

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE - JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
NEW YORK SCHOOL

INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESIS

AUTHOR: Bradley W. Solmsen
TITLE: The Evolution of the Education of Children and
the Relationship Between Teacher and Student from
the Biblical to the Rabbinic Era.

TYPE OF THESIS:

RABBINIC ☒ SSM () D.H.L. ()
D.MIN. () M.A.R.E. () M.A.J.S. ()

- () May be used without my written permission.
- ☒ My written permission is required for use during the next 5 years.

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis.

☒ yes ☐ no

3/1/01
Date

Bradley W. Solmsen
Signature of Author

THE KLAU LIBRARY
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
BROOKDALE CENTER
ONE WEST FOURTH STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10012

LIBRARY RECORD

Microfilmed: _____

Date _____

Signature of Library Staff Member

**The Evolution of the Education of Children
and the Relationship Between Teacher and Student
from the Biblical to the Rabbinic Era**

Bradley W. Solmsen

**Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
Requirements for Ordination**

**Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion
Graduate Rabbinic Program
New York, New York**

March 1, 2001/6 Adar, 5761

Advisor: Dr. Lisa Grant

SUMMARY

- This thesis is divided into six chapters plus an introduction and conclusion.
- Part One (chapters one through three) explores education at home, Part Two (chapters four through six) discusses education at school with teachers.
- This thesis utilizes material from the Hebrew Bible and various sources from Rabbinic literature including: the Mishnah, the Tosefta, The Babylonian Talmud, The Jerusalem Talmud and Midrash Sifre Deuteronomy.

In the transition from the Biblical to the Rabbinic period the role of the teacher and student as well as the relationship between the two evolved. Education moved from the home where parents were the primary teachers to an institutional setting where "professional" teachers were responsible for instruction. The Biblical and Talmudic texts are particularly silent about the reasons behind this dramatic transition. However, elements of what are understood to be the original educational model are in several areas of the evolved form of education: the first appointed teachers worked from their homes; there was debate over whether teachers should be paid, parents were still intimately involved in the preparation of their children for entry into the educational system; similar methods of discipline were practiced, God's words and commandments were taught, and personal relationships between teacher and student were developed. These elements among others reveal an influence from the early educational system upon the later educational developments.

The transfer of educational elements from the home to what becomes the school model may reveal some of the values which contributed to the foundation of the educational philosophy of the time. While there was a shift in educational practice and structure some of the core values and philosophies may have remained intact. Through close textual analysis of Biblical and Rabbinic literature this thesis will examine, reveal and discuss the elements of the educational process that existed in the Biblical literature and subsequently migrated to the educational settings described in Rabbinic literature. The fact that many elements found within the home educational settings are also seen in the institutionalized educational settings may reflect a lasting, transmitted set of values, beliefs and educational principles. These educational principles will be identified, discussed and evaluated.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This Rabbinic Thesis has provided me with many opportunities to grow and learn both about the development of the Jewish educational system as well as about myself. I owe an immense debt of gratitude to Dr. Lisa Grant, my thesis advisor, for her faith, support, advice and wisdom.

My classmates (and soon to be colleagues) have offered a tremendous amount of support in tangible ways through helpful suggestions, resources and feedback as well as through moral support throughout the entire process.

My friends and family have been incredibly patient and understanding of the endless amount of time and energy I directed towards my thesis and away from them. It is my hope that these sacrifices have born fruit in this work.

I am blessed to have married Aliza Kline some five short months before this thesis was submitted. Her constant presence, faith and love enabled me to forge ahead when my own strength was in doubt. Her keen eye, high standards and probing questions were instrumental to the completion of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
Introduction	iv
Part One - Education at Home	
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 - Education in the Bible	3
Chapter 2 - Rabbinic Literature on the Obligations of the Father	12
Chapter 3 - The Father's Pedagogy	23
Part Two - Education at School	
Introduction	37
Chapter 4 - Theories of Educational Change	39
Chapter 5 - Rabbinic References to the Establishment of Schools	45
Chapter 6 - Educational Roles and Values: Father, Student and Teacher	59
Conclusion	73
Appendix	
Primary Rabbinic Sources (in the order cited)	
1. Sifre Deuteronomy Piska 310	77
2. Mishnah Kiddushin 1:7	77
3. Babylonian Talmud Kiddushin 29a-30a	78
4. Babylonian Talmud Ketubot 50a	81
5. Sifre Deuteronomy Piska 46	82
6. Tosefta Hagigah 1:2	82
7. Mishnah Yoma 8:4	82
8. Mishnah Nedarim 4:2-3	82
9. Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin 17b	83
10. Mishnah Baba Batra 2:3	84
11. Babylonian Talmud Baba Batra 21a	84
12. Babylonian Talmud Brachot 47b	85
13. Mishnah Baba Metzia 2:11	86
14. Babylonian Talmud Baba Metzia 33a	87
15. Babylonian Talmud Avodah Zarah 19a-b	88
16. Babylonian Talmud Makkot 10a	90
Selected Bibliography	92

In the transition from the Biblical to the Rabbinic period the role of the teacher and student as well as the relationship between the two evolved. Education moved from the home where parents were the primary teachers to an institutional setting where "professional" teachers were responsible for instruction. The Biblical and Talmudic texts are particularly silent about the reasons behind this dramatic transition. However, elements of what are understood to be the original educational model are in several areas of the evolved form of education: the first appointed teachers worked from their homes; there was debate over whether teachers should be paid, parents were still intimately involved in the preparation of their children for entry into the educational system; similar methods of discipline were practiced, God's words and commandments were taught, and personal relationships between teacher and student were developed. These elements among others reveal an influence from the early educational system upon the later educational developments.

The transfer of educational elements from the home to what becomes the school model may reveal some of the values which contributed to the foundation of the educational philosophy of the time. While there was a shift in educational practice and structure some of the core values and philosophies may have remained intact. Through close textual analysis of Biblical and Rabbinic literature this thesis will examine, reveal and discuss the elements of the educational process that existed in the Biblical literature and subsequently migrated to the educational settings described in Rabbinic literature. The fact that many elements found within the home educational settings are also seen in the institutionalized educational settings may reflect a lasting, transmitted set of values, beliefs and educational principles. These educational principles will be identified, discussed and evaluated.

As a society grows and changes culturally, politically and economically it must also grow and change in its approach to education. Some change is calculated. It takes

place with full intention and premeditation. This form of change can be seen as a response to some form of evaluation. Other changes are more spontaneous or natural. They are reactions to other changes or adaptations to realities within the society. Education within the Biblical period reveals some level of development of change as well as from the Biblical period to the Rabbinic era. Each time a major change takes place within the Israelite and later the Jewish community, a change in the way education is perceived and delivered takes place.

The survival of the Jew under conditions of unparalleled adversity is a riddle to some, a miracle to others. It is in reality neither. It is mainly the result of a successful system of education, extraordinarily adequate alike for the needs of the individual as of the community.¹

Morris contends that at the core of the survival of the Jewish people lies their system of education. Its development followed or was dictated other changes in the society. Did the Bible and its authors intend for a formal system of education? As there are no references to schools or any other institutionalized learning situation it is doubtful that the Bible intended this manner of learning. On the other hand, it is not clear whether people outside of the immediate family were engaged as teachers of Scripture, ritual and legal subject matter. If these outside teachers did exist it is likely, as will be discussed later, that the model for these teachers were the parents, explicitly charged in the Bible with educating their children.

This thesis is organized into four distinct sections. First, this introduction seeks to define the motivating issues of exploration for this thesis, define the organization of the paper and discuss its methodology. Second, part one of the thesis, divided into three chapters, explores education in the home as defined from the Biblical period through to the period immediately preceding the destruction of the Second Temple. Third, part two,

¹Nathan Morris, *The Jewish School: An Introduction to the History of Jewish Education*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode 1937. p. XXvi.

divided into another three chapters, explores the transition of education from the home to an institutionalized setting with teachers becoming responsible for providing children with their education. The fourth and final section is a conclusion, exploring the elements found within the earlier educational setting that transition or migrate to the evolved educational model. Each text from the Rabbinic literature that is cited in this thesis appears in its Hebrew form in the appendix.

Learning in the Bible seemed to have as its goal an understanding of the law (Torah) and desire to practice the rituals and legal requirements. Much of the learning in the time of the Bible centered around the Tabernacle and subsequently worship at the Temple. "The emphasis of Jewish education is hence not on the pursuit of knowledge and the attainment of culture as in our modern systems, but rather on conduct."² Drazin defines Jewish education in its earliest periods as having several components; knowledge of the law, adherence to the law and behavior following that of your father or family. As the Talmud develops Drazin explains the knowledge and observance of a wider set of more dynamic laws.³ Perhaps this is one of the explanations for the need to install teachers to supplement the father's role as primary teacher.

The history and character of Jewish education is woven into the history of the culture and the faith in the period of the Second Commonwealth at the time that the Torah assumes greater importance in the life of the people and in the development of society and social relations. With the prevalence of pure monotheism, with the strict adherence to the Law from the times of the Babylonian Exile, and the beginning of the Return to Zion, there emerges predominantly one of the distinctive traits of this period: the importance of the Torah in the life of the people. Beginning with the first generations of the Second Commonwealth, the Torah not only forms the foundation of civil law and the individual's way of life, but it is also the book of study and meditation for all the people. Scripture and the Oral Tradition

²Nathan Drazin. *History of Jewish Education: From 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 1940, p. 12.

³Nathan Drazin. *History of Jewish Education: From 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 1940, p. 11.

which was based on it, merged as a united force that shaped and formed not only civil and religious law but also the individual's code and pattern of behavior from birth to death, in his family life and in his surroundings.⁴

Education historians Julius Maller and Robert Ulich claim that the survival of Jews and Judaism is in large measure due to the continuous emphasis, throughout Jewish history, on the transmission of ideas and practices from one generation to another.⁵ This thesis seeks to demonstrate that in order for this transmission to take place in an effective manner, the pedagogy and overall educational structure must adapt to the needs of the society. At the same time, radical change, or change without regard to effective strategies will not result in, "the transmission of ideas and practices from one generation to another."

