

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"A Critical Evaluation of Current Methods of Teaching
Hebrew Reading in the Reform Religious School"

written by Philmore Berger
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: ()
cannot be considered for publication: (✓)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: ()
may not be loaned by the Library: (✓)

Sylvan D. Schwartzman
(signature of referee)

Sylvan D. Schwartzman
(referee)

March 27, 1953
(date)

RESTRICTION REMOVED

4-7-70

Date

MLB

Initials

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF CURRENT METHODS
OF TEACHING HEBREW READING IN THE REFORM RELIGIOUS SCHOOL

by

Philmore Berger

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
the Master of Hebrew Letters
Degree and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
March, 1953

Referee:

Professor Sylvan D. Schwartzman

DIGEST

This study attempts to examine in an objective manner the present day situation as regards Hebrew instruction in Reform religious schools. The six chapters of this thesis deal with the psychological factors involved in learning a foreign language, with the methods of Hebrew instruction utilized by non-Reform agencies, with the methods utilized by Reform congregations for the instruction of Hebrew and concludes with an evaluation of Hebrew instruction in Reform religious schools. In addition several recommendations are offered for the improvement of Hebrew instruction in Reform congregations.

A questionnaire was sent to 450 Reform congregations in order to determine the frame of reference and other factors involved in the teaching of Hebrew. To test the effectiveness of Hebrew instruction in Reform congregations an examination was devised and distributed to those congregations which showed an interest in this study by returning the above mentioned questionnaire.

In the chapter dealing with the psychological factors involved in the learning of a foreign language it was seen that better results are obtained if the study of a foreign language is begun at a latter age. Studies have shown that it is much wiser to have a child begin the study of a foreign language only after he has a reasonable mastery of the vernacular tongue.

Investigation was made of the following methods which are utilized by non-Reform agencies in the instruction of Hebrew: 1) Ivrit-b-Ivrit, 2) Natural and Reading Methods, 3) Specific Practice, and 4) Goal Method.

With regard to the Reform religious school the following methods of Hebrew instruction were examined: 1) Gilenu Method, 2) Rote Method, 3) Prayerbook Method, using the Union Prayer Book, 4) Prayerbook Study, 5) Reshith Daath and related methods, and 6) One Bond Method.

This study reveals that Hebrew is primarily taught in Reform religious schools for liturgical purposes.. It reveals, in addition, that the aims and objectives of Hebrew instruction in Reform religious schools, by and large, are not being fulfilled.

The author suggests that perhaps the need for a delay of Hebrew instruction is necessary in order to achieve more positive results or perhaps the methodology presently employed needs to be revised..

In the final analysis this study indicates that religious educators in the Reform field need to do much work before a satisfactory measure of achievement in Hebrew instruction can be obtained..

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I INTRODUCTION

A. Reasons for Study	1
B. Procedure Followed	1
C. Summary of the Results	2

II THE GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

A. Building for Reading Readiness	5
B. Postponing Teaching of Reading Until Greater Maturity	6
C. Teaching of Reading as a Basis of Later Comprehension	8
C. Application of These Principles to the Teaching of Hebrew in the Religious School	9

III GENERAL METHODS OF TEACHING HEBREW IN NON-REFORM CONGREGATIONS

A. General Philosophy of Teaching Hebrew	11
B. General Methods	12
C. Criticisms	18
D. Summary	20

IV GENERAL METHODS OF TEACHING HEBREW IN REFORM RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS

A. Frame of Reference	23
B. Findings	30
C. Methods of Reform Religious Schools	32
D. Summary	43

V AN EVALUATION OF HEBREW INSTRUCTION IN THE REFORM RELIGIOUS SCHOOL

A. Procedure	45
B. Summary of Results	57

VI SUMMARY AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

A. Summery	61
B. Observations	63
C. Recommendations	65

NOTES	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	73
APPENDIX	75

"The World Rests on the Breath of the
Children in the Study Room." Shabbath 119B.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A. Reasons for Study.

Two major factors are responsible for this particular study: 1) In the instruction of the Hebrew Language there are numerous different methods being employed. All of these methods are underlined by various psychological factors. Because of this it was felt that a compendium as well as an investigation of these methods and factors would be of some assistance to Hebrew educators. It appeared that the time was now ripe for an evaluation of the general methods and procedures as applied to the general field of Hebrew instruction. 2) On the basis of a study of these methods, factors, and psychological explanations as applied to various congregations, it was felt that it would be helpful to know which methods and factors were most effective as they related to the Reform Religious School. Various educators in the Reform field have indicated an interest in this study. It is the intention of this evaluation but to suggest plausible methods for Reform Schools which come as a direct outgrowth of careful examination and evaluation of methods, frame of reference factors and psychological explanations surrounding the study of a foreign language and in particular the study of Hebrew.

. B. Procedure Followed

In order to ascertain the basic effectiveness and underlying soundness of Hebrew teaching, a study was made of the psychological principles which lie behind language learning, which principles are the results of studies made in the general field of teaching a foreign language. Also taken in consideration

were the methods employed by agencies concentrating more extensively on the instruction of Hebrew. The most notable example of this kind of agency was the Talmud Torah. This investigation of course led into a study of the methods for teaching Hebrew which are at present being employed by the Reform religious school in terms of its frame of reference.

A questionnaire in the form of a postal card was sent out to Reform congregations in order to ascertain the methods and various factors involved in the teaching of Hebrew. On the basis of 202 responses, data was compiled in the various areas of the teaching of Hebrew in Reform religious schools. All of these facts would have furnished little valuable information unless a means could be devised to test the effectiveness of the various methods employed and factors involved in the instruction of Hebrew by Reform congregations; therefore another questionnaire in the form of a simple Hebrew examination was sent out to those who expressed an interest in this study by returning their postal card. As a result of the answers received a relationship was established in so far as possible, between various methods and factors of teaching Hebrew in Reform religious schools. This was one way in which to ascertain effectiveness.

The study went on to draw conclusions based on these findings and other data involved in the psychological principles and in the various methods employed by non-Reform congregations.

C. A Summary of the Results

As a result of this study it was discovered that there was the following major psychological principle involved in the

teaching of a foreign language: it is much wiser to have a child begin the study of a foreign language only after he has a reasonable mastery of the vernacular tongue. Studies have shown that the later one starts acquiring a foreign language the quicker will he learn it, for he has had sufficient maturity and language experience to equip him for such a task.

With regard to non-Reform agencies which teach Hebrew, the following methods are employed: 1) Ivrit-b'Ivrit, 2) Natural and Reading Methods, 3) Specific Practice and 4) Goal Method.

In so far as the Reform religious schools are concerned the following are the methods currently being used: 1) Gilenu Method, 2) Rote Method, 3) Prayer Book Method, using the Union Prayer Book, 4) Prayerbook Study as taught by Braverman, 5) Reshith Death and related methods, and 6) One Bond Method.

This study has revealed that the overwhelming majority of Reform schools teach Hebrew for liturgical purposes, and employ special Hebrew teachers. In addition to this it was learned that most of the congregations make Hebrew study compulsory and average 48 minutes a week in this study of Hebrew. Hebrew is taught predominantly in grades 4 through 8 with little Hebrew taught in other grades.

While the response to the special Hebrew examination was small, the results obtained revealed that Hebrew was not being taught very effectively. They supported the major principles involved in the psychological aspects of learning a foreign language. They also indicated that the methods and means employed today are not achieving satisfactory results. Perhaps the need for a delay of Hebrew instruction is here indicated or perhaps the methodology which is being presently employed, needs to be

revised. At any event this study reveals that much work needs to be done before we shall have attained a satisfactory measure of achievement in this area.

It is hoped that the following study will prove to be of some value to those who are concerned with the teaching of Hebrew, in the Reform Religious School. This work, then, is merely the beginning - much yet remains undone and requires the attention of Hebrew educators who are concerned with this problem.

Chapter II

THE GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

A. Building for Reading Readiness

Reading readiness is helpful in the reading of a foreign language. Many educators handle this important factor by having the child observe symbols and concepts for a number of years prior to the attempt at actual reading. This would imply that the child should be familiar with Hebrew symbols early in his religious school training.

There is one school of philosophy regarding education which claims that knowledge is not that which one can display. Some people, it maintains, can recite without knowing what they are reciting and some cannot recite and still know a great deal, even perhaps the greater part of what he is expected to recite. This does not display real knowledge or lack of real knowledge. "Just as the ability to display what looks like knowledge is a very unsafe test of real knowledge, so is the inability a very unsafe test of ignorance."¹ This school holds that a person develops the concepts of what signs mean long before he learns the actual signs. "Having mastered a set of concepts in one language, they have already done most of the work of mastering these concepts in any other language."² It would seem then that on this basis it would be wiser to have the child master his own vernacular first and then master the comprehension of foreign symbols before starting the actual reading process.

Reading is conceived of as a complex of physiological and psychological processes whose motor processes are visual, vocal, and extraneous.³ Because of this it is said that

"reading should be delayed until children's background of experience and mental growth enable them to find meaning in the tasks presented to them, and until this process of maturation has engendered a condition in which reversals are few and perception of words and other meaningful units is possible."⁴

In other words a child is ready for the reading process only after he has matured enough so as to control his motor processes and is capable of seeing the relevance of foreign language study. Progress in reading is made rapidly when the student is mature and capable of steady concentration. The motor processes when developed aid immeasurably in reading readiness.

A person only has trouble learning a language when "he is bombarded with a lot of strange concepts or with concepts that organize the elements of experience in an unusual way."⁵

In the teaching of Hebrew the big job is to "help the child to become conceptually ready for it, not to teach a new collection of sounds or visual symbols."⁶ To put it differently the task for the Hebrew teacher is to have the child surrounded by signs with Hebrew symbols, to use these signs and to familiarize the child with them. This will give us real knowledge. An item becomes more "knowledgeable" providing that it extends numerous bridges to other items. If it is isolated from other items it really does not mean real knowledge.

B. Postponing Teaching of Reading Until Greater Maturity

The question of when to start the study of a foreign language has been the bone of contention among many educators; however it seems the later the study of foreign language begins the better are the results because of the following two reasons:

- 1) The child has mastered the vernacular and can apply the

principles of learning to the study of a foreign language, and 2) he has secured for himself a growth in mental and emotional experiences.

Two educators in the field of foreign language, Eddy and Henmon, have found that foreign language study begins at every age and school grade from the junior high school through the university and that the situation, especially at the junior high school level is chaotic.⁷ Several studies indicate that the popular assumption that an early beginning is universally advantageous is all wrong. "Buswell offers evidence to the effect that junior high school and elementary school pupils progressed much more slowly than older pupils in reading ability."⁸ Thorndikes' study of language - learning ability indicates the same thing. "Although these authors conceded that much of the success of the adults was probably due to a greater power of concentration and sense of responsibility, the evidence points to the possible conclusion that language study, particularly if limited in time, may advantageously, be begun at a later school stage."⁹ Keeping this in mind one may quite properly wonder as to the advantages of starting a second or third grade pupil of a one day-a-week religious school in the study of Hebrew reading. It would seem that on the basis of these studies much more is to be gained if Hebrew reading is begun at a later period in the school curriculum than if it is begun at an earlier period.

One may now legitimately ask the question as regards oral training. Where we aim to teach reading should oral training be ignored? It is generally held that written symbols do not survive unless they are associated with aural and "kinesthetic impressions and that one remembers words and phrases better if he connects them with vocal and motor experiences."¹⁰

This bears out the claim that the ability to pronounce written words correctly and uniformly is a way to rapid comprehension of written materials. If then the child can see Hebrew printed signs and learn to pronounce by rote the words of the signs, indications are that when he is ready for reading, his comprehension ability will improve with oral recitations.

"Hence, if the aim is reading ability, the procedure must provide ample training in reading. Although other aspects of language learning are not ignored, they are relegated to the status of aids to the development of the desired reading ability and of background for active skills which are to be developed systematically in a somewhat more advanced state."¹¹ This implies that sufficient training is supplied in the recognition of signs and symbols.

