

Green, W. S. (1978). Introduction. In W. S. Green (Ed.), *Approaches to ancient Judaism: Theory*

    and practice, (pp. 1-9). Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers, Inc.

Green, W. S. (1978). What's in a name? The problematic of Rabbinic "biography." In W. S.

    Green (Ed.), *Approaches to ancient Judaism: Theory and practice*, (pp. 119-131). Ann

    Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers, Inc.

Green, Y. (2006). Prolegomena to the book of Proverbs. *Jewish Bible Quarterly*, *34*(4), 218-225.

Greenberg, S. (1969). The concept of man underlying the Biblical philosophy of education.

    Jewish Education, *39*, 18-35.

Griffin, C. (1983). *Curriculum theory and adult and lifelong education*. New York, NY: Nickols

    Publishing.

Gutmann, J. (1975). The origin of the synagogue. In H. Olrinsky (Ed.), *The Synagogue: Studies*

    in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture (pp. 72-76). New York, NY: Ktav Publishing.

Hansman, C. (2001). Context-based adult learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), <u>The new update on</u>

    <u>adult learning theory (pp. 43-51).</u> *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*

    Update on Adult Learning. No. 89. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hartman, D. (1999). *A heart of many rooms*. Woodstock, Vermont: Jewish Lights Publishing.

Hartree, A. (1984). Malcolm Knowles' theory of andragogy: A critique. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *3*(3), 203-210.

Heath, G. L. (2008). *Doing church history: A user-friendly introduction to researching the history of Christianity*. Toronto, Ontario: Clements Publishing.

Heimstra, R., & Sisco, B. (1990). *Individualizing instruction*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Heiser, M. (2008). Monotheism, polytheism, monolatry, or henotheism? Toward an assessment of divine plurality in the Hebrew Bible. *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, *18*, 1-30.

Helmreich, W. (1982). *The world of the yeshiva*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Helterbran, V. R. (2008). The ideal professor: student perceptions of effective instructor practices, attitudes, and skills. *Education*, *129*(1), 125-138.

Henschke, J. (1975). How to use the lecture as a learning/teaching technique with adults. *Baptist Leader*. Valley Forge, PA: American Baptist Churches.

Henschke, J. (1998). *Historical antecedents shaping conceptions of andragogy: A comparison of sources and roots*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Research in Comparative Andragogy, Radovljica, Slovenia.

Henschke, J. (1999). Historical antecedents shaping the term of performance and learning and their relationship in human resource development: An exploratory study. In K. P. Kuchinke (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1999 AHRD Conference* (pp. 611-619). Arlington, VA.

Henschke, J. (2009). A perspective on the history and philosophy of andragogy: An international sketch. In M. Boucouvals (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Commission on International Adult Education [CIAE] Pre-Conference, 1*, 54-122.

Henschke, J. (2009). The dynamic of a living lecture in career and technical evaluation. In V. Wang (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on E-Learning Applications for Career and Technial Education*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Henschke, J., Cooper, M., & Isaac, P. (2003). *Teaching adults and non-traditional students*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Adult Education, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO.

Henschke, J., & Cooper, M. (n.d.). *Toward a more complete understanding of the international foundations of andragogy in adult education and human resource development*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Adult Education, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO.

Henschke, J., & Cooper, M. (2001). *Andragogy: The foundation for its theory, research and practice linkage*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Adult Education, University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO.

Hezser, C. (2001). *Jewish literacy in Roman Palestine*. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Heywood-Thomas, J. (1970). Existentialism. In S. G. F. Brandon (Ed.), *Dictionary of
     comparative religion* (pp. 272-274). New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Hoenig, S. (1975). The supposititious temple-synagogue. In H. Olrinsky (Ed.), *The Synagogue:
     studies in origins, archaeology and architecture* (pp. 55-71). New York, NY: Ktav
     Publishing.

Hoffman, J.E. (1997). Jewish education in Biblical times: Joshua to 933 BCE. *Jewish Bible
     Quarterly*, *25*, 114-119.

Howard, D. M. (1993). *An introduction to the Old Testament historical Books*. Chicago, IL:
     Moody Press.

Hughey, M. (2005). The sociology, pedagogy, and theology of Huey P. Newton: Toward a
     radical democratic utopia. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, *29*(3), 639-655.

Ilan, T. (1996). *Jewish women in Greco-Roman Palestine*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson
     Publishers.