METHODOLOGY

There is no lack of information and instruction in the Rabbinic tradition regarding the issue of relationships and interactions between teacher and student. However, when attempting to learn from these sources caution must be used in speaking of "the Rabbinic perspective" on any particular topic. For indeed, there is no one Rabbinic perspective on any topic. As Daniel Boyarin warns,

any view or interpretation that is undercut by another in the same canonical work unsettles, almost by definition, its own use as a foundation for cultural and social practice. Accordingly, in the research on this culture it is vital always to pay very close attention to the structures built into the very texts, to the interplay of view and counter view...Thus a view will often enough be quoted as if typical of rabbinic Judaism when in fact it has been cited in the talmudic text only to be discredited or at any rate undermined by a

⁴Shmuel Safrai, "Elementary Education, Its Religious and Social Significance in the Talmudic Period, in: H.H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, eds., *Jewish Society Through the Ages*, NY 1971, pp. 148-168. 155.

⁵Julius B. Maller, "The Role of Education in Jewish History," in *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*, ed. Louis Finkelstein (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1949), p. 896; Robert Ulich, *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 644.

counter-text.⁶

In looking for the "rabbinic perspective" on teacher-student relationships, I have tried to take this cautionary message to heart and mind. Although the plethora of quotes and stories related to the nature of the teacher-student relationship do, in fact, seem to paint a fairly clear outline of expectations; exceptions and contradictions exist. That said, there does seem to exist a rather clear overall model for teacher-student relationships.

An additional word of caution must be stated regarding the historical reliability of the information. It is problematic to assume that these educational rules and guidelines reflect a particular reality in time. Ephraim Urbach asserts that, "the sources serve less as testimony to the existing social structure than to the painful struggles between loyalty to ideals and the hard reality, as well as to inner conflicts regarding the determination of priorities in the scale of various values."⁷ In fact, Aberbach views the vast number of rules and guidelines as an indication that such models of relationship were, in fact, *not* adhered to.⁸ In any case, I am not attempting to prove or disprove adherence to the provided ideals of teacher-student behavior, but rather, use the collection of information to try and paint a picture of what those expectations of behavior were.

⁶Daniel Boyarin, *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*, (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1993), p.28.

⁷Ephraim Urbach, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs*, (The Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1979) p.629.

⁸Moshe Aberbach, *HaHinuch Hay'hudi B't'kufat HaMishna V'ha-Talmid*, (Reuven Mass Publishers, Jerusalem, 1983) p.115.

PART ONE**EDUCATION AT HOME****INTRODUCTION**

The Biblical era extends over a period of more than two thousand years from approximately 2500 B.C.E. to 300 B.C.E. Despite the fact that the Hebrew Bible actually consists of different books written by different authors over a long period of time, it is still considered a single work. The reasons for this unity among the diverse books of the Bible can be attributed to several variables. It is clear that editors or redactors unified the works as they were accepted into the canon of Biblical literature. Additionally, the works contained in the Hebrew Bible share other common features: a belief and set of practices supporting the notion that there is only one God and the understanding that the people of Israel were chosen by God to be a Holy Nation.

While there are several areas throughout the Bible that place emphasis on education, the Bible does not present a unified educational philosophy, methodology or curriculum. Various terms are found including: **למד** and **שנן**, **חנך**. Additionally, there are different understandings of the skills and qualities of the people responsible for providing education to children and how the relationship between teacher and student was characterized. While education is commanded in different forms in the Bible, there is no textual evidence of institutionalized education. The Biblical authors never mention schools, and this silence can be read in at least two ways: (1) the existence of schools was so well known that no

one stated the obvious; or (2) there were no schools in ancient Israel.¹ Parents were given the primary responsibility of educating their children. It seems fair to say that as a public institution, schools as we know them did not exist during the whole period covered by biblical literature.² There are some scholars who claim that loosely organized institutions established for the training of scribes and possibly attendants in the Temple did exist in the Biblical era.

Part One of this thesis, divided into three chapters, will explore education in the Biblical period: The education of children at home by their parents. Chapter one investigates the educational process largely through the lens of Biblical literature. Chapter Two discusses how Rabbinic literature, responding to several Biblical verses, describes the educational obligations of parents. Chapter three explores various sources describing educational methodology and pedagogy.

¹James L. Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel: Accross the Deadening Silence*, New York: Doubleday, 1998.

²Nathan Morris, *The Jewish School: An Introduction to the History of Jewish Education*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode 1937. p. 4.

CHAPTER ONE

EDUCATION IN THE BIBLE

MODELS OF TEACHERS IN THE BIBLE: GOD, MOSES, PARENTS, CHILDREN

In attempting to learn how the Bible depicts the relationship between teacher and student one must examine the role of God as teacher as a paradigm for any relationship between students and educators. In Judges 13:8 Manoah exemplifies this understanding by turning to God for advice on how to raise his child.

וַיִּעֲמֵר מְנוּחַ אֶל-יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר בִּי אֲדֹנָי אֵישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר שְׁלַחְתָּ יְבוּא-נָא עִוֵּד אֵלֵינוּ וַיֹּרֶנוּ
מֵה-נַעֲשֶׂה לְנֶעֱר הַיּוֹלֵד:

Manoah says to God, "Adonai, my God, let the man of God whom you sent come again to us, teach us what we should do with the child that will be born." The ultimate role model in Biblical literature, and perhaps elsewhere, for guidance on how to educate the child seems to be God's role as teacher.

While the Bible is silent on school and schooling, there is evidence in Midrashic literature that suggests that God is the supreme teacher and model from which subsequent teaching is based. Sifre Deuteronomy contains a discussion on different teaching models. Piska 310 comments on Deuteronomy 32:7.

זְכוֹר יְמוֹת עוֹלָם בֵּינוּ שְׁנוֹת דָּר-נֶדֶר שָׁאֵל אָבִיךָ וַיִּגְדֶּה זְמַנֶּיךָ וַיֹּאמְרוּ לָד:

“Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations; ask your father and he will show you; your elders and they will tell you.” This verse does not contain a direct reference to teaching children, rather it refers to God as Israel’s teacher. The second half of the verse says, “ask your father, he will inform you.” In explaining who the father in this verse characterizes, the Midrash refers to Isaiah 30:20.

וְנָתַן לָכֶם אֲדֹנָי לֶחֶם צָר וּמִים לֶחֶץ וְלֹא-יִגְנוּ עוֹד מוֹרֶיךָ וְהָיוּ עֵינֶיךָ רֹאוֹת אֶת-מוֹרֶיךָ:

“And though Adonai gives you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, your teacher shall not withdraw himself any more, but your eyes shall see your teacher.” God, understood as the quintessential teacher of all the people, is meant to be understood as the father. God will reveal God’s self to the people and they will realize who their teacher is. This Midrash reinforces the imagery of God as teacher. The Book of Deuteronomy (11:19) contains the commandment of the father to teach his son. At the same time God is teaching Moses and Moses is teaching the Israelites. The bigger lesson is that God wants the people to follow God’s ways. Just as God is a teacher and Israel a student, so too, this model should be present in each community and within each family.

The verses in the Bible referring to the teaching of children are deceptively simple. Thorough analysis of these verses and the subsequent examination of the Rabbinic literature will reveal these apparently straightforward laws are demanding and complex. The model of father teaching his son closely mirrors the model of God teaching the people. God leads through both direct commandment as well as through modeling behaviors and actions. Additionally, God does not always act in the world based on previous teachings and

commandments. All of the complexity and contradiction found in the relationship between God and the Israelite people is also found in the educational relationship between father and son.

THE FATHER

The Bible commands fathers to teach their sons and in some cases includes mothers in this obligation. Exodus 12:26, Deuteronomy 4:9, 6:7, 11:19 and several verses in Proverbs contain instructions to parents regarding the education of their children. What is the purpose of these laws directed primarily to the father in Biblical text? One possibility is to continue the development of a literary comparison between God and the Israelite people and father and son. Through Moses, God is a strict, disciplinarian. God teaches the Israelites, admonishes them when they are slow to learn and praises them when they demonstrate understanding. This same relationship is reflected in the commandments of the father to teach the son. Perhaps, there is less importance on the actual roles and more emphasis on the content. The issue of who teaches and learns is less significant than what the learning is and whether or not it is digested.

Another possible explanation draws our attention to the historical context. Scholars of the ancient Near East note that teaching had three goals. The first was to pass on the common, shared story of the nation. The second was to instruct one's children in moral and ethical behaviors. The third was to teach one's child a profession, specific skill or craft.

The family is the most natural educational institution, especially in an ancient society in which formal schooling was probably mostly for professional purposes rather than general education. Hence, Moses' exhortations are frequently addressed to parents, urging them to impart the

Teaching to their children on their own initiative and in response to children's questions about rites and commandments.³

An alternative historical understanding of the Bible's emphasis on the father as educator is found through an examination of the Book of Deuteronomy, the final book of the Torah. The people have received the laws and are beginning to venture out with increasing independence. God is stepping back from the heavy control God exerted on the people; and Moses will not be accompanying the people on their full journey. This is similar to the role a parent plays in the life of his or her son or daughter. It is crucial for the parent to teach his or her child but there also comes a time when the parent must step back and offer the child some control. Again, in this case, whether it is the father or mother, son or daughter, is less important than the need to guide and then allow for some level of independence.

The theme of control and independence is commonly found in wisdom literature, a genre of literature that has roots in the ancient Near Eastern literature predating the biblical texts. Wisdom literature scholars cite Moses' farewell speech to the Israelites as well as Jacob's farewell speech to his son's as examples of father figures relinquishing control and bestowing independence upon their 'children.'