C. Teaching of Reading as a Basis of Later Comprehension

Traditionally, the best way of attaining reading ability has consisted in the main, "of oral reading, of translation from the foreign language into the vernacular, and of intensive grammar analysis of limited amounts of reading material."¹² However the question is raised as to whether this is the most effective way of teaching a foreign language in view of the special difficulties of teaching a foreign language as compared to teaching the vernacular..... difficulties of comprehension and point of reference.

The people who maintain that a student will learn to read a foreign language by first attaining oral-aural mastery forget the fact "that there is a fundamental psychological difference between the two types of reading, the reading of

the vernacular, which is best attained by oral - aural technique, and the foreign language; in the vernacular the spoken symbol serves the beginner as the point of reference for understanding the written symbol but ⁱⁿ the foreign language it is the vernacular meaning rather than the spoken foreign word which must serve the beginner as the point of reference for comprehension. Hence it is impossible to make the pupil think in the foreign language, especially in the early stages, when a certain amount of mental translation is essential."¹³ What is being said in other words, is that only one task at a time should be attempted. Thus, for instance, while Gamoran attempts to accomplish many tasks simultaneously in Gilenu, utilizing methods of English instruction as advocated by Gates' study, it is clear that this is a difficult thing to do because of the many factors involved. You cannot use the same methods in teaching a foreign language as are used in teaching the vernacular because of the element of comprehension.

D. Application of These Principles to the Teaching of Hebrew in the Religious School.

It would seem therefore from the general psychological studies of the principles of learning foreign languages that the learning of Hebrew in religious schools should employ the following principles:

- 1) Hebrew educators should build for Hebrew reading readiness in the early grades. This could be done by having various and numerous posters around the room with the blessings over candles, wine, bread printed on them. In other elementary grades selected prayers from the Union Prayer Book should be

printed on posters. The rote-song method should be employed
in the teaching^{of} these prayers.

2) Hebrew educators should postpone the teaching of actual reading until the child is well advanced in general vernacular reading.

3) Hebrew reading should be mastered before comprehension is allowed. This will serve as a basis for more rapid comprehension later on.

Chapter III

GENERAL METHODS OF TEACHING HEBREW

IN NON-REFORM CONGREGATIONS

A. General Philosophy of Teaching Hebrew1. Frame of Reference

In this chapter attention is being focused primarily on those schools which teach Hebrew for several hours a week and over a period of two or three years. Added to this frame of reference also is the fact that special Hebrew teachers are engaged who earn their livelihood largely through daily instruction of Hebrew. Many of the pupils who study this intensive kind of Hebrew usually come from the kind of environment where Hebrew usage is part of regular domestic routine; for example they hear and recite the "motzi," they witness the grace ceremony after meals, and they participate in the kiddush ceremony. In other words many of these pupils are, from an environmental point of view, favorably conditioned toward the study of Hebrew.

2. Aims

The educators in this field seek primarily, although not exclusively to instruct its pupils in such a way as to enable them to study "chumash" in the original; to have an appreciation of the Bible and to be capable of reading simple selections from modern Hebrew literature. In the traditional congregational schools the over-all general aims are as follows: 1) "To prepare the child to take part in the religious customs of the home and synagogue, all of which involve the use of Hebrew. 2) To create in the child a sense of being a part of the Hebraic culture of our people, for Hebrew is the language band which unites the child to his people throughout the world as well as to Israel of the past."

It is clearly seen from the second of the above aims that the matter of self-identification is secondary and emphasis is placed on modes of worship (although in this worship and custom observance the child is actively identifying himself with his people.) The study of the Bible in the original rather than in translation form is another goal. A child does not receive the appreciation of the Bible which he should if he studies only the Jewish Publication Society's English translation. "Through the acquaintance in the original with the Hebrew language and literature, we can perpetuate within American Jewish life the age-long Hebraic tradition of our people."¹⁵ The aims of non-reform agencies, teaching Hebrew are then of the liturgic and comprehension type, in addition to translation of Bible. All of these aims are founded upon proper attitude and appreciation.

B. General Methods

There now follows an investigation of the major methods utilized in the week-day Hebrew schools and of the motivation behind this instruction. As noticed above there is little mention made of any of the studies on Hebrew instruction as to the study of Hebrew for self-identification purposes; that is for the purpose of actually knowing the language of the child's forefathers as it is found in ancient literature. This type of motivation plays a secondary role in Hebrew instruction. The emphasis seems to be placed on Hebrew as a living language and also as a means of prayer-study. Of course the philosophy of self-identification is explicit in all that follows, however, it is not the dominant philosophy behind the various modes in instruction.

1. Ivrit-b'-Ivrit

As one peruses the various methods of teaching Hebrew employed during the last twenty years he discovers that predominance has been given to the 'Ivrit-b'-Ivrit' method. This is the method whereby Hebrew educators hope to sustain Hebrew as a living language since all the class instruction takes the form of Hebrew discussion. The student reads the original Hebrew and then translates what he has read through the medium of Hebrew synonyms.

William Chomsky, a leading educator in the field of Hebrew education makes it clearly understood that "the Ivrit-b-Ivrit' method has contributed much toward vitalizing Hebrew instruction in our schools."¹⁶ From this it is clearly inferred that a degree of success has been had from the instruction which is given by the 'Ivrit-b'-Ivrit' method. The aim of this particular method is to create situations which would beget the easy use of Hebrew. While the propounders of this method mean well, they have, thus far, failed in their ultimate goal----that of teaching the Hebrew language as a living, vital tongue ---- because they have forgotten that "where Hebrew only is used conversation is limited to the narrowest of channels. Instruction is largely based on three pillars: memory, forced concentrated attention, and constant review."¹⁷ In other words the educators of Hebrew, through their employment of the 'Ivrit-b'-Ivrit' method have forgotten to provide the one essential requirement so necessary to the study of language ----- that is they have neglected to establish a MODUS VIVENDI ---- they have not created any relative purpose for the study of Hebrew and as a result interest has lagged and instruction has become meaningless. They have paid little heed

to what should be considered a maxim of education ---- namely that "memory, forced concentrated attention and constant review are enemies of real, living child-interest."¹⁸ For this very reason in many of the more traditional schools the 'Ivrit-b'-Ivrit' method has been eliminated. "In the teaching of Hebrew we cannot rest satisfied even with following the lead of best practices in the general field of language instruction, but must strive to be the vanguard of profitable innovation and improvement."¹⁹

2. The Natural and the Reading Method

There are two distinct types of thinking or approaches to language learning, namely, the direct method, which is a procedure that imposes upon the auditory and oral faculties of the student the responsibility for both hearing and pronouncing completely foreign sounds, and the reading method. "The natural method (synonymous with direct method) represents the reaction of language teachers to the artificiality of the translation method."²⁰ Although there are those who maintain that the natural method is the process by which the mother tongue is acquired, there are those who have raised strenuous objections to this method. They have claimed that this method places too large a strain on the auditory and oral capacities of the student. Such a person is William Chomsky who claims that "the natural method involves a learning process which is too difficult."²¹ Chomsky maintains that when a child is to master a Hebrew sentence by this method he must be able "to recognize its meaning when it appears in print and inscript; to use it in oral and in written composition and to recognize its meaning when it comes to his auditory senses."²² Clearly then, even for a bright student of the grade school level this is an extremely difficult learning situation. As its best in many schools

the instruction of Hebrew is planned so that only the limited range of superior students will succeed in its study.

Another potent criticism of this method is that "it is not possible when the natural method is used to plan effectively for individual differences or for individual needs."²³ Modern pedagogy demands that provision be made for the individual, whether he be a quick student or a slow student. Certainly then in view of these criticisms and in view of the fact that the primary admitted objective in Hebrew instruction is that of Hebrew reading there is no justification for the utilization of the natural method.

It appears then, according to one Hebrew educator that "for the best results we should practice directly the skill which is our objective."²⁴ This means that the Reading Method should be employed almost exclusively. Although this thought seems to be quite logical as well as practical it is known, for instance, that where the admitted aim is that of Hebrew reading there are many considerations to be thought of before even a minimum of success can be attained. Intelligence, innate language ability, and proper motivation are the factors which will ultimately lead to the acquisition of the reading skill.

Morris Arzt maintains that the principles of the Reading Method as propounded by Michael West can achieve the best learning process.²⁵ West claims that since the ability to read is the matrix, leading to the acquisition of other language skills it is quite possible to learn how to read independently of the other skills. "When the learner has a sufficient knowledge in reading then the learning of other skills is undertaken."²⁶ Furthermore West goes on record as saying that the skill of learning to read is the least

difficult because of the following reasons: 1) the skill of learning to read "is based on recognition which is^a much simpler process than recall; 2) Because practice in this power needs no social milieu it is possible to arrange for abundant and intensive practice experience in a comparatively short time."²⁷ West completely repudiates the idea that the best road to reading is through the media of speaking and writing.

Morris Arzt, who was mentioned above, claims that "the application of the principles of the Reading Method to the problem of teaching Hebrew in the Jewish schools is simple enough. If these principles are sound, the Sunday School teacher ---- will be able to pay attention to and drill directly in the only power he wishes his pupils to acquire - reading - without spending unnecessary precious moments in activities which may transfer."²⁸

3. Specific Practice

Without going into elaborate detail, the writers of Hebrew methodology claim, "it should ---- be obvious to all those who think the matter through objectively that the establishment of a core vocabulary is a 'sine qua non' in the methodology of language whether in the case of Hebrew or of any other language."²⁹ One system in such a methodology is that of "Specific Practice." This particular system suggests that "a pupil trained to respond to words as a mosaic of syllables, letters, and vowels cannot readily be restrained to respond to words as symbols of meanings and ideas."³⁰ Children who are trained by meaningful reading methods have the edge on pupils trained by methods of phonic and oral nature. However nowhere is there given any explanation as to what is meant by "meaningful reading methods." This "Specific Practice" system suggests that learning and practice should be conducted in the manner in which the acquired learning

product is to be used by the pupil in actual life situations. Practice, it contends, must be directed to this end.³¹ This system also holds that the more often a word is seen in a reading context, the more effectively it is learned and the more permanently it is retained for reading purposes.³²

4. Goal Method

One method which was prevalent in the more traditional schools was that which was known by the name "Goal Method."

The propounders of this method claimed for it the tremendous asset of "definiteness." The child knew when he had made progress. Certain objectives were established for the pupil and he proceeded toward these goals at his own rate of speed. This method, educators claimed, "gives to him (the pupil) a sense of responsibility for his own work."³³ Under the guidance of an intelligent teacher the pupil "thus becomes independent and resourceful and develops traits that are from all possible points of view desirable."³⁴ This individual method of teaching Hebrew constituted a very definite type of work for both the pupil and the teacher. It lent itself readily to definite scientific studies on the basis of which the materials of instruction were constructed.³⁵ The materials made adequate provision for differences in pupil abilities and interests. Nudelman stated that this method of setting goals was used by teachers of comparatively mediocre ability with marked success.³⁶

The one comprehensive and valuable criticism of the individual or goal method is that which was given by E. A. Nudelman. "Goal work makes of language study an altogether too conscious process. It tends to lay emphasis on words and

language structure rather than on the direct expression of ideas and meanings. It stresses unduly the matter of translation. Its materials of learning are to a large extent unsatisfactory. Its procedure is somewhat lacking in variety, and the work, therefore, tends in time to become monotonous.³⁷ Moreover nowhere in the description of the 'Goal Method' is there a statement dealing with the mechanics of reading. It is merely assumed, a-priori, that the pupil already can read the Hebrew vowels and consonants. This method is aimed primarily not at acquisition of the reading ability, but rather at the improvement and the speed of reading.

C. Criticisms

While few if any of the educators present a detailed method for the instruction of Hebrew, all of them are quite clear as to the aims and the objectives of Hebrew instruction. Perhaps the lack of detailed methods is due to the validity of Chomsky's statement: "Let us remember that there is no such thing as a good method, a sort of panacea or cure all. There is, however, such a thing as good method in teaching. This implies the following elements: a) a clear perspective of the goal, b) an understanding of the child's natural interests, and c) an attempt to bring our procedure and practice into harmony with those interests, in pursuit of the desired goal in the most direct and most economic method."³⁸ Also he would enable the child to acquire a vocabulary by having the child meet the vocabulary in multiple reading situations and settings. Further he would adapt and create reading materials for each grade.³⁹

However here again no directive is given and the statement is merely made that "good method" is not attainable. Certainly the Hebrew teacher in the Reform religious school can obtain little assistance from Chomsky - nor can the teacher of Hebrew in any congregational school receive any valuable aids for instruction.