Ingalls, J. D. (1976). *Human energy: The critical factor for individuals and organizations*.
     Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Isaacs, N. (1925). Study as a mode of worship. In L. Jung (Ed.), *The Jewish Library* (Vol. 3, pp.
     3-22). New York, NY: Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Isbell, C. (2003). Deuteronomy's definition of Jewish learning, *The Jewish Bible quarterly*,

31(2), 109-116.

Jackson, L. D. (2009). Revisiting adult learning theory through the lens of an adult learner. *Adult Learning*, *20*(3-4), 20-22. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Jacobs, L. (1999). *The Jewish religion: a companion*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jaeger, W. (1961). *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press

Jaffee, M. (1997). *Early Judaism*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

James, B. (2011). *Development of the Talmud*. Retrieved from http://judaism.about.com/od/torahtalmud/a/talmud_dev.htm.

James, K. (2003). How low self-esteem affects adult learners. *Adult Learning*, *14*(5), 24-26. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Jarvis, P. (1984). Andragogy: A sign of the times. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *16*, 32-38.

Jarvis, P. (1987). *Adult learning in the social context*. London: Croom Helm.

Jarvis, P. (1993). The learning process and late modernity. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 37*(3), 179-190.

Jarvis, P. (2000). Globalisation, the learning society and comparative education. *Comparative Education, 36*(3), 343-355. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/

Jarvis, P. (2006). *Andragogy versus pedagogy or from pedagogy to andragogy: A re-assessment of Knowles' dilemma with the development of learning theory*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Surrey, Surrey, UK.

Jeremias, J. (1969). *Jerusalem in the time of Jesus*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Johnson, L. F. (2000). *Dialogues in andragogy*. Paper presented to a Doctoral Research Graduate Credit Seminar on Andragogy, University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Jorgensen, H. K. (1998, August). *Adult learning theories and religious education for Seven-Day Adventist college students: From theory to practice*. Paper presented at the Seminar Schlossbogenhofen, St. Peter Am Hart, Austria.

Josephus, F. (1961). *Josephus: The life against Apion* (H. J. Thackeray, Trans). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published in 1926).

Kabuga, C. (1982). Why andragogy in developing countries? In *Adult Education and Development: Journal for Adult Education in Africa, Asia and Latin America, 19*, 53-60.

Kaplan, M. M. (1974). The legal foundations of Rabbinic Judaism. In J. Neusner (Ed.), *Understanding Rabbinic Judaism,* (pp. 55-60). New York, NY: Ktav.

Keil, C. F., & Delitzch, F. (2001). *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Kershner, I. (2010, November 19). Life's work is a Talmud accessible to all Jews. *New York Times*, p. A9.

Kilpatrick, W. H. (1951). *Philosophy of education*. New York, NY: Macmillan Company.

Kim, S. K., & Merriam, S. (2010). Situated learning and identity development in a Korean older

    adults' computer classroom. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *60*(5), 438-455. doi:

    10.1177/0741713610363019

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1971). *A practical guide for supervisory training and development*. Reading,

    MS: Addison-Wesley.

Klapholtz, Y. Y. (1970). *Tales of the Baal Shem Tov*. New York, NY: Feldheim Publishers.

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy*.

    New York, NY: Association Press.

Knowles, M. S. (1975). *Self-directed learning*. Chicago, IL: Follett.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*

    (Rev. ed.). Chicago, IL: Follett Publishing Company.

Knowles, M. S. (1986). *Using learning contracts*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M.S. (1989). *Adult learning: Theory and practice*. In L. Nadler & A. Nadler (Eds.),

    The handbook of human resource development (2nd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley &

    Sons.

Knowles, M.S. (1989). *The making of an adult educator*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knowles, M.S. (1990). *The adult learner: a neglected species*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing

    Company.

Knowles, M.S. (1995). *Components of an andragogical process design*. Alexandria, VA:

    American Society for Teaching & Development. Retrieved from

    www.umsl.edu/~henschkej/

Knowles, M.S. (1996). Adult learning. In R. Craig (Ed.), *The ASTD training and development

    handbook* (pp. 253-265). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Knowles, M.S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). *The adult learner: The definitive classic

    in adult education and human resource development* (5th ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf

    Publishing Company.