In proverbs, the written compilation of wise sayings is drawn directly from the real-life situation of a son's instruction by his father or a pupil's by his teacher. D is at least one literary stage removed from this. Moses' address to the children of Israel represents a conscious imitation of features found in a wisdom teacher-pupil setting.⁴

³Jeffrey H. Tigay. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society: 1996. P. 498-9.

⁴Calum M. Carmichael. *The Laws of Deuteronomy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 1974. Pp. 22-3.

The picture of the honored man of ripe old age gathering his sons or disciples around him, passing on his counsel, foretelling the future, and giving his blessing of life and prosperity is a feature of wisdom literature (especially extrabiblical, ancient Near Eastern material), and the D setting is fashioned along similar lines....

Mosaic instruction is the main element in D's setting (i. 5). Moses begins to make plain (באר), to explain the law. The term "torah" in i. 5 should itself be understood as instruction....The Egyptian Ptah-hotep's instruction has a somewhat similar setting to D's: an old counselor instructs his son, his designated successor, in the conduct befitting a wise state official.

Recent research has indicated the affinities between D and the wisdom literature. The recurrent use in D of "hear" compares with the common "hear my son(s)" of Proverbs. In Proverbs the command "hear" often occurs in the context of a student's instruction in wisdom by his teacher, or a son's by his father. That D's instructional setting is similar is suggested by the description of the relationship between Yahweh and Israel as one of father and son; Yahweh is disciplining Israel as a father does his son (viii. 5; cf. Prov. iii. 11, 12). D's concern with the instruction of the young is clear in iv. 9, vi. 7, xi. 19, where there are explicit commands to educate them.⁵

Wisdom literature highlights the characteristics of Deuteronomy and its central character, Moses, and compares them to educational instructions found in Proverbs. From this explanation we begin to see the connections between the command for parents to teach their children found in Deuteronomy, the overall themes of the importance of learning and teaching found in Proverbs and the similar form and content seen in wisdom literature from the ancient Near East.

The Bible places a heavy emphasis on the retelling of historical events as the justification for fathers teaching their sons. Often the methodology involves a series of questions asked by the child with answers provided by the father. Possibly the most well known example of this phenomenon occurs at the time of the Ten Plagues and subsequently during the Passover seder. Exodus 12:26 states:

וְהָיָה כִּי-יֹאמְרוּ אֲלֵיכֶם בְּנֵיכֶם מָה הָעֲבוֹדָה הַזֹּאת לָכֶם:

⁵Ibid. , pp. 17-9.

“And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say to you, What do you mean by this service?” An essential aspect of the Exodus from Egypt, the Books of Deuteronomy and Proverbs and later throughout Jewish tradition is the educational relationship between father and son. Children are encouraged to ask questions and fathers are obligated to answer them. Another example of this common phenomenon is found in Deuteronomy 32:7, quoted above:

זָכוֹר יָמֹת עוֹלָם בֵּינוּ שָׁנוֹת דֹּר-דֹּר שֶׁאֵל אָבִיךָ וַיֹּצִיֶךָ וְזָמְנָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ לְךָ:

“Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations; ask your father and he will show you; your elders and they will tell you.” In the Book of Exodus, in addition to the lengthy rituals that must be performed to commemorate Passover, children are seen as the focus in what seems like a highly structured, well thought out educational endeavor. Fathers are obligated to teach their children. Elsewhere in the Bible there are commandments directed to fathers regarding their children. Psalms 78:3-4 states:

אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְנוּ וַיִּדְעוּם וַאֲבוֹתֵינוּ סִפְרוּ-לָנוּ: לֹא נִכְחַד מִבְּנֵיהֶם לְדֹר אַחֲרֹון מִסִּפְּרֵיהֶם תְּהִלֹּת יְהוָה

וְנַסְּלֵאֲתָיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה:

“That which we have heard and known, and our fathers have told us, we will not hide from their children, telling to the generation to come the praises of Adonai, and God’s strength and God’s wondrous works that God has done.” This verse combines the obligation of the father to teach his children with the influence of God on the educational process. The verse establishes the link being examined throughout this chapter between God as teacher and the father as teacher.

The discussion of teaching in Biblical literature would be incomplete without mention of the role of mother as educator. One clear difference between Proverbs and Deuteronomy are the statements in Proverbs giving preference to

both the mother and father as teachers of the children. In Proverbs 1:8, the very beginning of the book, both parents are given equal mention in regards to the education of their son.

שִׁמְעֵנִי בְּנִי מִסֵּר אָבִיךָ וְאַל-תִּשְׁלַח תּוֹרַת אִמְךָ:

"My son, hear the instruction of your father, and forsake not the Torah of your mother." This verse dispels any doubt that the mother had some role in the education of her son in Biblical times.

The book [Proverbs] gives great importance to the mother's influence and position. The father is to handle instruction or discipline (musar), the mother is to convey the fundamentals of teaching (torah). The word torah is used here in its widest sense: ritual and moral teaching [or instruction] which assists man in fulfilling his destiny.⁶

Plaut's theory begins to broaden the level of complexity concerning the educational requirements of parents. We have seen that the requirements of the parents are not simply to teach their children the law (Deuteronomy 6:7) but also involve explanations of historical relevance and ritual practice (Exodus 12:26).

While it has been explained that the word or concept of school did not appear in Biblical literature it is important to note that the educational relationship between father and son was at times interpreted broadly. Throughout Biblical literature there is a conflagration of terms relating to educational roles. Crenshaw, quoted below, understands certain references to father in educational settings to actually mean teacher and likewise translate son in some cases as pupil. This broad pattern of interpretation is similar to the imagery depicting God, Moses, various prophets and leaders and parents as all being linked in a successive chain, one to another, as educators. Beyond God, additional models were sought to fill

⁶W. Gunther Plaut, *Book of Proverbs: A Commentary*, New York: UAHC 1961. P. 33.

the void of the lack of written guidance on how to teach or structure a relationship between teacher and student. As mentioned previously Moses was also considered a powerful model as teacher within this realm.

Similarly, it is possible that we should understand the instructions to teach one's children in Deuteronomy on this broad scale. As there are no references to schools or words used to designate the formal role of teachers in the Bible, some scholars seek to understand the educational commandments in Deuteronomy as instructions to teach one's pupils. Occasionally certain characters will occupy the role of teacher but never have the title applied to them. Some scholars have theorized that in some educational settings within Biblical narratives, the father-son description may, in fact, have been actually teachers and their students. Scholars both within the Jewish tradition and in the ancient Near Eastern traditions agree that there is room to understand 'sons' in the context of Deuteronomy to mean pupils. The role of the teacher was often extremely paternal and the text may have meant to be understood in this sense. Crenshaw, in referring to a specific type of ancient Near Eastern literature, the Instructions, sites this phenomenon of the wider understanding of sons and pupils:

The Instructions span the period from 2800 to 100 B.C.E. and function as a barometer by which one can determine the religious and social values of ancient Egypt. Except for a tendency to become shorter (monostichs), their external form remains remarkably consistent throughout this long period; in general, a father offers advice to his son, although these two terms "father" and "son" may also designate a teacher and his student.⁷

Crenshaw introduces the concept of the father offering his son advice among the other educational tasks he might undertake. The further one explores the

⁷James L. Crenshaw. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press: 1998. P. 206.

educational role of the father the more complex the educational process becomes both in terms of the qualities demanded of the father as well as the content to be taught. Part two of this thesis presents Rabbinic sources that discuss the introduction of more institutionalized learning settings. One possible intermediate step that borrows heavily from the home/parent learning model of the Biblical period may have been the individual relationship between a learned elder, possibly within the home, and a deserving student. Before the Jerusalem schools were established (most scholars date this at around the time of the destruction of the Second Temple) it had been customary for the great masters of the Law of every generation to select an unusually gifted student, unless their own sons were such, upon whom they concentrated all their scholarly efforts.⁸

In Sifre Deuteronomy the Rabbis ask the question of how the word sons was to be understood. They prefer the broader definition of *לְבָנִיךָ* understood as pupils or disciples. It is not by chance that students call their teachers father and teachers refer to their students as son. While there is a broadening of understanding of the terminology, at this point it is not clear whether there were corresponding changes in educational roles or structure. Chapter Two continues the analysis turning to an examination of how Rabbinic literature describes the obligations of parents with regard to the education of their children.

⁸Nathan Drazin. *History of Jewish Education: From 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 1940, p. 40-1.

CHAPTER TWO

RABBINIC LITERATURE ON THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE FATHER

As stated in chapter one, the Biblical literature contains few explicit references to educational theory or methodology. It is impossible to know with certainty how the Jewish people educated their children, what educational theory existed and what the biggest challenges were. The Bible posits that parents are primarily responsible for the education of their children. Crenshaw stated that in some cases the narratives and language of fathers and sons might have been interchangeable with pupil and teacher. Teachers may have been teaching students in proto-school type settings even in Biblical times. In addition to the Biblical references to education, the Rabbis also discuss the obligation of the father to teach his son. This chapter will explore the treatment of the parent's obligation to educate their children as contained in Rabbinic literature. Some nuances regarding the role and obligation of the father were uncovered based largely on the Biblical literature. The Rabbinic literature will serve to take us deeper into the analysis of the father's role and responsibility as educator of his son. The starting point for this examination is the well-known educational edict found in Deuteronomy 6:7:

וְשִׁנַּנְתֶּם לְבָבְךָ וְדַבַּרְתָּ בָּם בְּשֹׁכְבְּךָ בְּבֵיתְךָ וּבְלֶכְתְּךָ בְּדֶרֶךְ וּבְשֹׁכְבְּךָ וּבְקוּמְךָ.

"You shall repeat them with your children and speak of them in your sitting in your home and in your walking on the way, in your lying-down and in your rising-up." A search through a wide scope of traditional Jewish literature using the Bar-Ilan Responsa Project CD-ROM revealed relatively few instances of the phrase וְשִׁנַּנְתֶּם לְבָבְךָ first seen in Deuteronomy 6:7. The phrase does not appear anywhere else in the Bible and only once

in either the Jerusalem or Babylonian Talmud. The one occurrence is found in Tractate Kiddushin of the Babylonian Talmud 30a.