William Chomsky clearly points out the fact that the time spent by non-Reform agencies in Hebrew instruction is neither valuable nor productive. "However, the fact of the matter is that we do not generally succeed in preparing our pupils adequately, in the course of two or even three years, for an appreciative study of the Bible and for the reading of simple selections from Modern Hebrew literature."⁴⁰ The reasons which are given for this failure are: confusion as to the major aim in studying Hebrew ---- poor word lists ---- lack of good textbooks and finally the fact that learning is not cumulative. In addition "training must be provided in independent reading, which is the ultimate goal of Hebrew instruction in our schools. Unless our pupils are trained systematically in this ability by means of materials written with a controlled vocabulary, they will never achieve this goal. The more often a pupil comes in contact with certain words in a reading context, the more effectively he will learn these words and the more equipped he will be for further progress and growth in reading power."⁴¹ This is clearly the philosophy of the "Specific Practice" method; however no specific detail as to how instruction is to take place is given.

The educators in this field prove to be inconsistent,

for while they insist that "methods must be adopted" they also strongly maintain the following: "What a tremendous waste has been going on in the teaching of Hebrew in failing to recognize that the problem is not only how to teach Hebrew but what to teach. In over-emphasizing the "how" we have been guilty of trying to do well that which we should not have been doing at all."⁴² It appears that much "double talk" is being used in as much as these educators know full well what they want to teach. The "what to teach" is clearly defined: "Our aim in the teaching of Hebrew should be to develop the attitude and the desire to read Hebrew and to cultivate abiding interests in the reading and study of the Hebrew language and literature; in brief to raise our pupils to be ⁴³גאון-רבי'". The method which they advocate and the method still very much in vogue in our Talmud Torah is the 'Ivrit-b-Ivrit' method. The goal mentioned above, has, as yet, not been attained nor does its fulfillment seem very likely. The important matter to consider is that ⁴⁴גאון-רבי' is not a Talmud Chochem or a Lamden but rather one who has a "feeling of reverence and affection for a book or a sayer."⁴⁴ The important thing is that all who study Hebrew acquire for themselves a positive and favorable attitude toward our language and its literature.⁴⁵ With this view every sincere educator agrees for he knows that where a pupil is not pleasantly disposed toward his subject no method can impart the subject matter itself.

D. Summary

An investigation of the general methods used for the teaching of Hebrew by non-Reform agencies has shown that consideration must first of all be ^fgiven to the particular frame of reference under discussion. Mention has been made of the intensive study

of Hebrew, several times a week, of the professional Hebrew teachers and also of the favorable environment in which the child finds himself.

The aims of non-Reform agencies who teach Hebrew seem to be, 1) ability to translate "~~Chumash~~" and some modern Hebrew Literature, 2) ability to utilize the prayer book with some comprehension, 3) the general ability to read Hebrew. The over-all aims of a reading program, as described by Wm. Chomsky, are: 1) "To develop in our pupils the habit, the ability, and the desire to read Hebrew with understanding and appreciation, 2) to stimulate and cultivate in them tastes for and interests in the literary expression of the Jewish people, both in ancient and in modern times, 3) to impart to them a sympathetic insight into Jewish experiences, ideals, and attitudes, as reflected in Jewish literature throughout the ages, 4) to provide a basis for interjecting and correlating the various phrases of subject matter in the Jewish Curriculum."⁴⁶

The methods utilized by non-Reform agencies in the instruction of Hebrew are 1) Ivrit-b'-Ivrit, 2) The natural and the Reading Method. 3) Specific Practice and 4) Goal Method. In practically all of the methods enumerated the assumption is made that the pupil already has a reading foundation, that the teacher need only improve this reading ability. Nowhere is there given a method of instruction for beginners.

As for method itself it can be said that in the final analysis the term "good method" implies the creation of learning situations in terms of the capacities and the interests of the

pupils. This "good method" must resemble, in so far as possible, desirable situations in actual life.

In the following chapter the methods, the aims and objectives of Reform Religious Schools, as regards Hebrew instruction, will be considered.

Chapter IV

GENERAL METHODS OF TEACHING HEBREW
IN REFORM RELIGIOUS SCHOOLSA. Frame of Reference

In order to determine the particular frame of reference for the teaching of Hebrew in Reform religious schools the following postal card questionnaire was sent out to all member congregations of the Union of American Congregations totaling 450:

Please underline the answers concerning the present Hebrew Program of your school.

1. Hebrew is - obligatory - voluntary - not taught in our school. (Do you have Hebrew clubs? Check ____).
2. Hebrew is taught in grades 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 - 10 - 11 - 12.
3. The total weekly time spent on Hebrew is - less than 30 min. - 35 min. - 45 min. - about an hour - more than hour.
4. Hebrew is taught by - classroom teacher - special teach.
5. We teach Hebrew primarily for - conversation - liturgical reading - general reading with comprehension.

RABBI _____
CITY AND STATE _____

The objective of this questionnaire was to determine the following data:

1. Is the study of Hebrew obligatory, voluntary, or not taught at all?
2. In what grades is Hebrew taught?
3. How much class time is spent on the Study of Hebrew?
4. Is Hebrew taught by special or regular teachers?
5. For what principal purpose or purposes is Hebrew taught?

The following findings are the results of the 202 responses to the postal card questionnaire as well as a survey of the literature which has been written regarding the study of Hebrew in the Reform religious school.

1. Time

As any educator, who is actively participating in the operation of a Reform religious school, well knows the amount of time set aside for the study of Hebrew is meager indeed. Other investigations have shown that because of extra-curricula activities (choir, dramatics, journalism, etc.) as well as the inclusion of many more subjects in the curriculum, the time devoted to Hebrew study is of necessity, limited. Frequent assembly programs, Holiday observances and vacations likewise limit the amount of available time.

- In response to the postal card questionnaire it was seen that with regard to time allotted to Hebrew the following was the case: 8 congregations spent less than 30 minutes a week on the study of Hebrew; 52 congregations spent 30 minutes a week; 48 congregations spent a period of 45 minutes per week; and 87 congregations indicated that they spent 60 minutes or more a week on the study of Hebrew. In addition to this information many congregations noted that they conducted additional Hebrew classes during the week.

The average time spent on Hebrew instruction is: non-week day schools, 47 minutes; schools with week day sessions, 49 minutes; all schools 48 minutes per week.

Emanuel Gamoran goes on record as saying that in any

two hour session of instruction $3/4$ of an hour should be given to the study of Hebrew.

2. Obligatory or Voluntary

There were 108 congregations in whose religious schools the instruction of Hebrew was obligatory and 87 congregations who reported that Hebrew was taught on a voluntary basis. Seven congregations stated that Hebrew was not taught at all in their religious schools.

3. Grades in which Hebrew is Taught

Most of the Hebrew instruction takes place between the 4th and 8th grades. The other grades have little or no Hebrew instruction.

For 178 congregations reporting on this subject, the average number of years spent in the study of Hebrew is 5.7 years. When one considers that the amount of time reported, is the maximum spent in teaching Hebrew, it can readily be observed that much less time is actually given to Hebrew instruction. This is true because of the inroads which assemblies, holiday observances and extra curricular activities frequently make on the regular time set aside for Hebrew instruction. The author's personal experience with a prominent Reform temple of over 1200 members and with a religious school of over 900 children substantiates this contention. Over the five years in which he has been teaching Hebrew no one class had over an average of 30 minutes instruction, in spite of the fact that the curriculum called for 40 minutes or more.

4. Teachers

Of course the way in which the student learns Hebrew is due in no small measure to the ability of the teacher he has.

The answers given to the postal card questionnaire showed that 172 congregations had special Hebrew teachers; that they had engaged teachers who went from class to class in order to teach the pupils Hebrew.

Many would contend that this is not a sound pedagogical procedure because it interrupts regular classroom work. The regular teacher, for example, may not have completed the history or customs and ceremonies lesson before the special Hebrew teacher arrives. Thus the lesson must be interrupted at, perhaps, the most advantageous moment of instruction.

Secondly, this system prevents integration of Hebrew with the curriculum. For example, prayers and blessings could be used and taught in conjunction with the teaching of various holidays and customs.

Thirdly, this method of instruction does not enable the Hebrew teacher to establish a rapport which could carry over from week to week. In fact he scarcely gets to know his pupils and each week pupil and teacher must reestablish a new rapport which lasts for only twenty to forty minutes at most. It would be much more desirable to have the same teacher who teaches Jewish History and customs and ceremonies also instruct the same pupils in the reading of Hebrew. This would make possible much more integration, better rapport and probably better learning.

However the problem immediately arises in many congregations that the teaching staff is not at all familiar with Hebrew and consequently unable to instruct the children. The problem may be overcome, perhaps, by holding Hebrew class work-shops two or three weeks prior to the opening of the religious school. The rabbi or supervisor might then instruct the teachers in the fundamentals of Hebrew so that they in turn would be able to instruct their children. After all, if as we shall see, the primary aim of the Reform religious school is the teaching of prayerbook Hebrew, it should not be too difficult to train regular teachers to accomplish this.

5. Texts Used

From the answers supplied by the questionnaire it was discovered that the following material in the order of frequency of use is being currently used in Reform religious schools: The Union Prayer Book; Prayerbook Study; Gilenu; Ha-Shear; Our Prayer-Book; Ha-Sefer; Let's Read Hebrew; Reshis Death. It is evident that there exists no single universally adopted series of Hebrew material in Reform religious schools. Hence no uniform Hebrew curriculum is in operation within the movement.

The primary goal, from the evidence supplied by the names of the texts alone, seems to be the teaching of Hebrew reading for the purpose of prayer study.

6. Goals

There are three main aims for the teaching of Hebrew in the Reform religious school: 1) liturgical, 2) general reading with comprehension and 3) conversation. Of these

the primary emphasis of most Reform congregations is placed on the liturgical purpose.

In response to the postal card questionnaire 118 congregations indicated that they teach Hebrew primarily for liturgical purposes; 33 congregations teach primarily for general reading and comprehension purposes. Other congregations state that their aims include a combination of conversation, liturgical, and general reading with comprehension.

In the curriculum of the one-day-week school the admitted aim, as we have observed, of most Reform congregations is to enable the student to read Hebrew in order to understand the prayers of the Union Prayerbook. Thus one Reform temple recognizing that for the great majority of its pupils this must be the total goal of Hebrew instruction, states: "Our ultimate aim --- is two fold, to develop a large group which in spite of their lack of an intimate knowledge of the language will be deeply sympathetic and emotionally responsive to it --- secondly, to develop a smaller group carefully selected, which will study the Hebrew language and literature more intensively. All we can possibly do insofar as the greater numbers of the student body are concerned, is to familiarize them with Hebrew sufficiently to enable them to follow the prayers intelligently."⁴⁷ This appears to be remarkably similar to the stated aims and objectives of the more traditional schools. The ability to read the prayer book with some degree of fluency and understanding is the basic aim of all Hebrew educators.

To this aim Dr. Gamoran would add two more. He maintains that a love for Hebrew must be developed in the child - a favorable attitude toward Hebrew must be achieved. This positive attitude will also make for the acquisition of greater Hebrew knowledge and skill. Here all prominent Jewish educators are in full agreement. Another aim, Gamoran contends, is to enable our children to read and to translate at least a few choice passages from the narratives of the Bible and from subsequent Hebrew literature.

7. Attitude

Certainly of prime importance is the attitude which the student acquires during his study of Hebrew. As any educator will verify, the more positive attitude the pupil exhibits the more of any given subject he will learn. This must be taken into consideration in the teaching of Hebrew. Thus one educator writes: "The negative student response (to Hebrew) was fostered as a result of our inability to appreciate the fact that the interest of the children as they enter the higher grades usually undergoes a marked transformation, that their enjoyment of naive and child-like texts diminishes and their eagerness to accumulate words and jingles in a language basically foreign to them is somewhat dampened under the pressure of more worthwhile tasks."