Knowles, M.S., Holton, E.F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic

    in adult education and human resource development* (6th ed.). Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Krauss, S. (1948). Outdoor teaching in Talmudic times. *The Journal of Jewish Studies*, *1*, 82-84.

Kuethe, J. L. (1968). *The teaching-learning process*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and

    Company.

Lassner, J. (Ed.) (1999). *A mediterranean society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Legge, D. (1971). Discussion methods. In G. W. Roderick & M. D. Stephens (Eds.), *Teaching

    techniques in adult education* (pp. 75-89). Newton Abbott, Devon: David and Charles.

Levine, L. (2000). *The ancient synagogue*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lindeman, E. (1926). *The meaning of adult education*. New York, NY: New Republic.

Lynch, J. P. (1972). *Aristotle's school: A study of a Greek educational institution*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Mayo, P. (2005). A review of liberating praxis: Paulo Freire's legacy for radical adult education and politics. *Convergence*, *38*(2), 80-84.

McFarlan, D. M. (1986). *Concise Bible Dictionary*. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass & Sons.

Merriam, S. B. (2001). Andragogy and self-directed learning: Pillars of adult learning theory. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *The New Update on Adult Learning Theory* (pp. 3-13). New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No. 89. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Merriam, S. B., & Elias, J. L. (1995). *Philosophical foundations of adult education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in Adulthood*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., & Elias, J. L. (2005). *Philosophical foundations of adult education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.

Merriam, S.B. Caffarella, R.S., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

Merrill, T. C., & Douglas, J. D. (Eds.) (1988). *Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishers.

Merrill, H. S. (2005). Book reviews. *Adult Education Quarterly, 55*, 232-233. doi:10.1177/0741713605274631

Mettinger, T. N. D. (2006). A Conversation with my critics: Cultic image or aniconism in the first temple? In Y. Amit, E. Ben Zvi, I. Finkelstein, and O. Lipschits (Eds.), *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context* (pp. 273-296), Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Meyers, E. M., & Strange, J. F. (1981). *Archaeology the Rabbis & Early Christianity*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Monroe, P. (1915). *Source Book of the History of Education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Moore, G. F. (1960). *Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era: the age of Tannaim* (Vol. 1). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Morgan, T. (2000). *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Moseley, R. (2000). *Kingdom relationships*. Baltimore, MD: Messianic Jewish Publishers.

Moseley, R. (2010). *Measuring instrument for society of scholars June paper*. Unpublished

    manuscript, American Institute for Advanced Biblical Studies, Little Rock, AR.

Nadich, J. (1998). *Rabbi Akiva and his contemporaries*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Nesteuk, J. (2004). Liberal education as moral education. *National Civic Review*, 68-72.
    doi: 10.1002/ncr.43

Neusner, J. (1978). The use of the later Rabbinic evidence for the study of first-century

    Pharisaism. In W. S. Green (Ed.), Approaches *to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*

    (pp. 215-228). Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers, Inc.

Neusner, J. (1983). *Formative Judaism: Religious, historical and literary studies*. Chico, CA:

    Scholars Press.

Neusner, J. (1984). *In search of Talmudic biography*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Neusner, J. (1984). *Judaism in the beginning of Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Neusner, J. (1984). *From Mishnah to Scripture: the problem of the unattributed saying with*

    special reference to the division of purities. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Neusner, J. (1987). *School, court, public administration: Judaism and its institutions in Talmudic*

    Babylonia. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Neusner, J. (2006). *The Talmud: What it is and what it says*. Lanham, MD: Rowman &

    Littlefield Publishers.

Neusner, J. (2010). Judaism: Beginnings. In J. Neusner (Ed.), *Introduction to world religions:*

    communities and cultures (pp. 1-20). Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Neusner, J. (2010). The formation. In J. Neusner (Ed.), *Introduction to world religions: communities and cultures* (pp. 21-35). Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Newman, R. (1976). The council of Jamnia and the Old Testament canon. *Westminster Theological Journal*, *38*, 319-349.

Newsome, J. D. (1992). *Greeks, Romans, Jews: Currents of culture and belief in the New Testament world*. Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International.

Newton, D. E. (1971). The unsung teaching Technique: The modified lecture. *The High School Journal*, *54*(7), 432-439.

Noddings, N. (2007). *Philosophy of education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Nottingham Andragogy Group (1983). Towards a developmental theory of andragy. *Adults: Pyschologyical and Educational Perspective*, *9*. Nottingham, England: University of Nottingham Department of Adult Education.