The context in which we find the phrase is in the midst of a discussion concerning the obligation of the father to teach his son Torah. This specific discussion is a small fragment of a larger explanation based upon Mishnah Kiddushin 1:7. This tractate deals with general principles of acquisition and this Mishnah details the commandments women are required to observe and those from which they are exempt. In attempting to clarify the obligations of women this Mishnah contrasts the commandments applied to the mother with those applied to the father. The opening line of the Mishnah states:

כָּל מִצְוַת דָּבָר עַל הָאָב - אֲנָשִׁים חַיִּבִּין, וְנָשִׁים פְּטוּרוֹת.

At first glance this opening line is difficult to interpret. Are the Rabbis addressing the father or son? Should the first half of the sentence read, 'All of the son's commandments regarding the father,' or, 'the father is responsible for all of the son's commandments.' In terms of the second half of the line, are the Rabbis referring to sons and daughters or fathers and mothers? It is generally translated as, 'All of the commandments regarding the son are obligatory for fathers and mothers are exempt.' The Mishnah does not specify what these commandments are but leaves this to the Rabbis of the Babylonian Talmud to explain. It is within this discussion of exactly what obligations a father has regarding his son that the Talmud mentions the teaching of Torah and within that discussion refers to the verse contained in Deuteronomy 6:7.

Returning to Kiddushin 29a, the Rabbis seek to fully explain and elaborate on this opening line of the Mishnah. The anonymous layer of the Talmud addresses the two possible ways of understanding the subject and object of this sentence. A Baraita is introduced in the text which clarifies the two possible interpretations. The Rabbis are discussing the father's obligations in regards to his son. Rabbi Yehuda states that the correct understanding of the Mishnah is, 'all obligations involving a son are incumbent

upon a father to perform, fathers are obligated and mothers are exempt.'

Another Baraita now appears in the text explaining more explicitly the father's obligations regarding his son:

האב חייב בבנו למולו, ולפדותו, וללמדו תורה, ולהשיאו אשה, וללמדו אומנות. ויש אומרים אף להשיטו במים. רבי יהודה אומר: כל שאינו מלמד את בנו אומנות מלמדו ליססות.

'Regarding his son, the father is obligated to circumcise him, redeem him (the first born), teach him Torah, obtain a wife for him, teach him a craft and some say teach him to swim. Rabbi Yehuda says that anyone who does not teach his son a craft, teaches him to become a thief.' The anonymous strand, in an effort to clarify Rabbi Yehuda's comment, asks how the failure to teach a craft is understood as teaching thievery. The response, also from this unidentified layer, states that, 'a son not taught a craft, it is as if he were taught to be a thief.' It was so important to learn a craft in order to provide support for oneself and one's family (and allow oneself the opportunity to continue studying Torah) that the Rabbis acknowledge the liability involved in the failure to teach one's son a craft.

One subtle progression can be observed from this Baraita. The Rabbis are reinforcing what we observed in Proverbs. The father's obligation is to teach his son Torah. However, the Rabbis include two other obligations of an educational nature; the teaching of a craft and swimming. Where the Torah had only obligated the father to teach his son the commandments, the Rabbis both concretize and extend this obligation into areas that will ensure their sons will be able to continue the learning they began with their fathers. Without the ability to earn a living, master a craft, the son will not be able to continue to learn Torah and follow its laws and commandments. Without the ability to provide for himself, both in terms of livelihood and safety (knowing how to swim), the lessons of Torah are meaningless. Torah was meant to be studied in and of itself but its larger lessons were important as well. A father or son that could not provide for his

family or contribute to his community was not living a full life of Torah.

At this point the Talmud undertakes an in-depth explanation of each of the obligations a father must fulfil for his son and a subsequent explanation for the mother's exemption in the order that the obligations were originally listed.

On page 29b the text returns to the issue of the father teaching his son Torah as one of the commandments he is obligated to fulfill for his son. The Talmud explains that the father's obligation to teach his son Torah is rooted in Deuteronomy 11:19:

וְלַמְדֶתֶם אֹתָם אֶת-בְּנוֹיכֶם לְדַבֵּר בָּם בְּשִׁבְתְּכֶם בְּבֵיתְכֶם וּבְלֶכְתְּכֶם בְּדֶרֶךְ וּבְשֹׁכְבְּכֶם וּבְקוּמְכֶם:

The pronoun אֹתָם is understood as the key component of this verse. The Rabbis justify the father's requirement to teach his son Torah because they understand אֹתָם to refer to the commandments of the Torah. This is the subject with which the surrounding verses are occupied. The root למד, found in this verse, is a strong indicator of the educational significance of this verse. למד appears most frequently in the Books of Deuteronomy and Psalms.

At this point the Rabbis have demonstrated that the father has an obligation not only to teach his son laws and commandments as was demonstrated in chapter one, but specifically to teach him Torah, a craft and in some opinions to swim. Furthermore, the Rabbis justify the reason for the father's obligation to teach his son Torah through the connection to Deuteronomy 11:19.

After straying from the topic, the Talmud text returns to the specific issue of the father's obligation to teach his son with the question, 'to what extent is a man obligated to teach (ללמד) his son Torah?' A pattern of education taking place within families is described in the following discussion in Kiddushin 30a. The text seems to indicate that the value of fathers teaching their sons was handed down from generation to generation.

The answer from Rav Yehuda in the name of Rav Shmuel says, 'to follow the example of Zevulun ben Dan whose father's father taught him Scripture, Mishnah, Talmud, Halachah and Aggada.' The anonymous scholars indicate they reject this position through the use of the word מִיֵּחִיב. This term meaning, "they object," is used specifically when the anonymous strand within the Talmud voices an objection to the remarks of an Amora mentioned by name on the grounds that his remarks are in conflict with an earlier Tannaitic statement. The basis for all objections of this kind is the accepted principle that an Amora cannot disagree with a ruling laid down in a Mishnah or Baraita.¹ The objection states that a father is obligated to teach his son Scripture and not Mishnah. Rava adds that Scripture should be understood as specifically Torah, the Five Books of Moses. There are now two positions being offered regarding the question of to what extent a father is obligated to teach his son Torah. These two positions seem to be focusing on the subjects to be taught, not necessarily who the teachers are. One position, the broad understanding, in the name of Shmuel, cites Zevulun whose grandfather taught him Scripture, Mishnah, Talmud, Halachah and Aggada. The only problematic aspect of this first position is that the teacher is not the father but the father's father. The second, narrower position, is raised by the anonymous scholars and clarified by Rava stating that a father must only teach his son scripture or Torah. Up to this point the second, more narrow position seems to be the stronger one as it was ruled in a Baraita. This narrow position also follows the rulings found throughout the analysis of the Bible as well.

The text now attempts to clarify these apparently conflicting positions. The broader statement is problematic both because it endorses teaching more than Torah and also because the teacher is not the father but the grandfather. It appears as though Zevulun ben Dan's answer is intended for a slightly different question. Instead of

¹Adin Steinsaltz. *The Talmud: A Reference Guide*. Random House: New York, 1989. p. 131.

responding to the question, 'to what extent should Torah be taught?' or, 'how does one define Torah in terms of subjects to be taught to a child?' Zevulun ben Dan is answering the question, 'to what extent is a person's family obligated to teach a son Torah?' Zevulun ben Dan's answer is therefore similar in one respect to the answer given by the Baraita and not similar in another respect. Both the Baraita and Zevulun say that there is an obligation of the father. They differ in terms of which father, the grandfather or the son's father as well as to the extent of the curriculum which the father is obligated to teach.

This section of the Talmudic discussion raises two new educational issues. First, the depth of subject matter the father is responsible to teach his son. The Bible and Talmudic texts cited previously in this chapter had agreed that the father's responsibility was primarily to teach the Torah. The Rabbis then added the teaching of a craft and some said, the ability to swim. Now the Rabbis add the possibility that the father may also be responsible for teaching Mishnah, Talmud, Halachah and Aggadah in addition to the other skills and subjects. Second, the Rabbis raise the question of the role of the father's father in the educational process. While this question may seem to be outside of the scope of this thesis, it is relevant to the extent that another family member, close to the role of father may be obligated to play a role as educator.

The possibility of the father's father fulfilling the obligation of the father is now addressed in the text of the Talmud. A Baraita is introduced that refers back to Deuteronomy 11:19. This verse mentions sons but not grandsons. The text then asks, 'What am I to make of Deuteronomy 4:9?'

ר"ס השק"מ לה' ושק"מ נפשוה מאד פן-תשכח את-הדברים אשר-ראו עיניו ופן-יסורו מלבבה כל ימי חייו

והודעתם לבניו ולבני בניו:

"Only protect yourself, and protect your soul carefully, least you forget the things which your eyes have seen, and least they depart from your heart all the days of your life; but teach them to your sons, and to your grandsons." This verse explicitly mentions the teaching of one's grandchildren. The text of the Talmud based on this verse from Deuteronomy explains that each person who teaches his son Torah, Scripture states that he raises his level to the extent that he has taught him, his son, his son's son, all the way to the end of all generations. Deuteronomy 4:9 is not meant to be taken literally but rather emphasizes the importance of teaching one's son. This interpretation is the second opposition to the teaching by grandfathers.