In the author's experience it was found that a negative attitude exists precisely because the materials and textbooks used are not geared to the various age levels. What is taught in the fifth grade and the manner in which it is taught is repeated, for example, in the sixth grade. No new incentive

is added and the pupil quite naturally assumes a negative attitude. A student's sense of progress and achievement is completely lacking in this type of instruction.

In addition, the amount of time allotted and the status which Hebrew is given in the curriculum can also lead to negative attitudes. The child who feels that Hebrew instruction has a secondary if not tertiary position in the curriculum and congregational environment will not posit anything but a negative attitude. Thirdly and perhaps most important, a negative attitude is acquired from one's social milieu. "In contrast to the immigrant," an educator writes, "the present generation manifests a lukewarm or apathetic attitude toward religious education. Primarily as a result of the general weakening of Jewish life in America, the Jewish parent of today disparages the religious values that were cherished by his fathers, thereby becoming indifferent toward the religious instruction of his children." ⁵⁰ Consequently this in turn has contributed to the lack of interest in or use of Hebrew in both congregational and community life.

B. Findings

Summing up, then, the contents of the 202 postal card responses, the following is a picture of the frame of reference for the teaching of Hebrew within Reform religious schools:

1. Fifty-six percent of the congregations make the instruction of Hebrew obligatory and 44% of the congregations place Hebrew on a voluntary basis. Seven congregations

indicate that they teach no Hebrew whatsoever. Fifty congregations indicate that in addition to teaching Hebrew in their Sunday Religious School they also devote extra time during the week for Hebrew instruction, as indicated on the chart. (See Appendix)

2. Hebrew is being taught from the first grade through the tenth grade. The statistics indicate that most Hebrew instruction occurs during the 4th through the 8th grades. Little or no Hebrew is taught in other grades.

3. With regard to time devoted to the study of Hebrew our findings indicate that 27% of the congregations spent 30 minutes a week on Hebrew instruction; 25% of the congregations spent 45 minutes a week and 44% of the congregations devote 60 or more minutes a week to the instruction of Hebrew. Included in this latter group are those congregations who have additional Hebrew classes during the week. Eight congregations indicated that they spent less than 30 minutes a week on Hebrew instruction. The average amount of time spent in 195 Reform Religious Schools is about 48 minutes a week.

4. Eighty-eight percent of the congregations employ special teachers to teach Hebrew in the religious school, leaving but 22 % of the congregations whose regular class room teachers also instruct their children in Hebrew reading.

5. In answer to the question dealing with the purposes for which Hebrew is being taught, 61% of the congregations stated they teach Hebrew primarily for liturgical

purposes; 17% of the congregations stated Hebrew is taught primarily for general reading with comprehension; in 14% of the congregations the primary purpose for Hebrew instruction is a combination of liturgical and general reading with comprehension. Six congregations said that their primary purpose in teaching Hebrew include all three objectives ---- namely, conversation, liturgical and general reading with comprehension. Six congregations said that they teach Hebrew primarily for conversation and liturgical purposes. Two congregations taught Hebrew primarily for conversation and general reading with comprehension. Two congregations did not say why they teach Hebrew.

In 91% of the congregations the average number of years devoted to Hebrew study was 5.7 years.

C. Methods of Reform Religious Schools

There are two aspects regarding method: 1) the most economical method which can be used to instruct pupils, and 2) what kind of method would best stimulate interest of pupil?

Jacob Pollack states our problem very succinctly: "During the last decade we have witnessed a remarkable change in our conceptions of method. Psychology has given us a great deal of knowledge with regard to children and the learning process, and we have acquired a great deal of information with regard to the most economical ways of teaching various subjects based on careful studies and investigations. At the present time there are two prevalent notions with regard to method. On the one hand, method is regarded as the most

economical manner of teaching the materials of the curriculum, on the other hand, method is primarily a question of how to stimulate and guide the child so that he shall best call for and exercise his possibilities."⁵¹

We shall be interested, as we look at each method now employed, in the economic as well as in the stimulus factor of teaching Hebrew in the Reform religious school.

1. Gilenu Method

According to Emanuel Gamoran, educators should no longer teach the names of the letters of the alphabet but rather should teach whole sentences and phrases "because that is how the normal human eye sees ----- that is how reading is taught in our public schools today."⁵²

An experiment by Professor Gates of Columbia University demonstrated that phonetic teaching created many difficulties ---- especially in that it tended to concentrate instruction unduly on minor elements. On the other hand, teaching for comprehension raised the difficulty that a distinction of specific elements in new words was not made. "The most successful group was the one that combined the comprehension material with phonetic drill."⁵³ Hence Dr. Gamoran adopted these findings and formulated them into his method of Hebrew instruction which is known as the Gilenu approach. In it he presents non-liturgical Hebrew words both as a whole and broken down into letters. He also teaches the child the comprehension of the particular words.

Concerning Gilenu the following criticism has been

offered: "The Gilenu approach to the teaching of Hebrew, to quote Dr. Gamoran, seeks to follow the experiments made in the teaching of the reading of English by Professor Gates of Columbia University, in which the child is taught to read a whole phrase or a whole sentence - the meaning of which he understands - then follow this with phonetic drill. To follow this theory in the teaching of Hebrew would be feasible only in Palestine or in teaching those who had perhaps attended *הית הילד*, a Hebrew nursery school. We must remember that before a child is taught to read English he has been speaking the language for about three years; he is then taught to read phrases and sentences for approximately $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 years before the phonetic breakdown is made. According to the Gilenu approach, vocabulary is taught one week, the reading of the word or phrase as a complete unit the next week and its phonetic components the following week. In the one day a week school, teaching a child to speak and read a foreign language at the same time is almost impossible. Moreover the Gilenu method aims to teach the meaning of prayers as an outgrowth of language study, which is ideal in a Talmud Torah or any intensive Hebrew school system - not in our one day a - week system." ⁵⁴

The criticism of the Gilenu Method is based on 3 factors: 1) It is founded on experiments designed to teach English reading and not Hebrew reading; 2) it fails to take into account the difficulties of learning multiple Hebrew skills, i.e. reading, comprehension, meaning, and in a one day a week school; and 3) it does not meet the goal of most

Reform religious schools, namely to read the Hebrew prayers.

2. Rote Method

Another way in which educators can start on the teaching of Hebrew with little children, Gamoran claims, is through the rote method.⁵⁶ "Here the teaching of little children begins with concrete things, lively things, something that will arouse their interests. While the teaching of the Hebrew Prayer Book must necessarily be postponed to the higher grades, it is well to stimulate the feeling on the part of the children that Hebrew will function in their lives by introducing them to some of the simplest and most important of the Hebrew responses immediately. That is like the Shema, the En Kelohenu, the Sabbath and Hanukkah blessings, and one or two others which can be taught largely through song."⁵⁶

While Gamoran does not actually state that the method which he is advocating for young children is the rote method this is clearly implied from the above quotation, and this method/^{is}being employed by many schools in some form.

Certainly this method is economical; however it does not achieve the primary goal of Hebrew instruction in Reform temples namely, that of reading Hebrew prayers. In addition to this, the stimulus is weak, for in many instances nonsense syllables are used and student interest, consequently dwindles.

3. Prayer Book Method

Max Reichler agrees with Gamoran and claims that the primary aim of Hebrew instruction must be to teach for Prayer-Book understanding. There must also be a connection

between what is learned and what one experiences in daily life. "We do not, however, want our congregations to repeat, or sing words that convey no living message. Hence our aim in teaching the rudiments of Hebrew should be to enable our children, after a few years of study, to read Hebrew fluently, to know fairly well the grammar and construction of sentences and to become familiar with the vocabulary of the most important parts of the Union Prayer Book."⁵⁷

Obviously, Reichler expects too much when he speaks of "grammar and construction," for the time allotted in the Reform religious school does not permit this kind of instruction.

However the first stages of his method is feasible. It begins with the vocabulary of the Union Prayer Book, has the child assimilate the words and phrases by a gradual process and by continuous repetition. "The prayer book vocabulary must continue to be the background of every lesson. Home study must be insisted on and the despised mechanical reading is absolutely essential."⁵⁸ Reichler pays no heed to what has already been mentioned in Chapter Two --- that is that constant repetition is the enemy of real child interest and that there is an inherent disinterest in this material.

4. Combination of Rote and Prayer Study

The Euclid Avenue Temple of Cleveland, Ohio, discovered that as it introduced congregational reading and singing by the children, the interest in Hebrew grew proportionately. This particular temple also believes that

through a study of Hebrew their children come to identify themselves more fully with Jews all over the world. This latter thought is in line with the feeling of those educators, both traditional and Reform, who hold that the study of Hebrew definitely serves as a cultural link and bond. Among ^{it} Jews suggests also that through the introduction of congregational reading and singing there is a kernel of truth in the statement: "In every phase of education, pupil participation is the most essential element. Progressive schools recognize more and more that children learn best through experiencing."⁵⁹

Now let us look at the Hebrew curriculum of this Reform temple and observe their method of interest. For quite some time they had utilized Reshith Death but to no avail. The letters were taught but were not learned. The administrators of the school therefore completely eliminated the Reshith Death and developed a technique of teaching Hebrew which enabled them to build up an entirely new curriculum and a methodology based upon the experience and the needs of the children of the Temple School. They used devises and games calculated to make the teaching of mechanical reading a pleasant activity for both teacher and pupils. The children first learned the letters, followed by vowels and then they were taught a combination of both. "By the time our children reach the confirmation grade," declares the school administrator, "they are able to read Hebrew fluently and their attitude toward Hebrew is a very healthy one."⁶⁰

The children who attended this school for nine years have had Hebrew instruction of about 150 hours --- 61 the equivalent of about a year's work in the Talmud Torah. Coming one day a week for Hebrew instruction the teaching of Hebrew with its grammatical constructions, as a spoken tongue, is an impossibility. "In our temple (Euclid Avenue Temple, Cleveland, Ohio,)" the administrator continues, "where we have only 30 minutes in the primary department, and but 50 or 60 minutes per week in the intermediate or junior high classes for the study of Hebrew, we can do little more than prepare the pupil for active and intelligent participation in the synagogue life; that is, give to the pupil the tool which will enable him to read and understand the significant Hebrew prayers which are found in the Union Prayer Book, as well as those blessings and prayers which relate to our festivals and those words which are associated with the symbols, customs, and ceremonies of our Jewish religious life." 62 This means of course, that Hebrew prayers and not the Hebrew language is taught.

The Hebrew curriculum of this Reform Temple is as follows: In the first grade the children learn by rote the שמע ישראל and the phrase יהוה אחד; they are also taught the blessings over the candles, wine, and bread. In addition to this they, of course, learn the translation of all the prayers which they are taught. In the second grade they review the previous years' work and learn אלהי נאמן. The teachers of Hebrew take into account the forgetting factor

of the summer vacation and provide ample review before attempting anything new. In the third grade they learn some of the short responses such as **קראו את "פאמאדק"**, **פאמאדק לעולם ועד**, **"ימאדק"** and **הרוק**; in addition they are taught the hymn **אין כאלפניו**; all of this is learned by rote and without the aid of a Hebrew textbook.

When the children reach the fourth grade they are first given a Hebrew textbook. There they begin to learn **אופהת** and complete it, plus additional responses in the fifth grade.

Each year after adequate review "something new is added." "In the sixth grade," the administrator tells us, "they learn responses and the Sabbath hymn, **עלום עליכם** ---- in the seventh grade the **עירוב** of Yom Tov and Shabbos is learned and in the eighth grade the **עמ'ד** is taught and learned, in addition to the blessings for the Torah reading. By the ninth grade the children are equipped to read from Hebrew scripture and they also learn **אנחנו כנעם** and **אנחנו**." ⁶³

The student begins to acquire the rudiments of reading Hebrew print in the fourth grade. From the fourth through the ninth grades, there are six manuals, prepared by the staff, which the students use in their work. In each manual are found an explanation of the Hebrew prayer, then the prayer is followed by a Hebrew and English vocabulary list. Finally, provision is made for a series of drills. While the student does not learn how to write Hebrew, he does learn how to stick print. it.