Patten, P., & Patten, R. (1980). *Before the times*. San Francisco, CA: Strawberry Hill Press.

Pitts, A. W. (2008). Hellenistic schools in Jerusalem. In S. E. Porter (Ed.), *Paul's world* (pp. 19-50). Boston, MA: Brill Publishing.

Pohland, P., & Bova, B. (2000). Professional development as transformational learning. *International Journal Leadership in Education, 3*(2), 137-150.

Porter, N. (1982). Liberating teaching. *Liberation Education*, *68*(2), 115-126. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Price, D. W. (2000). Philosophy and the adult educator. *Adult Learning Journal*, *11*, 3-5.

Provan, I., Long, V. P., & Longman III, T. (2003). *A Biblical history of Israel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Rachal, J. R. (2002). Andragogy's detectives: a critique of the present and a proposal for the future. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *52*(3), 210-227. doi: 10.1177/0741713602052003004

Rager, K. B. (2009). I feel, therefore, I learn: The role of emotion in self-directed learning. In T. Rocco, D. H. Smith, & T. G. Reio, Jr. (Eds.), *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, *23*(2), 22-33.

Ragin, C. C. (1994). *Constructing social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Renov, I. (1975). The seat of Moses. In H. Olrinsky (Ed.), *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology and Architecture* (pp. 233-238). New York, NY: Ktav Publishing.

Rivkin, D. B., & Casey, L. A. (2008, May 23). Mr. Constitution. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A25.

Roberson, D. N. (2002). Andragogy in color. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov

Roberson, D. N., & Merriam, S. B. (2005). The self directed process of older, rural adults. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *55*(4), 269-287. doi: 10.1177/0741713608325169

Rogers, A. (1986). *Teaching adults*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Rogers, A. (1993). Adult learning maps and the teaching process. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *25*(2), 199-220. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Rosenstock-Huessy, E. (1925). *Andragogy-1925*. Retrieved from

    http://www.argobooks.org/feringer-notes/t24.html.

Roth, C. (Ed.) (1996). *Encyclopedia Judaica*. Israel: Keter Publishing House Jerusalem Ltd.

Rubenstein, J. L. (2003). *The culture of the Babylonian Talmud*. Baltimore, Maryland: The John

    Hopkins University Press.

Safrai, S. (1976). Education and the Study of the Torah. In S. Safrai and M. Stern (Eds.), *The*

    Jewish People in the First Century (Vol. II, pp. 945-970). Philadelphia, PA: Fortress

    Press.

Safrai, S. (1987). Oral Tora. In S. Safrai (Ed.), *The Literature of the Sages* (Part 1, pp. 35-119).

    Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Savicevic, D. (1999). Roots and roads in the evolution of andragogy. In F. Poggeler (Ed.),

    Studies in Pedagogy, Andragogy, and Gerontagogy: *Adult education: From practice to*

    theory building, (Vol. 37, pp. 209-254). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Savicevic, D. (2000). `(Koreni I razvoj andragoskih ideja – in the Serb language), Institut za

    pedagogiju I andragogiju Andragosko drustvo Srbije, Beograd, Serbia.

Savicevic, D. (2008). Convergence or divergence of ideals on andragogy in different countries.

    International Journal of Lifelong Education, *27*, 361-378.

Schiff, A. I. (1997). Educating for the future: can Jewish education be effective? *Journal of*

    Jewish Education, *63*, 37-47.

Schiffman, L. H. (1991). *From text to tradition: A history of second temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, Inc.

Schiffman, L. H. (Ed.) (1994). *The Talmud of the land of Israel* (Vol. 13). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Schniedewind, W. M. (2004). *How the Bible became a book*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Schuster, D. T. (2003). *Jewish Lives, Jewish Learning: Adult Jewish learning in theory and practice*. New York, NY: UHAH Press.

Schwandt, T. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Scott, J. J. (1995). *Jewish backgrounds of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Segai, A. F. (1996). The Jewish tradition. In W. Oxtoby (Ed.), *World religions: Western traditions* (pp. 33-157). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Shinan, A. (1990). *The world of the aggadah*. Tel-Aviv, Israel: Naidat Press Ltd.

Shinan, A. (1991). Echoes from ancient synagogues: vocatives and "emendations" in the Aramaic Targums to the Pentateuch. In I. Abrahams & C. Montefiore, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, *81*(3-4), 353-364.