The text now attempts to defend the position of Grandfather as teacher. The Baraita explains that Deuteronomy 11:19's purpose is not to oppose grandfathers but rather to clarify that sons are to be taught and not daughters. Furthermore, Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said, each one who teaches his son's son Torah, Scripture states that he is raised up to the level of receiving the Torah from Mt. Sinai, as it is written in Deuteronomy 4:9. The Rabbis associate the teaching of Torah by a grandfather to Mt. Sinai by linking 4:9 with 4:10 which states:

יום אשר עמדת לפני יהוה אלהיך בחרב באמר יהוה אלי הקהל לי את-העם ואשמעם את-דברי אשר
ילמדון ליראה אתי כל-הימים אשר הם חיים על-האדמה ואת-בניהם ילמדון:

"The day when you stood before Adonai your God in Horeb, when Adonai said to me, gather the people together, and I will make them hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all the days that they shall live upon the earth, and that they may teach their children." The result of this complex set of arguments is that the Rabbis seem to give some legitimacy to the notion of the grandfather teaching his grandson and thereby fulfilling the obligation of the son's father. This possibility has several elements of significance. One question this scenario raises is why is the grandfather needed to teach

in place of the father? Is he a better teacher? Is the father unable to teach because of a lack of time, skill or desire? Does this discussion by the Rabbis reveal some pattern that might have been evident pointing to a loss of ability between two generations to teach children? Was the father's father simply modeling for his son the communally accepted behavior of teacher to the next generation? Unfortunately, the text does not provide answers to these questions. However, some of the educational developments that take place within the Rabbinic text may point the investigation towards some of these questions and away from others.

Tractate Kiddushin provides textual support for the father teaching his son various subjects and skills, specific reasoning for the teaching of Torah, the possibility of teaching texts beyond the Torah as well as the possibility of the father's father teaching the son all in fulfillment of the Torah's commandment of father teaching son. This same Tractate also addresses the case of the father who, for some reason, fails to fulfill this obligation in any of the alternative understanding which the text provides. The anonymous voice, in raising this issue, introduces a term we have not encountered in the context of the father's education of his son. When discussing the father's failure to teach his son the Aramaic word אגמריה is used as the word for "teach him." This word comes from the root גמר which has a multitude of meanings. The Jastrow Dictionary offers: to finish, to consume, to destroy, to conclude, to divine, to be perfect, to be ready to answer, to know well or to learn by heart (especially traditional law). The form of the word אגמריה is defined as the verb, "to teach verbally."² The use of this term broadens the vocabulary used to describe the educational process at the same time that the text is broadening our understanding of the complexity of the educational process. Additionally, גמר has the

²Marcus Jastrow. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1992. P. 254 ff

same meaning as גמרא which is used to mean to teach Oral Torah, specifically Mishnah and Gemarrah. This is especially true when the word appears in the same context as the words תורה or מקרא.

Scholars have acknowledged that fathers were an important educational influence on their sons, especially in the Biblical era, but exactly what and how they were teaching was not always consistent. These same scholars point out that there must have been limitations upon how much the father was able to teach his son in some cases.

This form of education [father teaching son] was at all times an important element in Jewish social and religious life, but it was not necessarily of a formal character, nor did it always include such a subject as, for instance, reading, especially when the father himself could not do it.³

The practical implications of these considerations are straightforward. In an educational context such as this, the knowledge of the father usually served as a limit on the learning of his children: normally, they did not know more than he did. In particular, when he did not know how to read neither did they; when his culture was oral so was theirs. There were exceptions, of course, but they should not have been numerous.⁴

These two quotes from Morris and Baumgarten reinforce the fact that while the father was considered in the Biblical era to be the primary educator, there were recognized limits both in the primary and secondary literature to the father's abilities. It is possible that the Rabbis attempted to restrict the father's teaching to only the Torah because they recognized this limitation. It is also possible that a decline in knowledge and skills among fathers led to both this Rabbinic limitation as well as their discussion regarding the role of grandfathers. In truth, there is no evidence to present a conclusive finding regarding the extent to which fathers followed the commandment to educate their sons. It is likely that geographic and socio-political factors heavily influenced their ability to follow the

³Nathan Morris. p. 15.

⁴A.I. Baumgarten, "Literacy and its Implications," in idem, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*, Leiden: 1997. Pp. 114-136. 116-7

commandment. Part two of this thesis will begin to address some of the questions of external influences on the educational relationship between father and son.

Tractate Kiddushin's coverage of the father's obligation to educate his son began from a Mishnah discussing the different obligations of men and women. It is not surprising that the *sugya* therefore returns to examine the educational obligation of mothers. The first line of the Mishnah stated:

כָּל מִצְוֹת הַבֵּן עַל הָאָב - אֲנָשִׁים חִיבִין, וְנָשִׁים פְּטוּרוֹת.

"The father is responsible for all of the son's commandments - Fathers are obligated and mothers are exempt." In the process of explaining the mother's exemption the term למילך is utilized as a word meaning to teach. The Jastrow Dictionary defines this word as teacher. The root of this word is אִלף. Its common meaning is connected to the quantity of thousands but its more obscure meaning, to practice or learn occurs three times in the Bible in Proverbs 22:25, Job 33:33 and 35:11.⁵

The Talmudic text explains that one only teaches commandments that he or she is required to fulfill him or herself. In the case of the father teaching his son Torah, fathers are required because men and not women are commanded to study Torah. The Rabbis explain that Deuteronomy 11:19 commands boys to learn Torah and not girls. A cyclical argument is thus employed here using the same verse. Since girls are not taught Torah according to their interpretation, women can not be the teachers of Torah.

The Rabbis state that mothers can not teach Torah to their sons but here the Rabbis do not respond to the statement in Proverbs 1:8 quoted earlier in chapter one. It is possible that mothers had definitive teaching roles not involving the teaching of Torah. While the Rabbis go into some detail regarding the complexity of the father's role as teacher they do not address the possibility that the mother had a formal teaching role in

⁵Marcus Jastrow. p. 72.

the home. This silence can not be understood as stating definitively that the mother did not teach at all.

This chapter has explored Rabbinic literature's response to the commandment of the father to teach his son. It has explored why the father is commanded, what he is commanded to teach and the fact that he may have been limited in his ability as a teacher. The Rabbinic text also briefly addresses the mother's role as teacher. The next chapter will investigate how Rabbinic literature addresses the father's methodology and pedagogy as teacher of his son.

CHAPTER THREE

THE FATHER'S PEDAGOGY

This chapter will explore how the Rabbinic sources describe the father's pedagogical practice. Some of these sources delve into educational methodology, others describe the appropriate times in a child's life when a father should teach specific subjects or skills. After establishing firmly that it is the father who is considered to be the primary educator, it is essential to explore in as much detail as possible how the father carries out his obligation to educate.

The first Rabbinic text we will examine is based on a verse found in Proverbs. In verse 22:6 which appears below, the root חנך, meaning to educate or train, appears for the first and only time in the entire Bible. The verse comments more explicitly on the manner in which a child should be educated. Proverbs 22:6 states:

חֲנֹךְ לְנֶעַר עַל-פִּי יִרְכּוּ זָם פִּי-יִחְזַק לֹא-יִסוּר מִמָּוֶה:

"Children should be trained in the proper way of behaving in order for them to know how to live their entire lives." The use of the verb חנך may imply more of a sense of training as opposed to a verbal type of teaching. The Rabbis understood חנך in this sense. In the Babylonian Talmud, Kiddushin 30a the text states,

אֲדִידָא עַל צוּאָרֵי דְבָרִיד מְשִׁיתָסָר וְעַד עֶשְׂרִים וַחֲרָתִי וְאִמְרִי לֵה מִתְמַנִּי סְרִי עַד עֶשְׂרִים וָאַרְבַּעַה

'Rabba says to Rav Natan bar Ami: Keep your hand on your son's neck from age sixteen to twenty-two. Others say the age should be from eighteen to twenty-four.' A Baraita in reference to this instruction cites Proverbs 22:6 as its prooftext.

This description regarding the educational obligation of the father whether it is

interpreted literally or not is markedly different from the language encountered in previous descriptions. First we see the physical description of the hand on the son's neck. This expression is not considered a common educational term as it is not found elsewhere in Rabbinical literature. There is a physical element not seen earlier in the Biblical or Talmudic references. The father is instructed to guide his son with his own hand at a specific time of his son's life. This also conveys a sense of pedagogy. Perhaps earlier in the child's life it is appropriate to teach him (למד or שן) the laws, skills or pertinent texts but at a later stage of his development one should guide him (נהג). The Jastrow Dictionary defines the root נהג as; to rub, polish, finish, to train or to dedicate.¹ This alternate word understood as to train might suggest that the father should guide his son, in close physical proximity, in the more abstract, non-legal lessons of life. נהג might also suggest a more experiential approach to teaching. The Rabbis seem to equate this method of teaching with a specific age group. The Talmudic text contains a repetition of the argument over which age range is most appropriate for this type of training.

This *sugya* contains elements that present some contradictions. The Talmudic text states two possible age ranges as either sixteen to twenty-two or eighteen to twenty-four as appropriate for training (נהג) one's son. At the same time, the Talmudic text cites the verse from Proverbs which contains the word נער. The common Rabbinic understanding is that this term refers to a child below the age of thirteen. The explicit statement of the ages of the son renders a peculiar educational image between father and son. In effect, the Rabbis are instructing fathers to train their adult sons in proper behavior. The Rabbis do not explain why such a late age is included in the text or if it is possible to train one's child at an earlier age. It may be possible to conclude that the use of the term נהג is

¹Ibid., p. 483.

especially suited for this late form of training. It is also possible to conclude that the combination of the contradictory age information as well as the image of the father's hand on his son's neck may indicate some form of coercive, manipulative or possible violent methodology existing in the educational relationship between father and son. It is also possible to interpret the Talmudic text to state that **נָתַן** relates to an additional educational process beyond teaching a skill or subject. The father may be training his son in a craft as mentioned earlier in chapter two, which may demand a more physical dimension of instruction at a later age.

There is much conjecture and little evidence regarding the root **נָתַן** largely because it only appears one time in the Bible with educational significance. Did this term connote an educational practice that was only developing in the time of the Bible? Was there significant difference between the educational practice described by this term as opposed to earlier terms? It is impossible to answer these questions definitively but it is possible based on their context and treatment in other sources to offer possible explanations similar to the ones discussed above.