"Whenever a pupil is required to fill in a missing Hebrew word," the administrator of the school explains, "he uses stick printing. Occasionally exercises require that missing letters be filled in. This is not for the purpose of stressing spelling in the study of a language but an added device to help recall significant words and to help the pupil recognize the root derivation of many words which reappear in the liturgy such as עֲשֵׂה with forms

עֲשֵׂה, הֲעֲשֵׂה, עֲשֵׂה." ⁶⁴

The texts which are used in this school are:

Ha Shear and the Hebrew Prayer Study which was prepared by their staff. Gilenu and Resith Death are not used.

It is unfortunate that the Euclid Avenue Temple did not respond to the examination questionnaire sent to their pupils so that an objective evaluation of the method could be made. On the surface this method seems to have the advantage of meeting the goals of teaching Hebrew in a Reform religious school in an economic way.

5. Resith Death and Similar Methods

Numerous temples with the one day a-week schools use the Resith Death or similar methods based upon Resith Death, Ha-Sefer and others. This is the method which attempts to teach Hebrew reading by the individual letter and vowel approach and employs no comprehension or meaning or words.

There are real difficulties with the use of Resith Death; first and foremost the work is presented in a dry and tedious manner. The English equivalent to a letter or vowel

appears only once and unless the child learns it perfectly the very first time, he must search for the place where the particular letter or vowel first appeared. In Ha Sefer no English equivalent is given for the vowels and if the child does not repeat often enough, the learning process is immeasurably hindered. In further criticism it must be stated that in this method there is not enough regard given to repetition, difficulty of letters and vowels, over-learning, and forgetfulness. The individual ability of children is passed over and the group is therefore the prime concern. The very vital element of child motivation is also completely lacking in these texts. The "Let's Read Hebrew" by Lillian Koch is somewhat better a method for children in grades two through four. It provides adequate motivation for the children and at the same time gives ample drill work. It can be successful when used over a two year period and augmented by home study and review. The children have the opportunity to color and cut out Hebrew letters thus providing for pleasurable motor activity.

In "Ha-Sheer" which uses the device of games for drill work, a similar degree of success can be achieved provided the teacher and the time are adequate.

6. One Bond Method

Abraham N. Franzblau developed what he calls the "One-Bond Method" because as he put it, the following criteria for a sound method of teaching Hebrew did not exist:

"First and foremost, while the child is learning

them, he should never be in doubt as to the correct sound of the letters or vowels he is trying to learn. This criterion must apply whether or not the teacher is present.

"The second crucial criterion is that each individual child be given exactly the amount of drill necessary for him to stamp in or to overlearn each element taught. The method must adjust both to the learning rate of each child and to the inherent difficulty of each element.

"The third criterion is that the method provide for not just a few combinations of letters and vowels, but for all possible combinations which may be encountered by the child. It must also permit enough repetitions to insure learning.

"Fourthly, a satisfactory method should be self-correcting. Errors, whether made in class or at home, should be immediately apparent and promptly correctable.

"----- the method should be attractive to childrent and should have as much of the aspect of play in it as possible. However, the play should be intrinsic to the learning, not an extraneous sugar-coating which contributes nothing pedagogically."⁶⁵

In essence the One-Bond Method consists of "presenting the Hebrew symbol and its English meaning alone. The sound of the word is not presented. The child is not able to pronounce it because he does not know what the word sounds like. He is not asked to read it or to write it in script. He merely learns to recognize the word for what

it means, nothing else. However, having only this one bond to learn instead of five or six, or even three, the child moves ahead rapidly acquiring more and more words."⁶⁶

This One Bond Method is so constructed so as to be in complete harmony with the psychological principle established earlier, namely that a child will learn and comprehend more easily when presented with one simple task than when presented with a complex of more than one task. However this method conflicts with the primary religious school objective, that of prayer reading.

In addition to this difficulty there is also the matter of actual reading. Nowhere in this method is there a technique for actually learning how to read. As a matter of fact there is as yet no evidence as to the effectiveness of this method or the achievement of the purposes for which Franzblau designed it.

D. Summary

It has been seen that the Reform Religious Schools' frame of reference for Hebrew teaching includes special teachers, who are engaged because the regular instructors are deficient in knowledge of Hebrew; that the average weekly amount of time is 48 minutes and that most of the Hebrew teaching is done between grades four and eight.

The aims are primarily concerned with teaching Hebrew so that the student can participate in the religious worship services. In addition to this some Reform congregations have expressed a desire to establish more positive attitudes toward Hebrew and greater degree of Hebrew com-

prehension.

In this chapter on "General Methods of Teaching Hebrew in Reform Religious Schools" it has been observed that the methods utilized very considerably. Among these used are the rote-method, the Gilenu Method, Rote and Prayer Study Method, Resith Daath and similar methods, One-Bond Method, and Prayer Book Method.

Chapter V

AN EVALUATION OF HEBREW INSTRUCTION
IN THE REFORM RELIGIOUS SCHOOLA. Procedure

Having determined the facts connected with the teaching of Hebrew in the Reform religious schools as well as the various texts and methods employed we turn now to an evaluation of the effectiveness of this Hebrew instruction. To determine this an examination was prepared and distributed to the 195 congregations who participated in the preliminary postal card questionnaire and indicated their willingness to cooperate in the testing of their pupils' Hebrew achievement.

The methods which were employed to determine the pupils' degree of achievement in Hebrew were:

1) examination

was to be given to the last grade in which Hebrew was taught, in order to obtain the measure of maximum achievement.

2) the exam-

ination consisted of two major parts, designed to test the ability of children to read and /or translate liturgical Hebrew and to test the ability of children to read and /or translate general Hebrew.

3) to judge

reading ability, it was deemed advisable to permit the child to transliterate into English. (It was understood that in scoring the widest latitude would be given in the transliteration supplied by the pupil.)

The following letter and questionnaire was distributed:

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

Clifton Avenue
Cincinnati 20, Ohio

October 29, 1952

Dear Rabbi:

I want you to know how much I appreciated your reply on the questionnaire on the teaching of Hebrew which I sent you last Spring.

Again I am calling upon your helpfulness in asking the teacher of the confirmation class of your religious school, if it receives Hebrew instruction, or the teacher of the next highest grade before confirmation which receives Hebrew instruction, to administer a brief test. This test is divided into the following

- A) Hebrew Prayerbook Reading
- B) Prayerbook Translation
- C) General Hebrew Reading
- D) General Hebrew Translation

Will you please select as the test for your children those sections which cover the type of Hebrew instruction the pupils have been receiving. For example, if the children have been receiving Hebrew instruction in Prayerbook Hebrew please select parts A and/or B. If they have been receiving instruction in General Hebrew please select parts C and / or D.

I do hope that I may count upon your kind cooperation, since the information from this test is needed to supply important details for my rabbinical thesis, A Critical Evaluation of Current Methods of Teaching Hebrew Reading in the Reform Religious School.

May I ask your prompt cooperation and I shall be grateful to you if you would return the completed test to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

With sincerest gratitude and kindest wishes,
I remain

Cordially yours,

Philmore Berger

Instructions to the Teacher

Here is a test of ability which you are kindly asked to administer. It should be given to the pupils in the confirmation class, if they receive Hebrew instruction; if they do not, it should be given to the highest grade below the confirmation year in which the pupils receive instruction in Hebrew.

Please follow these general directions:

1) The pupil is to take only those parts of the test which cover the type of Hebrew instruction he has received in the religious school: a) if he has been taught only to read from the prayerbook he is to take the A part of the test; b) if he has been taught to read and translate the prayerbook he is to take the A and B sections of the test; c) if he has studied general Hebrew reading he is to take the C part; and if he has studied general Hebrew reading with translation he is to take the C and D parts.

2) Do not allow the class more than 20 minutes per section. If two sections are given then 40 minutes should be allowed.

3) Do not score these tests; instead please return them in the self-addressed envelope to Mr. Philmore Berger c/o Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 20, Ohio.

4) Please fill out and attach the following with the returned tests:

School _____ City _____

Sections of test administered _____

Teacher's Name _____ Grade _____

Please check the names of the following books used in connection with Hebrew study in the religious school:

- ☐ 1. Ha Shear
- ☐ 2. Ha Sefer
- ☐ 3. Let's Read Hebrew
- ☐ 4. Reshls Daas
- ☐ 5. Gilenu

- ☐ 6. Prayerbook Study
- ☐ 7. Union Prayerbook

List any others:

A Message to the Students Taking This Test

This is a test of your ability to read or translate Hebrew and it is being given to Reform Religious School pupils all over the country. It is part of a study which is being made of the various methods of teaching Hebrew.

In no way will the results of this test effect your individual school work or grade, so you do not have to sign your name on the paper.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Philmore Berger
Hebrew Union College-Jewish
Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio

SECTION A

Hebrew Prayerbook Reading

Instruction to the pupil: Below is a Hebrew prayer taken from the Union Prayerbook. Please write out in English in the spaces provided below each Hebrew word the way the Hebrew sounds. Do not worry about spelling.

Example: פָּרְכוּ אֵת יְיָ הַמְבָרֵךְ

In English it sounds like: Ha' Menoroch Adonai Et Borach

הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל הַנּוֹפֵר וְהַנּוֹרָא. אֵל עֲלִיוֹן

נִזְמָל חֲסִדִּים סוֹבִים. וְנִנְחָה חֶפֶל וְזוֹכֵר חֲכָדִי

אֲבוֹת. וְסִבְיָא בְּאֵלָה לְכִנִּי בְּנֵי יִחִם. לְמַעַן שְׁמֹחַ

בְּאַחֲכָה.

SECTION B

Prayerbook Translation

Instruction to the pupil: This is to see how well you can translate Hebrew prayers. Please translate into English the following Hebrew prayers. Do it word by word in the spaces provided beneath the Hebrew words.

Example:

שָׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶחָד
Hear Israel our God the Lord one

(1) סִי־כִסְכָּה פְּאֵלִים. סִי כִסְכָּה נֶאֱדָר בְּכֶשֶׁת

נִזְרָא תְּחִלָּה עֲשֵׂה פִלָּא.

(2) יִסְלַח יְיָ לְעוֹלָם אֱלֹהֵינוּ צִיוֹן לְדוֹר וְדוֹר
תְּלַלֵּנוּ יִחֵ.

SECTION C
General Hebrew Reading

Instruction to the pupil: This is to see how well you can read Hebrew. Read the following sentences and write out in English in the spaces provided below the Hebrew words, the way the Hebrew sounds.

Example:

אבא	סדכר	בגן
<i>Abba</i>	<i>Sedaker</i>	<i>Bagan</i>

(1) הילדה אומרת לאב שלי: הטוב בגן שלך?

האב אומר: ילד שלי טוב מאד.

(2) האיט אומר: הילדה בגן יבנה מאד.

האישה אומרת: כן, היא קטנה מאד.

(3) האב אומר: איך יושב הילד?

האמא אומרת: הילד יושב בבית הספר.

SECTION D

General Hebrew Translation

Instruction to the pupil: Translate into English the following three sets of sentences:

Example:

אבא מדבר בגן

Father is speaking in the garden.

(1) הילדה אומרת לאב שלה: הסוכ בן שלי?
האב אומר: ילד שלי סוכ מאד.

1) English translation:

(2) האישה אומר: הילדה בגן קטנה מאד.
האיש אומר: כן, היא קטנה מאד.

2) English translation:

(3) האב אומר: איך יושב הילד?

האמא אומרת: הילד יושב בבית הספר.
3) English translation:

Of the 195 sets of tests sent, only 21 religious schools completed and returned their sets, totaling 193 individual tests. In addition thirty congregations sent letters indicating that they were unable to administer the examination because as one administrator put it " I have to honestly confess that I don't think that any of the youngsters in our school can even get to first base with any of the questions."

The following is but one of the many letters received from religious school administrators indicating inability to take the examination:

Dear Mr. Berger:

I am sorry, but I am not going to be able to cooperate with you on your latest questionnaire on the teaching of Hebrew.

Unfortunately, Hebrew is one of the major current weaknesses of our religious school. We are trying to work out a satisfactory curriculum because we have found none elsewhere.

Our present confirmation class takes no Hebrew.