Shupak, N. (2003). Learning methods in ancient Israel. *Vetus Testamentum*, *3*, 416-426.

Simmons, L. K. (2007). "The Grand Experiment": Modeling adult learning with adult-ministry students. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, *10*, 42-49.

Sizoo, S., Malhhotra, N., & Bearson, J. (2003). A gender-based comparison of the learning strategies of adult business students. *College Student Journal*, *37*(1), 103-110.

Sizoo, S., Jozkowskia, R., Malhotra, N., & Shapero, M. (2008). The effects of anxiety and self-efficacy on finance students. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *35*(4), 347-356.

Solomon, N. (Ed.) (1998). *The historical dictionary of Judaism*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Solomon, N. (Ed.) (2006). *The historical dictionary of Judaism*. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Streisand, B. (Producer & Director). (1983). *Yentl* [Motion picture]. United Kingdom: Ladbroke Entertainments.

Stern, D. (1991). *Parables in Midrash*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

St. Clair, R. (2002). *Andragogy revisited: theory for the 21st century*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/

Strauss, L. (2004). What is liberal education? *Academic Questions*, *17*, 31-36.

Sukati, C., Vilakati, N., & Esampally, C. (2010). HIV/AIDS education: what works for Swaziland University students? *Educational Research*, *52*(1), 101-113.

Swift, F. H. (1919). *Education in ancient Israel: from earliest times to 70 A.D.* Chicago, IL: The

    Open Court Publishing Company.

Tisdell, E. J., & Taylor, E. W. (2000). Adult education philosophy informs practice. *Adult*

    Learning, *11*, 6-10.

Tomasino, A. (2003). *Judaism before Jesus*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Tough, A. (1971). *The adult's learning projects*. Toronto, ON: The Ontario Institute for Studies

    in Education.

Traore, M. K. (2008). Learning circles: Applying the andragogical concept to teaching and

    learning. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, *100*, 57-58.

Vass, J. (2010). Breaking the age barrier. *Adults Learning*, *21*(*10*), 9-10.

Van Gent, B. (1986). The history of andragogy: some concept. In P. A. Groen (Ed.),

    Proceedings of the Congress of Social Development, Social Policy and Helping

    Professionals, Amsterdam: Social Policy and Context Publications.

Vella, J. K. (1995). *Training through dialogue*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Vella, J. K. (2002). *Learning to listen, learning to teach*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.

Vasholz, R. (1990). *The Old Testament canon in the Old Testament church*. Lewiston, NY:

    Edwin Mellen Press.

Wald, S. G. (2007). Talmud, Jerusalem. In F. Skolnik (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, (2nd ed.,

    Vol. 19, pp. 483-487). New York, NY: Thomson-Gale.

Walton, J. H. (1994). *Chronological and background charts of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids,

    MI: Zondervan.

Weber, M. (1952). *Ancient Judaism*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

White, J. (2003). Five critical stances towards liberal philosophy of education in Britain. *Journal

    of Philosophy of Education*, *37*(1), 147-181.

White, W., & Unger, M. F. (Eds.) (1996). *Vine's complete expository dictionary of Old and New

    Testament words*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Wigoder, G. (Ed.) (2002). *The new encyclopedia of Judaism*. Washington Square, NY:

    University Press.

Wilmes, B., Harrington, L., Kohler-Evans, P., & Sumpter, D. (2008). Coming to our senses:

    incorporating brain research findings into classroom instruction. *Education*, *128*(*4*), 659-

    666.

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2005). *Research Methods in Education: An Introduction*. Boston,

    MA: Pearson.

Willem van Henten, J. (2009). The Hasmonean period. In M. Bockmuehl and J. C. Paget (Eds.),

    Redemption and resistance, (pp. 15-43). New York, NY: T & T Clark.

Williams, M. (1998). *Covenant theology (ST300) class notes*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Systematic Theology, Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO.

Wood, L. J. (1970). *A survey of Israel's history*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Wright, N.T. (1996). *Jesus and the victory of God.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Yadin, A. (2010). Rabbi Akiva's youth. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, *100*(*14*), 573-597.

Young, B. H. (1998). *The parables: Jewish tradition and Christian interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.

Zinn, L. M. (1990). Identifying your philosophical orientation. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods* (pp. 39-58). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.