Before moving beyond the Proverbs verse we must address the exact meaning of the Hebrew phrase **על פי דרכו**. The Rabbis seem to understand the meaning to be that a youth should be trained in the proper way to be. Another possible understanding of the verse could be that a youth should be trained according to his way. **על פי דרכו** might be understood as the method most appropriate for the boy as opposed to the most correct method according to society. This would reveal a sense that it is important for the educator not only to have a strong understanding of the material being taught but also of the student being taught.

Jewish education was never something extraneous to life or merely an instrument that served to prepare for life and that later could be discarded when its utility was exhausted. Jewish education was

rather synonymous with life. It unfolded life, giving it direction and meaning. In fact a modern Hebrew term for education, *Hinukh*, from a root found twice in the Bible (Genesis 14:14 and Proverbs 22:6) in the sense of, "to train," etymologically means dedication, or initiation, and hence may refer to the fact that the child on receiving Jewish education was dedicating his life to the service of God and to the observance of all His laws.²

The exact description of the pedagogy described by the Rabbis is unclear. They recommend either literally or figuratively that fathers should place their hand on their son's neck. The Rabbis also recommend a range of ages when fathers should enter into this training relationship with their sons. They do not discuss the subjects or skills to be taught by the father. These texts broaden our understanding of the educational process between father and sons both in terms of how the father should be teaching as well as the age of the son being taught by the father. Drazin explains that education, specifically the form signalled through the use of *חן* was a lifelong endeavor. This interpretation of the educational process between father and son is similar to John Dewey's contemporary philosophy of education.

When it is said that education is development, everything depends upon *how* development is conceived. Our net conclusion is that life is development, and that developing, growing is life. Translated into educational equivalents, this means (i) that the educational process has no end beyond itself; it is its own end; and that (ii) the educational process is one of continual reorganizing, reconstructing, transforming.³

Both Drazin and Dewey acknowledge that the educational process, like life, is extremely fluid. The Biblical text provides an extremely narrow glimpse into the educational process between father and son. The Rabbinic literature only slightly broadens this window. It is possible to understand the differing Rabbinic interpretations on educational

²Nathan Drazin, p. 12.

³John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1916, pp. 179-193.

subject, method and age of the child as corresponding to different periods of time, different geographic areas or sociological conditions within communities. Drazin and Dewey would most likely agree that as conditions within a community change, the educational system adapts in a parallel fashion.

In the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Ketubot 50a the text offers additional descriptions of methodologies father's were employing to teach their sons. This *sugya* begins with a Mishnah discussing the obligation of a father to provide for his sons and daughters. In the midst of the discussion the text raises the issue of the father's obligation with regard to education. "Rav Yitzchak said, 'It was enacted in Usha that a man should bear with (מרגלגל) his son until he is twelve years of age.'" This root can be understood as meaning: to roll, to turn, to burden, to tax, to cause, to put up with, to bear with, to overcome or to transfer.⁴

The word the Rabbis use to depict the relationship between the father and son is highly nuanced. It is a verb that contains an extremely mobile, active set of definitions. One might imagine the Rabbis attempting to convey that the son is moving within some sort of process, possibly an educational one, requiring the guidance, of the father. The process of development the Rabbis are referring to, whether it is educational or not, is not fixed, but rather is characterized by fluidity and movement. The Talmudic text continues, "From then onwards (age twelve) the father may employ harsh methods regarding his son's life." The Hebrew expression that appears here is extremely enigmatic. The Rabbis state that the father may, יורד עמו לחייו. This expression literally means, descend with him on his life. It appears three other times throughout the Babylonian Talmud to indicate the possibility that one is being exposed to danger.

The text continues, asking if this is true, that the father can expose his son to

⁴Marcus Jastrow. p. 244.

danger after his son reaches age twelve. "Rav said to Rav Shmuel bar Shilat, do not accept a student under the age of six. At age six, accept him and stuff him like an ox. Stuff him like an ox but he may not threaten his life (expose him to danger) until he reaches age twelve."

This text establishes a third age level for fathers teaching their son. We had seen the sixteen to twenty-two age (or eighteen to twenty-four) identified in Kiddushin 30a, age twelve was mentioned earlier in this passage and now the Rabbis introduce age six as the minimum age for beginning to learn. It is possible that the different age ranges may have been meant for different subjects or different methods of instruction. It is also possible that different ages were accepted in different communities. As the Rabbis began to attempt to understand the development of children they may have been raising the question of when to educate the child, what subjects are appropriate at different ages, and when to step back and allow the child to make his own educational decisions.

In the Midrashic literature, Sifre Deuteronomy, Piska 46 responds to Deuteronomy 11:19 focusing on a similar question of who should be taught and when to begin teaching. Yossi ben Akivah taught that sons should be taught and not daughters. More importantly, the Midrash explains that as soon as a child begins to talk he should be instructed in Torah. Specifically, the Midrash states that the father should speak with the child in the holy language and teach him Torah. The father should teach his son through the method of conversation. The Midrash supports a more informal approach. There is no mention of defined lessons, a set of specific texts or precise methodology. The son will learn through conversations with his father. This is still different from formal lessons, the classroom setting or the utilization of a hired teacher.

In Tosefta Hagigah 1:2⁵ the text states: "If he knows how to speak, his father teaches him the shema, Torah and the sacred language (Hebrew), and if not - it would

⁵Lieberman p. 374

have been better had he not come into this world. If he knows how to take care of his tefilin, his father purchases tefilin for him."

Sifre Deuteronomy and Tosefta Hagigah both expand on the topic raised in Tractate Ketubot. There are no explicit age guidelines offered in these texts. Some of the ages are implied based on the ritual being learned, such as tefilin. Others, such as learning to speak and reciting the *shema* seem to be more loosely defined. The responsibility is on the father to determine when the son is ready to learn new concepts and skills. At the same time, the text states with strong wording that it is important for both the son to know how to speak and for the father to teach his son the *shema*. The texts do not explain how the father should teach the *shema*. However, with tefilin the text reveals slightly more about methodology. The son must exhibit certain skills regarding the tefilin before the father is required to buy them. The son, at the least, must have watched his father wrap his tefilin, and at the most, practiced with his father the necessary skills to wrap and care for tefilin. This example illustrates that fathers were not only engaged in teaching their sons legal and textual material but also ritual and practical lessons as well. The father was required to spend at least enough time with his son to know whether his son had mastered the appropriate skill to be able to move to the next level of Jewish practice and responsibility.

Mishnah Yoma 8:4 contains a similar narrative revealing both educational methodology and content. The text states, "they [parents] do not cause children to fast on the Day of Atonement, but they should train them (מחנכין אותן) one year or two years before [they are of age] that they may become versed (רגילין) in the commandments." Again, this type of education is not necessarily of a cognitive nature but rather experiential. While the Mishnah and Talmud do discuss the legal age at which one is obligated to the commandments (twelve for girls and thirteen for boys) this Mishnah is

concerned with the education of children and not their legal obligations. Rabbinic literature places emphasis on children learning from their parents how to fulfill their obligations. This emphasis might indicate both that these specific rituals (reciting the *shema*, wrapping *tefilin*, fasting on Yom Kippur) were being practiced and were highly valued in certain communities.

Examining the way in which Biblical literature makes reference to education as well as how Rabbinic literature refers to education during Biblical times leads us to conclude that one of the most popular teaching modes was through imitation and experiential guidance. It is significant that in the numerous Biblical stories of heroes and their early childhood, we never find mention of literary education as forming part of their upbringing.⁶ At the same time there is a significant amount of legal knowledge that parents are commanded to teach their children. Some of the learning had to have taken place on a cognitive level. The very existence of laws, codes and statutes, according to Morris, must have meant that this information was passed down from one generation to the next. Some form of educational process must have evolved to ensure the transmission of these societal norms. Morris notes that the root *למד* appears more frequently in Deuteronomy (17 times) than any other book of the Bible, except in Psalms (13 times in Psalm 119 alone). It also appears frequently in Jeremiah (14 times).⁷ It is not clear what this educational process looked like but it is clear based on the texts examined above, parents were teaching their children, most likely both a set of information as well as a set of skills.

In imagining this process one must realize that religion was a completely blended element of a holistic Jewish life. Drazin and later Dewey's philosophies of education,

⁶Nathan Morris, p. 5.

⁷Ibid., p. 247.

discussed earlier, seem to fit well with the available sources. Religion was not confined to certain hours and to certain places; and nothing would have been stranger to the minds of those people than special lessons devoted to it. It was co-extensive with life and controlled every human action.⁸

DISCIPLINE

It is important in examining the educational setting, be it the home or a more institutionalized location, to explore the topic of discipline within educational methodology. The Book of Proverbs makes it clear that an essential element of educational training is discipline by either physical or verbal methods. Proverbs 13:24 states:

חֹשֶׁךְ שְׁכַסוּ שׁוֹנֵא בְנוֹ הָאֵבֶן לְשִׁחַר מוֹסֵר:

"He that spares his rod, hates his son, but he who loves him disciplines him early." It is unclear how literally this statement was meant to be understood. Clearly some level of corporal punishment may have existed in the educational setting between father and son or teacher and student but Proverbs balances this extreme statement later in the Book. In Proverbs 17:10 the text states:

תַּחַת גְּעֵרָה בְּמִבִּין מֵהַכּוֹת בְּסִיל מֵאָה:

"A rebuke enters deeper into a man of understanding than a hundred lashes upon a fool."

The text goes on to explain that the motivation behind any discipline by the parent towards the child must be educationally or constructively motivated.

The Bible does not contain any explicit legal text informing the educational relationship between parent and child. The fifth commandment obligates the child to honor his or her parents (Exodus 20:12). At the same time the Bible is replete with narratives containing examples of children rebelling against their parents (one example

⁸Ibid., p. 228.

can be found in II Samuel 15-19).