Hebrew, at present, and for the first time, is being taught only in our grades VI, VII, and VIII.

My cordial greetings to you.

Sincerely,

In scoring the examination the following key was established:

Section A consists of Hebrew prayer. Pupil is to transliterate into English in the spaces provided beneath each word.

Errors 1 - 5 = G (Good)

Errors 6 - 12 = F (Fair)

Errors 13 - 21 = P (Poor)

Section B consists of translating Hebrew prayer into English.

Errors 1 - 6 = G

Errors 7 - 12 = F

Errors 13 - 20 = P

Section C consists of general Hebrew. Pupil is to transliterate into English.

Errors 1 - 10 = G

Errors 11 - 24 = F

Errors 25 - 36 = P

Section D contains 3 sets of Hebrew sentences to translate into English.

1 set wrong = G

2 sets wrong = F

3 sets wrong = P

It is evident from this key that wherever possible considerable leniency in scoring was shown. Moreover in questions of transliteration, the student was always

given the benefit of the doubt.

The findings of the examination are to be seen from the following charts:

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT	TESTS TAKEN: A, B, C, D	NO. OF PUPILS TAKING TEST	RESULTS			
											A	B	C	D
Temple Israel Hollywood, Calif.	L	C	12	1-12	*	L, GC		39	A, B, C	10	7 G 2 F 1 P 6 F 3 F 1 G 4 F 1 F	5 G 3 F 2 F	9 G 1 F	
Beth Israel Hartford, Conn.	L	C	9	1-9	*	L,		30	A	10				
K. A. M. Temple Chicago, Ill.	L	V	5	4-8	*	GC		60	A, C, D	9			6 G 1 F	4 G 2 F 3 F
Temple B'nai Abraham Decatur, Ill.	S	V			*	GC	2	45	A, C, D	2	2 G		2 G	2 G
Temple Israel LeFayette, Ind.	S	C	7	1-7		GC	1	30	A, C	5	2 G 3 F 3 G 4 F 3 F 5 G 1 F 1 G 5 F 1 F	3 G 2 F		
Beth El Southland, Ind.	K	C	10	1-10	*	L		30	A	10				
Adath Israel Louisville, Ky.	L	C	5	4-8	*	L		45	A, C	9			6 G 2 F 1 F	
Isaac Mayer Wise Temple, Cincinnati, Ohio	L	C	8	3-10	*	L	1	30	A, C	19			1 G 1 F 10 F	
Rockdale Ave. Temple Cincinnati, Ohio	L	C	4	4-7		L	2	60	A	21	2 G 19 F			
Cheb Shelom Temple Baltimore, Maryland	L	C	7	3-9	*	L, GC	1	45	A	13	2 G 4 F 7 F			

B. Summary of Results

Of the 21 congregations who participated in this survey all but two took the A part of the examination, confirming the fact that Hebrew is predominantly taught in Reform religious schools for the liturgical purposes.

It appears that, proportionately, not too many congregations teach the translation of Prayers. Seven Congregations administered the B part which was designed to discover the pupil's ability in translation of prayer book Hebrew. Only 24% of these pupils, however, were able to attain a "G" status in this regard.

Fourteen of the total number of congregations that responded employ special teachers who go from class to class, instructing the children in Hebrew. From the final results as indicated on the chart (pp) it appears that these congregations show some gains over those use regular classroom teachers for Hebrew instruction.

Thus the 14 congregations employing special Hebrew teachers showed an average of 38% "G" students, while the rest showed an average of 25% "G" students in the A part of the examination (designed to test for liturgical reading ability).

This result, however, should be qualified by the fact that 18 of the 30 congregations who replied that their children were not prepared to take any portion of the examination employed special Hebrew teachers.

Of these 18 congregations 15 even have additional week-day Hebrew sessions.

There does not seem to be any constant relationship between the size of the congregation and the effectiveness of its Hebrew instruction. Thus in some instances it appears that the larger the congregation the poorer the results and vice versa. But on the whole the smaller congregations show a better proportion of results. Thus the average of "G" students for the 10 large congregations taking the A section of the examination is 28% while the average of "G" students for the other congregations is 50%.

Perhaps the most plausible reason for this is that in large congregations with correspondingly large religious schools the child will of necessity receive little or no individual attention.

There does not appear to be any appreciable difference in results between those schools which begin Hebrew instruction prior to grade 4 and those that start Hebrew with this grade. The percentages of 34% appear for both groups. Thus it would appear that there is no advantage to be gained by beginning the study of Hebrew early, whereas there might conceivably be some maturity advantage if Hebrew is postponed until later.

Nor is there much difference in the results of all schools having more than 5 years of Hebrew instruction

as compared with those having 4 or 5 years of instruction. Actually the latter group shows a somewhat higher percentage of 40% as compared to 32% for the former.

In congregations where Hebrew is voluntary the children seem to do considerably better than in those which have Hebrew on a compulsory basis. The figures show that the average of "G" students, taking the A section, in voluntary schools is 58% while in schools where Hebrew is compulsory the average is 28%. This an indication, it seems, of the fact that where there is selectivity based on some degree of greater ability the final results tend to be higher.

As one peruses the chart it is easily seen that the aims of Hebrew instruction by and large are not being fulfilled. Thus for example, of the 19 congregations who took the A part of the examination, the average of "G" students is 36%. This fact, combined with the 30 letters which indicated the inability of the pupils to take the examination, presents a picture of far less achievement in Hebrew instruction in Reform religious schools than the percentage above would indicate.

From the results obtained it is interesting to note that those congregations which conduct additional week day classes in Hebrew instruction show an even lower percentage of "G" students than the general average (11 percent).

Summarizing this we discover the following on the positive side: 1) that where small congregations with

apparently smaller classes exist and where conceivably, individualized instruction can be given, the results tend to be better; 2) that where special Hebrew teachers are employed, Hebrew is taught more effectively; 3) that where the study of Hebrew is voluntary the results tend to be better than where it is compulsory.

On the negative side we see that 1) there is no correlation of effectiveness in results either with the age at which Hebrew instruction is begun or with the number of years during which it is taught; 2) that there is no correlation between extra Hebrew classes and achievement; 3) that the admitted aims of Hebrew instruction in Reform religious schools are being attained only to a very limited degree. Actually less than a quarter of the pupils are learning simply to read liturgical Hebrew.

Chapter VI

SUMMARY AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONSA. Summary

We are now in a position to summarize the findings of the teaching of Hebrew especially as it concerns the Reform religious school. This study has considered the following areas: 1) the general psychological factors of the learning of a foreign language; 2) the general methods of teaching Hebrew in non-Reform agencies; 3) the general methods of teaching Hebrew in Reform congregations and 4) the present-day situation and achievement of Reform Hebrew instruction as revealed by questionnaire and examination.

From the area of the general psychology of learning of a foreign language we observe that provision for reading readiness is a valuable aid to the actual reading of a foreign language. In other words a child should be conceptually prepared for the reading process. We observe also that, because of complex physiological and psychological processes, reading should be delayed until the child is sufficiently mature enough to attempt the reading of a foreign language. Certainly of importance is the conclusion that a child should first master the vernacular before attempting the study of a foreign language.

From the area of the general methods of teaching

Hebrew in non-Reform agencies we note that the frame of reference of these non-Reform agencies is considerably different from that of Reform congregations. Professional Hebrew teachers instruct pupils in the Hebrew language for several hours a week and over a period of two or three years.

The methods investigated were 1) Ivrit-b'-Ivrit; 2) Natural and Reading Method; 3) Specific Practice and 4) Goal Method. Judging by the comments of educators in the field and especially those of William Chomsky we can conclude that the amount of success achieved by any of these methods is rather meager.

In the area dealing with the general methods of teaching Hebrew in Reform religious schools we note that the frame of reference includes: greater limitation of time; generally one day average of less than an hour; special Hebrew teachers and apathetic attitude toward Hebrew instruction.

B. Observations

On the basis of the investigation of the actual present day teaching of Hebrew in the Reform religious school we noted the following:

1. Aims

We have seen that the aim of Reform congregations is essentially that of the non-Reform agencies, namely, the teaching of Hebrew for liturgical purposes. However we must recognize that non-Reform agencies frequently include speaking, writing, and comprehension. Our findings have shown that within the Reform movement there has been little effort to expend the aims beyond that of liturgical purposes.

2. Attainment of Results

We have discovered that despite the sharp limitation of aim, Hebrew instruction within the Reform school has not succeeded in accomplishing its primary purpose.

There appears to be little relationship between results and the texts used or the amount of time devoted to the study of Hebrew. Somewhat more significant factors in the teaching of Hebrew is the rating of pupils to teacher and the employment of teachers for Hebrew instruction. Likewise it is seen that children who study Hebrew on a voluntary basis do better than children who study Hebrew because it is compulsory.

3. Method

There is no indication that any specific method produces better results. We have seen that there is a

need for new methods and new techniques. These methods should allow for greater individual instruction and take into consideration the inherent disinterest which children often show toward prayer-book Hebrew.

4. Degree to which Hebrew is Being Taught

The overwhelming majority of congregations is teaching Hebrew on a compulsory basis for an average of 48 minutes per week. A minority of congregations conducts extra week day classes and very few congregations teach no Hebrew at all.

5. Texts

The majority of congregations are at present using Resith Death and similar texts. This may to some degree account for our failure in this field since such texts hold no sustaining interest for children. Other texts built on liturgical reading and translation may likewise not be sufficiently stimulating to children since liturgical material by its very nature is not inherently exciting.

Apparently there are factors at work in the matter of teaching Hebrew in the Reform religious school which are more basic to the problem than that of texts, methods, time and teachers; namely, the general tone of the religious school and related agencies (standards frequently are not maintained within the school and consequently children are inclined not to take the work seriously; the home environment is often not conducive to religious study;

then too, lack of congregational use of Hebrew makes the learning and retention of Hebrew all the more difficult). It would be useful indeed to investigate the effect of these factors upon the instruction of Hebrew in the Reform religious school.

C. Recommendations

On the basis of this study it would appear that the most effective way of teaching Hebrew in Reform religious schools would include the following:

- 1) Implementation of the findings of psychology in connection with the learning of a foreign language; namely, that reading readiness be provided for in the earlier grades and that actual reading instruction be postponed until a later grade when the child has already mastered the mechanics of the reading of the vernacular.

- 2) A better utilization of the available time for Hebrew instruction, i.e., a consistent 30 or 40 minutes a week without interruption.

- 3) Provision for Hebrew instruction in smaller groups, where the teacher has the opportunity to give more individualized instruction.

- 4) Provision for more adequate reading readiness instruction, to be acquired through the media of rote and song learning.

In addition, as we have seen from the general opinion in the field, the teaching of Hebrew is done most

effectively when the following conditions prevail:

- a) favorable environmental surroundings.
- b) positive attitudes on the part of both teacher and pupil.
- c) proper environment for the learning of Hebrew established by both the religious school and the congregation; namely, by maintaining standards expected of students and by actually having more congregational participation in the use of Hebrew.
- d) the regular classroom teacher to instruct pupils in Hebrew in order to bring about integration of Hebrew with the rest of the curriculum.

e) texts to teach Hebrew reading which have been designed to stimulate more pupil interest.

In conclusion we are faced with four possible alternatives in the matter of teaching Hebrew in the Reform religious school:

First, we should attempt to develop on an experimental basis new methods and materials which show proportionately better results than are now being obtained. This would involve a careful program of experimentation and testing to determine the best possible texts and methods.

The second alternative is to utilize the rote method of Hebrew instruction entirely. This is in frank recognition of the fact that thereby we could achieve a greater economy in time and effectiveness in results.

True, this would mean the discontinuation of the teaching

of Hebrew as such.

The third possibility is to abolish completely all instruction in Hebrew. In view of the present day aims of religious schools this hardly seems in keeping with the desires of the schools themselves. Yet, objectively, the present day situation hardly justifies the time and effort employed in Hebrew instruction.

A fourth possibility is to continue teaching Hebrew as it is currently being taught and to expect that only a relatively small percentage of children will be able to attain the goal. Certainly one would hope that the Reform movement as such, accepting the value of Hebrew, would want to raise the level of accomplishment in the religious school.