While the Bible commands a great deal of moral and religious behavior it does not set out any guidelines for how these obligations were meant to be taught to children. Deuteronomy chapter six contains instructions for the father to teach his sons the words of God but does not go into any detail about methodology in any respect. One is left to understand that observance and actual imitation of practice must have been primary ways for fathers to teach their sons.

THE FORM OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT CONVEYS METHODOLOGY

Tigay and others in the field of wisdom literature believe that the Biblical texts were written with educational objectives in mind. While this is a common theme within the realm of wisdom literature and was mentioned in chapter one, it is also relevant to this discussion on educational methodology in the Bible. Education and pedagogy were not necessarily understood as separate from the entire communal living system. The compartmentalization of education found in modern societies did not exist in Biblical times. Deuteronomy can be seen as an endless set of educational experiences for the Israelite people. Through commanding parents to teach their children the religion, greater emphasis is placed on passing on the religion as opposed to glorifying it. It is important to note that the text does not command parents to teach their children to be good people of strong character. Rather, it commands the parents to teach the children the law as spoken by God through Moses.

Every parent is to be a teacher of religion. This obligation is the most pervasive expression of the biblical conviction that religion is not simply a personal, individual concern. Deuteronomy emphasizes repeatedly that the Israelites are not to keep to themselves the experiences they had and the responsibilities they were taught: they must transmit them to their children and grandchildren so that they, too, may share in the experiences, learn their responsibilities, and enjoy the benefits of faith and observance.⁹

⁹Jeffrey H. Tigay, p. 46.

Sharing in the experiences, learning the responsibilities and enjoying the benefits of faith and observance are the true foundations of the parent's obligations to teach their children.

Only after the Israelites share in experiences that happen to be both tremendously arduous as well as rewarding and then learn lessons that are both painful and full of satisfaction will they enjoy the benefits of faith and observance. This methodology put forth in the Book of Deuteronomy may have been crafted with thought given to pedagogy and the methodology of teaching.

The form of the text in Deuteronomy may have been developed with thought to pedagogy in addition to the importance of content. Could this then mean that the specific laws are not the only goal or point of the Book of Deuteronomy? Some of the most important portions of the Torah seem to be written by people who have a strong understanding of what it means to teach. The author(s) of Deuteronomy may have realized that the student will not necessarily remember every single law and all of its elements. With this realization may have come the desire for students to learn in such a way that they will retain the essence of the laws.

Children will be curious about the instructions and ask about their meaning, just as the book of Exodus expected children to ask about the ceremonies commemorating the Exodus (Exodus 12:26-27; 13:14). In answering, one is to go beyond the intrinsic value of the individual laws (cf. 4:6,8) and explain the reasons for obeying God altogether.... This lesson is typical of Deuteronomy's practice of using laws as educative devices for theological and moral teachings. Exodus expects children to ask about the ceremonies commemorating the Exodus. Here, Moses assumes that they will be curious about Israel's entire way of life. Deuteronomy sees all the commandments, civil as well as ceremonial, as opportunities for religious education.¹⁰

Teaching the law was crucial but how one taught seems also to be an essential element within the Israelite and Near Eastern cultures. The texts within these worlds were

¹⁰Ibid., p. 82.

designed to communicate specific content messages as well as values related to the import of teaching in and of itself. The Book of Proverbs, more closely related to wisdom literature than Deuteronomy, also conveys this message of dual priorities.

There are many comparisons between Proverbs and Egyptian, Babylonian, Ugaritic, and Phoenician Wisdom Literature which lead scholars to believe that wisdom literature may have served as a model for the writers or editors of the book of Proverbs. The ancients assumed that Solomon was the author of Proverbs, at least chapters 1-24. The "Men of Hezekiah" are said to have edited another collection of Solomon's proverbs (chapters 25-9). Agur bin Jakeh is credited with chapter 30 and King Lemuel with 31.¹¹ Proverbs in general deals with wisdom and the importance of knowledge and the penalties that come from either not gaining wisdom or abusing it. There are clear connections between lines in Proverbs 3:1-3 and 4:1-4 and Deuteronomy 6:9.

בְּנֵי תוֹרָתִי אֶל-תִּשְׁכַּח וּמִצְוֹתַי יֵצֵר לִבָּךְ: כִּי אֵרֶךְ יָמִים וְשָׁנֹת חַיִּים וְשָׁלוֹם יוֹסִיפוּ לָךְ: חֶסֶד וְאֱמֶת

אֶל-יַעֲזֹבֶה קִשְׁרָם עַל-גְּרוֹתְךָ כְּתָבָם עַל-לוֹחַ לִבָּךְ:

"My son, do not forget my Torah; let your heart keep my commandments: For lengthened days, and long life, and peace, they shall add to you: Do not let grace and truth forsake you; bind them around your neck; write them on the tablet of your heart:"

שִׁמְעוּ בָנִים מוֹסֵר אָב וְהִקְשִׁיבוּ לְדַעַת בִּינָה: כִּי לֶקַח טוֹב נָתַתִּי לָכֶם תּוֹרָתִי אֶל-תִּעֲזֹב: כִּי-בֶן תִּהְיֶה

לְאָבִי רַד וְיַחֲד לִפְנֵי אֲמִי: יִרְדְּנִי וַיֹּאמֶר לִי יִתְמֵךְ-דְּבָרִי לִבָּךְ שְׁמֵר מִצְוֹתַי וְחַיָּה:

"Hear, children, the instruction of a father, and listen to know wisdom: For I give you a good doctrine, do not forsake my Torah: For I was my father's son, tender and the only

¹¹W. Gunther Plaut, p. 8.

one in the sight of my mother: He taught me also, and said to me, let your heart retain my words; keep my commandments, and live:"

וְכָתַבְתֶּם עַל-מַזְוֵזוֹת בֵּיתְךָ וּבְשַׁעְרֶיךָ:

"And you shall write them upon the posts of your house, and on your gates:"

Not only must the law be taught to the children but it must be written down. Beyond writing the law in both Deuteronomy and Proverbs it must be written in a way that it can be transported with the person and placed in a spot so that it serves as a reminder.

Proverbs can be seen as advancing the cause of education on a more subtle level than Deuteronomy. The very name of the Book of Proverbs, מִשְׁלֵי, is the epitome of its dual nature as content and pedagogically driven. Parables were and still are, popular teaching devices. What better name to give a book devoted to advancing education than the book of parables. Other examples of Proverb's 'behind the scenes' work to advance education can be found throughout the book. One instance is in 31:10-31. These verses form an acrostic mnemonic device to help those studying the verses memorize them more easily. Generations later, we see that the emphasis on both aspects of learning: content and pedagogy still exists. Once the Israelite people have lost their geographical center with the destruction of the second temple, the reliance on effective education may become even more vital to the survival and growth of the people.

Finally and possibly most importantly, the way in which the Bible expounds the law reflects a specific pedagogy. A close reading of the commandments to teach the children found in Exodus, Deuteronomy, Proverbs and elsewhere reveal that how one teaches is at least equally as important as what one teaches. The father is singled out as the teacher because ideally he has a close relationship with his son and is practicing the

very lessons he is teaching. He has authority and is able to enter into educational conversations and opportunities to model the content of his lessons. This more complete understanding of the laws directed to the parents regarding their children allows us to come to a better understanding of what it means to teach. It is important in Israelite society to follow all of the rules, but it is also important to convey larger lessons to one's children; lessons that are not necessarily able to be spelled out in words and laws. However, the children will indeed learn these lessons if their parents spend the time to teach with their hearts, speak to their children and model the role God plays in their lives.

Part one of this thesis has investigated the Biblical sources for our understanding of father as teacher in chapter one. Chapter two enriched this discussion with greater understanding of the subjects father's were teaching, the role of the father's father and the limitations of the father as teacher. Chapter three has explored the pedagogy the father followed as teacher and how this pedagogy interacted with the content taught by fathers. Rabbinic literature offers glimpses into the educational practices of the father helping us to acknowledge that an educational system in the home existed and had complex elements. At the same time, little concrete information exists allowing us to state without hesitation exactly how children were educated by their fathers. Part two will seek to build an understanding of how children were educated in the school setting with specific attention placed on educational elements that migrate from the home setting to the school. The conclusion of this thesis will evaluate these elements that are found in both settings.

PART TWO**EDUCATION AT SCHOOL****INTRODUCTION**

In Biblical and later in Rabbinic literature there seem to be two major models for educational relationships. The one most common in the Bible is between father (or parent) and son. Later, in the Talmudic era the idea of a teacher taking on the obligation of educating the child is introduced. According to Talmudic texts which will be explored in detail in this chapter the teacher first appears in a centralized location in Jerusalem and later is installed throughout the Jewish community. The Talmud also defines the job description of the teacher and offers some insight into the relationship between teacher and student. The Talmudic literature does not offer clear explanations for the shift from parent as educator to the installation of the professional teacher and the ensuing establishment of schools. This section seeks to explore the role of the teacher, examining Rabbinic texts and sources that discuss the introduction of teachers into communities. I will also investigate Rabbinic literature that contains discussions of the ideal role teachers were supposed to play. I will explore the establishment of educational institutions, and the process of societal adoption of these new educational models. Further, I will address any possible understandings of how teachers and students may have related to one another. This section will also highlight some of the specific educational elements that existed in the Biblical era that migrate to the Rabbinic educational model. Once these common elements have been identified, their roles and significance will be evaluated in the conclusion of this thesis.

The relationship between student and teacher has many similarities and some

striking differences to the educational relationship between parent and child depicted in the previous section. An analysis of the student-teacher relationship has the potential to reveal a great deal about larger educational values. There are many of models throughout the Talmud of honored masters and beloved students. But one of the most emotionally charged relationships is that of Elisha ben Abuyah and Rabbi Meir. We will explore the relationship between Elisha ben Abuyah and his student Rabbi Meir and use them as a lens in understanding models of the teacher-student relationship as presented in the Talmud. I will address the teacher-student relationship from an interpersonal as well as a methodological perspective. That is, what were the acceptable, prescribed behaviors of a student toward his master, and what responsibilities did the master have toward his pupil? How clearly defined was the hierarchy? As for methodology, what were the educational responsibilities of both teacher and student in the learning process? What role did parents play in this evolving system? The goal of this analysis will be to compare the relationship between student and teacher revealed in the Talmudic literature to the educational relationship between parent and child. This section will identify the many elements found within the institutionalized educational setting that may be compared and contrasted to the home educational settings reflecting a lasting, transmitted set of values, beliefs and educational principles.