Of the four alternatives, the writer inclines toward a combination of the first two ----- the use of the rote method more intensively in the earlier grades and the adoption of better methods and texts made possible by a more concerted effort to raise the level of achievement in Hebrew reading in the Reform religious school.

NOTES

¹Isidor Chein, "Education and Knowledge," Jewish Teacher, XXI (March 1952), p.5.

²Ibid., p. 6.

³Wm. S. Gray, "Teaching of Reading," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1950), p. 987.

⁴Ibid., pp. 988 - 989.

⁵Chein, op. cit., p. 7.

⁶Ibid., p. 8.

⁷James Tharp, "Modern Foreign Languages," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1950), p. 464

⁸Ibid., p. 465.

⁹Ibid., p. 466.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 464

¹¹Loc. cit.

¹²Loc. cit.

¹³Loc. cit.

¹⁴Ben Rosen and William Chomsky, "Improving the Teaching of Hebrew in Our Schools," Jewish Education XII (September, 1940). p. 99.

¹⁵Loc. cit.

¹⁶Wm. Chomsky, How to Teach Hebrew in the Elementary Grades. New York: United Synagogue Commission and Jewish Education, 1946, p. 29.

¹⁷Louis Hurwich, "Hebrew Education Through Play," Jewish Education, X (January-March, 1938), p. 35.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 36.

¹⁹I. B. Rappoport, "New Type Devices in the Teaching of Hebrew," Jewish Education, II (October, 1930), p. 146.

²⁰Morris Arzt, "Methods of Learning Hebrew," Jewish Education, VI (January - March, 1934), p. 30.

²¹Ibid., p. 31

²²Ibid., p. 32.

²³Loc. cit.

²⁴Loc. cit.

²⁵Loc. cit.

²⁶Loc. cit.

²⁷Loc. cit.

²⁸Loc. cit.

²⁹Wm. Chomsky, "Aims and Methods in Teaching Hebrew," Jewish Education, XV (September, 1943), p. 148.

³⁰Ibid., p. 149.

³¹Ibid., p. 150.

³²Loc. cit.

³³E. A. Nudelman, "Three Years of Individual Instruction in the Teaching of Hebrew," Jewish Education, I (October, 1929), p. 154.

³⁴Ibid., p. 155.

³⁵Ibid., p. 156

³⁶Loc. cit.

³⁷Loc. cit.

³⁸Chomsky, op. cit., p. 151.

³⁹Loc. cit.

⁴⁰Wm. Chomsky, "Which Words and How Many," Pedagogic Reporter, VI (1952), p. 14.

⁴¹Loc. cit.

⁴²Rosen and Chomsky, op. cit., p. 97.

⁴³Chomsky, "Aims and Methods of Teaching Hebrew, p.149.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 152.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 153.

⁴⁶Wm. Chomsky, "A Reading Program in Hebrew," Jewish Education, VII (October - December, 1936), p. 137.

⁴⁷Libbie Braverman, "Hebrew in a Reform Temple School," Jewish Education, V (January 0 March, 1933), p. 40

⁴⁸Emanuel Gamoran, "A New Approach to the Teaching of Hebrew," C. C. A. R. Year Book, XXXVI (1936), p. 306.

⁴⁹Harry Essrig, "Teaching Hebrew in Reform Religious Schools," Jewish Education, XV (September, 1943), pp.29-30.

⁵⁰L. Ketzoff, Issues in Jewish Education. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1949. p. 153.

⁵¹Jacob Pollock, "Forty Years of Reform Jewish Education," C. C. A. R. Year Book, XXXIX (1929), p. 403.

⁵²Gamoran, op. cit., p. 304.

⁵³Loc. cit.

⁵⁴Lillian Sugerman, "The Teaching of Liturgical Hebrew," Jewish Teacher, XIV (January, 1946), pp. 11 - 12.

⁵⁵Gamoran, op. cit., p. 307.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 308.

⁵⁷Max Reichler, "The Instruction of Hebrew in Our Sunday Schools," C.C.A.R. Year Book, XXXIII (1923), p.281.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 283.

⁵⁹Braverman, op. cit., p. 40.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 44.

⁶¹Loc. cit.

⁶²Sugerman, op. cit., pp.11 - 12.

Bibliography

⁶³Loc. cit.

⁶⁴Loc. cit.

⁶⁵Abraham Franzblau, "New Methods of Teaching Hebrew," Jewish Education, XXII (Winter - Spring 1950-1951), p. 19

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 18.

Bibliography

TEXTS

Chomsky, William. How to Teach Hebrew in the Elementary Grades. New York: United Synagogue Commission on Jewish Education, 1946.

Gamoran, Emanuel. Changing Conceptions in Jewish Education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1924..

Katzoff, L. Issues in Jewish Education. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1949..

PERIODICALS

Arzt, William. "A Reading Program in Hebrew," Jewish Education, VI (January-March 1934), 30-32.

Braverman, Libbie. "Hebrew in a Reform Temple," Jewish Education, V (January-March, 1933), 40-41..

Chein, Isidor. "Education And Knowledge," Jewish Teacher, XXI (November, 1952), 5-8..

Chomsky, William. "A Reading Program in Hebrew," Jewish Education, VIII (October-December, 1936), 137-139..

Chomsky, William. "Aims and Methods in Teaching Hebrew," Jewish Education, XV (September, 1943), 148-154..

Chomsky, William. "Which Words and How Many," Pedagogic Reporter, VI (1952), 14.

Essrig, Harry. "Teaching Hebrew in Reform Religious Schools," Jewish Education, XV (September, 1943), 29-31.

Feinberg, S. "Critical Evaluation of Reform Religious School," Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book, XXXIX (1929), 439-440..

Franzblau, Abraham. "New Methods of Teaching Hebrew," Jewish Education, XXII (Winter-Spring 1950-1951), 18..

Gamoran, Emanuel. "A New Approach to the Teaching of Hebrew," Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book, XXXVI (1936), 304-317..

Hurwich, Louis. "Hebrew Education Through Play," Jewish Education, X (January-March, 1938), 35-36.

Nudelman, E.A. "Three Years of Individual Instruction in the Teaching of Hebrew," Jewish Education, I (October, 1929), 154-156.

Pollack, Jacob. "Forty Years of Reform Jewish Education," Central Conference of American Rabbis Year Book, XXXIX (1929), 402-406.

Rappoport, I.B. "New Type Devices in the Teaching of Hebrew," Jewish Education, II (October, 1930), 146-148..

Rosen, Ben and William Chomsky. "Improving the Teaching of Hebrew in Our Schools," Jewish Education, XII (September, 1940), 97-100..

Sugarman, Lillian.. "The Teaching of Liturgical Hebrew," Jewish Teacher, XIV (January, 1946), 11-13.

ENCYCLOPEDIA

Chipkin, Israel S. "Religious Education----Jewish," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1950), 1020-1022.

Gray, William D. "Teaching of Reading," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1950), 987-989..

Tharp, James.. "Modern Foreign Languages," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1950), 464-466.

APPENDIX

Key to ChartSize

1 - 150 congregations = S
151 - 450 " = M
451 - up " = L

Hebrew Voluntary or Compulsory

Voluntary = V
Compulsory = C

Purposes for Which Taught

Liturgical = L
General reading with comprehension = GC
Conversation = C

Extra Hebrew Classes

One hour = 1
Two hours = 2
Three hours = 3

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Emanu-El Birm. Ala.	L	C	4	4 - 7	*	L		30 min
Eman-El Dothan, Ala	S	V			*	L	2	45 min.
Beth Israel Gadsden, Ala	S	C	10	1 - 10	*	L		60 min
Shearai Shomayim Mobile, Ala	S	C	5	5 - 9	*	L		30 min
Beth Israel Phoenix, Arizona	M	V			*	GC	2	60 min
Ensi Israel Little Rock, Ark.	M	V				L		30 min
Temple Israel Hollywood, Calif.	L	C	12	1 - 12	#	L, GC		30 min
Israel Long Beach, Calif.	M	V	6	4 - 9	*	L		45 min
Leo Baeck Temple Los Angeles, Calif.	S	V	5	4 - 8	*	GC		60 min
Wilshire Blvd Temple Los Angeles, Calif	L	V	5	3 - 7	*	L		45 min

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Temple Beth Hillel North Hollywood, Calif.	M	V	3	7-9	*	L		30 min
Sinai Oakland, Calif.	M	C	7	1-7	*	L		45 min
B'Nai Israel Sacramento, Calif.	M	C	7	3-9	*	L, C		30 min
Beth Israel San Diego, Calif.	M	V	8	3-10	*	L		60 min
Sherith Israel San Francisco, Calif.	L	C	4	4-7		L		45 min
Temple Emanuel San Francisco, Calif.	L	C	4	4-7	*	L		30 min
San Mateo, Calif.	M	V	10	1-10		L	2	60 min
Israel Stockton, Calif.	M	C	7	4-10		L	2	30 min
B'Nai Israel Bridgeport, Conn.	M	V	9	1-9	*	L		45 min
United Jewish Center Danbury, Conn.	S	V	10	1-10	*	C, L, GC	3	45 min

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Beth Israel, Hartford, Conn.	L	C.	9	1 - 9	*	L		30 min
Mishkan Israel, New Haven, Conn.	L	V	6	5 - 10	*	GC		60 min
Israel, Norwalk, Conn.	S	C	8	3 - 10	*	LGC		45 min
Israel, Waterbury, Conn.	S	C	4	5 - 8	*	L		60 min
Beth Emeth Wilmington, Delaware	M	C	6	4 - 9	*	L,GC,C		60 min
Ahhvath Chesed Jacksonville, Florida	M	C	6	5 - 10	*	L		30 min
Israel Miami, Florida	L	C	8	3 - 10	*	L		30 min
Beth Shalom Miami Beach, Fla.	S	C	7	3 - 9		L,GC,C		60 min
Beth El Pensicola, Fla.	S	V	3	6 - 8	*	L		30 min
Israel Tallahassee, Fla.	S	V			*	GC		30 min

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Scheerai Zedek Tampa, Fla.	S	C	7	3-9	*	L		45 min
Albany Hebrew Albany, Ga.	S	C	1	10	*	L		60 min
Israel Columbus, Ga	S	V			*	L		30 min
Beth-El Chicago, Ill	M	V	4		*	L		60 min
South Shore Chicago, Ill.	L	C	8	3-10	*	L		30 min
Beth Am Chicago, Ill.	M	V			*	L		60 min
Emanuel Chicago, Ill.	L	V	6	2-7	*	GC	2	45 min
Washington Blvd Chicago, Ill.	L	V			*	L	2	60 min
Temple Mizpah Chicago, Ill.	L	C	5	4-8	*	L		30 min
Menorah Chicago, Ill.	M	V	4	1-4	*	GC		60 min

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
K.A.M. Temple Chicago, Ill.	L	V	5	4-8	GC			60 min
Temple B'Nai Abraham Decatur, Ill.	S	V			*	GC	2	45 min
Beth Emeth Evanston, Ill.	S	C	8	3-10		GC		30 min
Anshei Emeth Peoria, Ill.	M	C	7	3-9	*	L		45 min
Beth-El Rockford, Ill.	S	V	3	4-6	*	L		60 min
Brith Shelom Springfield, Ill.	M	C	6	5-10	*	GC		45 min
Washington Avenue Evansville, Ind.	M	V	4	5-8	*	L		30 min
Achduth Veshalom Ft. Wayne, Ind.	M	C	8	2-9	*	L		45 min
Beth - El Muncie, Ind.	S.	V	5	2-4, 7-8		L		30 min
Beth-El South Bend, Ind.	M	C	10	1-10	*	L		30 min

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
United Terre Haute, Ind.	M	C	5	6-10	*	L	2	30 min
Mt. Sinai Sioux City, Iowa	S	V	6	4-9	*	L		60 min
Judah Cedar Rapids, Iowa	S	C	7	2-8		L,GC		60 min
B'Nai Jeshuron Des Moines, Iowa	M	C	3	5-7	*	L		30 min
Temple Emanuel Wichita, Kansas	S	C	7	3-9		L		30 min
B'Nai Jeshurun Leavenworth, Ken.	S	V	6	5-10		L		30 min
Beth Shalom Topeka, Ken.	S	V	6	5-10	*	GC		45 min
B'Rith Sholom Louisville, Ky.	M.	C	9	2-10		L		45 min
Adath Israel Louisville, Ky.	L	C	5	4-8	*	L		45 min
Israel Paducah, Ky.	S	C	10	1-10	*	L,GC		30 min

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
B'Nai Israel Baton-Rouge, La.	M	C	1	9	*	L		60 min
Liberal Synagogue Baton Rouge, La.	S	V	2	1-2	*	C,GC		60 min
B'Nai Zion Shreveport, La.	M	C	6	4-9	*	L		30 min
B'Nai Abraham Hagerstown, MD.	S	C	4	4-7	*	GC		60 min
B'Er Chayim Cumberland, MD.	S	V	8	3-10	*		2	60 min
Chevy Chase, MD.	S	V	6	5-10	*	GC		60 min
Har-Sinai Temple Baltimore, Md.	L	C	7	4-10	*	L	2	45 min
Oheb Shalom Temple Baltimore, Md.	L	C	7	3-9	*	L,GC	1	45 min
Temple Center Belmont, Mass.	S	C	4	4-7	*	GC		45 min
Emanuel Lawrence, Mass.	M	C	1	3	*	C,L,GC		

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Ohabei Shalom Brookline, Mass	L	V	8	3-10	*	L, GC	2	60
Israel Brocton, Mass.	S	C	6	5-10	*	L, GC		60
Sinai Boston, Mass.	M	C	4	5-8	*	L		60
Temple Shalom Newton, Mass.	S	V	4	4-7	*	L, GC		
Beth El Lynn, Mass.	S	C	8	3-10		GC	2	60
Tiphereth Israel Malden, Mass	S	C	6	1-6		GC		30
Temple Anshe Amonim Pittsfield, Mass	S	V	M	3-9		L		60
B'Nai Brith Sommerville, Mass.	S	C	5	3-7		L, GC	2	60
Emanuel Worcester, Mass	L	C	8	2-9	*	L, GC		60
Beth-El Flint, Mich.	M	C	7	3-9	*	L		30

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Beth El Detroit, Mich.	L	C	3	4-6	*	L		30
Israel Detroit, Mich.	L	C	8	2-9	*	GC	2	30
B'Nai Israel Muskegon, Mich.	S	C	6	1-6		L	2	60
Emanuel Duluth, Minn.	M	C	5	5-9	*	L		60
Israel Minneapolis, Minn.	L	C	5	3-7		L		
Beth Israel Jackson, Miss.	S	V			*	L		30
Beth Israel Clarksdale, Miss.	S	C	7	4-10	*	L, GC		30
B'Nai Jehudah Kansas City, Missouri	L	C	4	4-7	*	L		30
Adath Joseph St. Joseph, Mo.	S	V			*	GC		60
Shaare Emeth St. Louis, Mo.	L	V			*	L		45

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Temple Israel St. Louis, Mo	L	V	5	4-8	*	L		60
B'Nai Israel Butte, Mont.	S	V	8	1-8	*	GC		45
B'Nai Jeshuron Lincoln, Neb	S	V	7	4-10	*	GC	2	60
Beth Elohim Brooklyn, N.Y.	L	C	10	1-10				60
Flushing Free Synagogue Flushing, N.Y.	M	C	6	1-6		L	3	45
Emanuel Utica, N.Y.	S	C	4	2-5	*	L		30
Sinai of the Bronx Bronx, N.Y.		C	8	2-7; 9-10		L		60
Temple Sinai Bayshore, L.I.N.Y.	S	V	5	5-9	*	L		60
Sinai Mt. Vernon, N.Y.	M	C	6	1-6	*	L, GC		45
Beth-El Spring Valley, N.Y.	S	C	4	4-7	*	C, L, GC		60

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Rodeph Shelom New York, N.Y.	S	C	6	3-8		L	1	45
Central of Nassau County Rockville Center, N.Y.	L	C	8	3-10	*	L		45
Society of Concord Syracuse, N.Y.	L	V	6	5-10		C, L	1	60
Ft. Washington Syn. New York, N.Y.	S	C	8	3-10	*	L		30
Temple Beth Jacob Newburgh, N.Y.	M	V	7	2-8	*	L		60
Emanuel Kingston, N.Y.	S	V	6	3-8	*	GC		60
B'Rith Kodesh Rochester, N.Y.	L	V	6	3-8	*	L, GC		60
Nassau Community Temple West Hempstead, N.Y.	S	C	7	4-10		L		45
Ros. Jew. Com. Center Roslyn Heights, N.Y.	M	V	6	5-10	*	L, GC	2	60
New York, N.Y.		C	6	3-8	*	L		45

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Larchmont Temple Marchmont, N.Y.	S	C	10	1-10	*	C,GC	1	60
Ahauseth Sholom Brooklyn, N.Y.	M	V	3	6-8	*	L		30
East End Temple Brooklyn, N.Y.		C	3	6-8	*	L,GC		60
Progressive Brooklyn, N.Y.	M	V	4	1-4		L		60
Free Syn.of Flushing Flushing, N.Y.	M	V			*	L		60
Temple Beth Zion Buffalo, N.Y.	L	C	4	3-6		L,GC	1	60
Binghamton, N.Y.		C	5	3-7		L		30
Emanuel Long Beach, N.Y.	S	V	8	2-9		L		30
West End Synagogue New York, N.Y.		C			*	L	1	45
Beth El Niegra Fells, N.Y.	S	V	2	2-3	*	L,GC		60

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Jew. Com. Center White Plains, N.Y.	M	V	7	3-9	*	L		60
Central Synagogue New York, N.Y.	L	V	3	4-6	*	L		60
Israel New Rochelle, N.Y.	L	C	5	3-7	*	L,	2	45
Beth Emeth Brooklyn, N.Y.	M	C	8	3-10	*	L,GC		
Ahavath Sholom of Flatbush Brooklyn, N.Y.	M	V	5	4-8	*	L,GC		60
Union Brooklyn, N.Y.	L	C	9	2-10	*	C,L		60
Beth-El Great Neck, N.Y.	L	V	5	5-9	*	GC	2	60
Beth Emeth Albany, N.Y.	L	C	5	4-8	*	L	2	45
Gates of Heaven Schenectady, N.Y.	S	V	4	5-8	*	GC		60
Temple of the Covenant New York, N.Y.	M	C	10	1-10		GC		60

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Shaari Zedek New York, N.Y.	L	C	10	1-10	.	C,L	3	
People's Temple Brooklyn, N.Y.	M	C	9	1-9	*	L	1	60
Mt. Nebo Cong. New York, N.Y.	M	C	10	1-10	*	L,GC		60
B'nai Israel Elmont, N.Y.		C	5	6-10	*	L	1	60
Corona, N.Y.		V	3	1-3	*	GC		60
Free Synagogue Mt. Vernon, N.Y.	L	C	3	3-5	*	C,L,GC	2	30
B'nai Israel Elmira, N.Y.	S	C	4	3-6	*	L		45
B'rith Sholom Troy, N.Y.	S	V			*	L		60
Tremont Temple New York, N.Y.	M	C	9	2-10		L		30
Har Sinai Trenton N.J.	M	C	2	4-5	*	L,GC	2	45

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Sherey Tipilo East Orange, N.J.	M.	C	9	1-9	*	L	2	45
B'nai Jeshurun Newark, N.J.	L	V	2	6-7	*	GC		60
Anshe Emeth New Brunswick, N.Y.		V	7	3-9	*	L		60
Beth Miriam Long Branch, N.J.	S	V			*	L		
Albert Albuquerque, N. Mex.	S	V	5	3-7	*	L		60
Emanuel Gastonia, N.C.	S	V	4	5-8	*	L		60
Emanuel Greensboro, N.C.	M	C	6	5-10		L		45
Beth Ha-Tephila Ashville, N.C.	M	V	1	10	*	L, GC		60
Beth-El-Center Fargo, N. Dakota	S	V	7	4-10	*	L, GC		60
Israel Columbus, Ohio	L	V	6	4-9	*	GC		60

OF CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Oheb Zedukah Springfield, Ohio	S	V			*	L,GC		
Eiclid Ave. Temple Cleveland, Ohio	L	C	7	3-9	*	L	2	45
The Temple Cleveland, Ohio	L	C	9	2-10	*	L,GC		45
Rockdale Ave. Temple Cincinnati, Ohio	L	C	4	4-7		L	2	60
Isaac Mayer Wise Temple Cincinnati, Ohio	L	C	8	3-10	*	L	1	30
Rodef Shalom Youngstown, Ohio	M	C	7	4-10	*	L		45
Israel Dayton, Ohio	L	C	6	1-6	*	L		30
Beth Israel Portland, Oregon	L	V	10	1-10	*	L	1	60
Oheb Shalom Reading, Penn.	S	C	7	4-10	*	GC		45
Keneseth Israel Philadelphia, Penn.	L	C	1	5		L	2	30

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
B'nai Israel McKeesport, Penn.	S	C	7	3-9	*	GC		60
Ohev Sholom Harrisburg, Penn.	S	C	4	4-7	*	L		45
The Temple Erie, Penn.	M	V	6	5-10	*	L		60
B'nai B'rith Wilkes-Barre, Penn.	S	C	5	4-8	*	GC	2	45
Beth-Israel Sharon, Penn.		V	6	3-8	*	L		60
Keneseth Israel Allentown, Penn.	M	V			*	GC		60
Beth Ha-Sholom Williamsport, Penn.	S	V	7	1-7	*	GC		60
Shearei Shomayim Lancaster, Penn.	M	C	7	3-9	*	L		45
Israel Newcastle, Penn.	S	V	5	4-8	*	GC		60
Cong. Rodeph Shalom Philadelphia, Penn.	L	C	4	4-7	*	L		45

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Judea Philadelphia, Penn.	L	V	6	3-8	*	L,GC		60
Beth Elohim Charleston, S.C.	M	V	8	3-10	*	L,GC		60
Beth Israel Florence S. Carolina	S	V	6	3-8	*	C,L		60
Mizpah Chattanooga, Tenn.	M.	C	3	8-10	*	L		60
Vine St. Temple Nashville, Tenn.	L	C	10	1-10	*	L	1	30
Israel Memphis, Tenn.	L	V	4	4-7	*	L		45
Mt. Sinai El Paso, Texas	M	V	3	7-9	*	L		60
Beth Israel Austin, Texas	M	V	4	4-7		L	1	30
Beth El Fort Worth, Texas	M	C	5	5-9	*	L		30
Beth El San Antonio, Texas	L	V	1	3	*	L,GC	3	

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
Beth Israel Cong. Houston Texas	L	C	7	4-10	*	L		30
B'nai Israel Galveston, Texas	M	C	7	2-8	*	L	2	30
Emanuel Houston, Texas	L	C	1	3	*	L	1	60
Beth El Corpus Christi, Texas	M	V	3	5-7	*	L		60
Emanuel Roanoke, Va.	S	C	5	4-8	*	L		30
Beth Ahabah Richmond, Va.	L	V	2	8-9	*	L	1	60
Ohef Sholom Norfolk, Va.	M	V	1	3	*	L	1	45
Beth-El Beckley, W.Va	S	V	6	5-10	*	L		60
Cong. Tree of Life Morgantown, W. Va.	S	C	3	3-5	*	C, L		45
Ahavath Shalom Bluefield, W. Va.	S	V	7	4-10	*	L		30

CONGREGATIONS	SIZE	VOLUNTARY OR COMPULSORY	NUMBER OF YEARS	GRADES	SPECIAL TEACHERS	PURPOSES	EXTRA CLASSES	WEEKLY TIME SPENT
De Hirsch Seattle, Wash.	L	C	4	4-9	"	L		45
Emanuel Spokane, Wash.	S	C	9	1-9		L		45
Beth Hillel Kenosha, Wis.	S	V	8	3-10	"	L	2	60
Emanuel B'nai Jeshurun Milwaukee, Wis.	L	C	4	5-8	"	L		30
Washington Hebrew Washington, D.C.	L	V	9	1-9	"	L		30

1000000