Part two of this thesis contains three chapters. Chapter four discusses some of the theories and context of educational change. Chapter five highlights the central pieces of Rabbinic literature commenting on the development of an institutionalized educational system. Chapter six looks at the roles and relationships of the father, student and teacher within this new educational system.

CHAPTER FOUR

THEORIES OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

THE INTRODUCTION OF TEACHERS

Scholars seem to agree that it is only after the destruction of the Second Temple with its accompanying external influences (social, cultural, political and economic) that the Jewish community began to develop the concepts of teacher and community supported school. While it is likely that some form of teacher, external to the immediate family, existed in Jewish and Israelite communities, scholars agree that the advent of community wide, community supported schools did not take place until after the destruction of the Second Temple. One theory regarding the timing of this shift in educational policy centers around the fact that the Jewish community swiftly faced the reality that they were a minority community living amidst a majority culture that was not similar to or necessarily supportive of their own. The need for formal education increases with the perception that assimilation and acculturation are threats to a community's way of life.

The only times when parents arranged for any type of formal training for their children previous to this political/social shift was if their children were required to learn a skill such as the scribal arts or functions in the Temple as part of their training to become an officiant in the Temple or a scribe.

Prior to the Second Commonwealth teaching was a parental concern except for the specialized training schools of the priests and of the prophets [and scribes]. This system was fairly successful because being chiefly an agrarian people during the days of the First Temple and since agriculture is a seasonal occupation, the Jews had sufficient time to advance their own education and to instruct their youth. With the rise, however, of the arts and

industries in Palestine after the Babylonian Captivity, many of the people had to work all year round for their livelihood and so found little time for training their young. Higher education especially suffered. The adults had hardly any time to continue their own education, and the children, therefore, received very little instruction, merely the rudiments of Jewish education, thus precluding higher education....As for elementary and secondary education, important as these were, it was felt that the fathers, even if their time was limited, could still continue to teach the elements to their sons.¹

Beyond the political situation, the economic climate also had an effect on the educational system. Fathers had a greater demand on their time throughout the year. Parents were spending less time on their own learning and education which resulted in both their having less time for their children as well as them being less prepared and inclined to teach in general. One likely scenario was that parents who did not have the time to teach their own children arranged to send them to a friend's house for instruction. The understanding was that in these communities, adapting to economic, political and social change, there was at least one person who had the time, ability and inclination to instruct children. This friend was paid for his services. There arose, from this custom, elementary teachers who took care of a number of young students. "Thus there came into existence the phrase, *tinokot shel bet rabban*, 'children of the house of the master' for school children. This situation existed, however, only in isolated instances. For one reason, it could apply only to parents of means."² It would be inaccurate, at this stage, to call this situation a school. People were not yet contributing to community-wide schools, on a voluntary or required basis. Teachers were hired for children on a voluntary basis by those who could afford the luxury. It is possible that *tinokot shel bet rabban* referred to a pre-school equivalent or stage before a school existed. At this point there was no discussion of the requirements of the teacher, the structure of the school setting or the

¹Nathan Drazin. *History of Jewish Education: From 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 1940, p. 40.

²*Ibid.*, p. 45.

obligations of the parents, students or teachers with regard to the school.

Early in the Rabbinic sources we encounter texts that in addition to Torah or Scripture acknowledge the teaching of Midrash, Halakhot and Aggadot. The Rabbis establish a distinction between who can teach which subjects. In Mishnah Nedarim 4: 2-3 the text states:

If one is prohibited by vow from deriving any benefit from his fellow, he may pay for him his shekel, and he may repay his debt, and he may restore to him his lost property....and he may teach him Midrash, Halakhot and Aggadot, but he may not teach him Scripture. Yet he may teach Scripture to his sons and daughters.

One person may teach another, in this case to repay a debt, Midrash, Halakhot and Aggadot but may not teach Scripture. The Rabbis of the Mishnah reserve the teaching of Scripture (Torah) to fathers. It is important to note the rare inclusion in this text of daughters to the customary teaching relationship of fathers and sons. In this text the Rabbis do not explain why they make this distinction. One of the results is that fathers will have a lasting role in the education of their children despite the introduction of larger systems of education. Not all children will learn Midrash, Halakhot and Aggadot but the norm of the society was that all children receive instruction in Torah, not only to become familiar with the text but also to reinforce all of the ritual aspects of their observance.

The Rabbinic literature is not necessarily consistent on the point of who is responsible for teaching specific types of material. One possible explanation may be that as time progressed, teachers may have taken on greater responsibility for teaching more material. I was not able to find evidence for any explanation for a transfer of responsibility from the father to the teacher. However, the Palestinian Talmud, a text which was written after the Mishnah that appears above, describes a situation in which teachers, not fathers, are responsible for teaching Scripture. In the Palestinian Talmud Hagigah 1:76c the text states:

Rabbi Judah Nesiah sent Rabbis Hiyya, Asi and Ami to travel through the cities of Israel and establish teachers of Bible and Oral law. They entered one town and found neither a Bible teacher nor a teacher of Mishnah. They declared: Bring us the watchmen of your town (נְחוֹרֵי כְּרִיתָא). They brought before them the local watchmen. The rabbis declared: These are the towns guardians? No, they are nothing but its destroyers! And who are the guardians? They replied: the teachers of Torah and Oral tradition.

Beyond acknowledging that teachers were teaching Scripture in Palestine or were at least permitted to teach Scripture, this text also provides a strong statement of support for the position of teacher within the society. The Rabbis state that the true protectors of the community were not the defenders, the watchmen, but rather the people responsible for teaching the children. It is important to point out here that while the first part of the text refers to teachers, the second part does not exclude the possibility that fathers may have been among the teachers of Torah and Oral tradition.

THE INTRODUCTION OF SCHOOLS: EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Several important variables contribute to the introduction of schools into Jewish communities. First, teachers had already been introduced in both legislated as well as less formal ways in many communities. Second, the role of the father as primary educator was not completely erased by the introduction of more institutionalized education. As we shall see later in some of the primary sources, ideally schools were meant to build on the educational foundation begun by the father in the home.

The schools of Hellenistic cities, as their other cultural institutions, were essentially urban and discriminating, intended to serve a narrow or broader stratum of their population, and were never intended to encompass all of the residents of the Greek cities. Certainly the overwhelming majority of the rural community, born in Egypt or in some other Hellenized land, never attained any educational framework at all. In contrast, the Jewish school, as will become clear to us, was intended for all the children as Jewish law obligated every father and every settlement to attend to the education of the children.³

³ Shmuel Safrai, "Elementary Education, Its Religious and Social Significance in the Talmudic Period," in: H.H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, eds., *Jewish Society Through the Ages*, NY 1971, pp. 148-168, 148.

In addition to the familiar aspects of teachers and father based education, schools also utilized a similar 'curriculum' to the one students would be familiar with if they were accustomed to learning at home with their father. The knowledge that the Rabbis felt was important centered around the knowledge needed to fulfill the commandments. Teachers may have been installed in the communities but fathers were still expected to participate to some extent in the educational process. The subject delegated by the Rabbis to the father was the teaching of Torah to his children. Whereas before the Torah might have been the complete guide to education, studying the text and learning the relevant practices, the Rabbinic literature and sources indicate a shift towards Torah becoming more of a foundation and starting point for more advanced learning.

The Bible was thus removed from its parochial Jewish context and given a universal role. To put this conclusion in other terms, as suggested by Bickerman, the Bible was now the foundation of Jewish education, much as Homer was the basis of Greek education (Bickerman, *Jews in the Greek Age*, 169-171). The Jews will therefore know the Bible, quote it when relevant (and when not), and draw conclusions for the present based on it, much as the Greeks did with Homer. This text was moving from being effectively restricted to the circle of the priests to being more widely known by members of the nation.⁴

Baumgarten is suggesting that in addition to a continuity of process (maintenance of the role of father and similar subject matter), there was a democratization of education in the Jewish community. Anyone who desired an education would be eligible. This democratic ideal of accessibility will be explored throughout this chapter and sources both supporting and negating the theory will be examined.

With the expansion of the scope of the educational system in terms of people involved, content covered and geography, the goal was to allow more people than before to have access to education.

However, with regard to the teaching of Torah to young children, it

⁴ A.I. Baumgarten, "Literacy and its Implications," in idem, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*, Leiden: 1997. Pp. 114-136. 118-9.

was clear to all, that one should include each child – the son of a pauper or a rich man, the son of a *Haver* (fellow) or a notable of the city together with the sons of ignorant men and people of low descent or even the sons of various evil doers and wicked men. Education was not given for nothing and parents had to pay the wages of the teacher, but the city participated in one way or another, defraying the cost of the scribes and repetitors and thus made possible the education of the sons of the very poor as well as of the orphans who were unable to pay any of the expense. In any case we hear of no rebuke or complaint from sages that children of the poor were unable to go to school or that they were expelled from school because of their poverty.⁵

Safrai addresses the issue, also raised by the Rabbis later in this work, of children who did not have fathers and therefore were unable, under a strict reading of the law, to receive even a rudimentary education in Torah. At the same time, Safrai's argument must be questioned. Simply because there was no, "rebuke or complaint from sages that children of the poor were unable to go to school or that they were expelled from school because of their poverty," does not mean that indeed, all children were attending schools or given access to educational opportunities. Safrai's argument depends on the assumption that the sages would complain about the lack of attendance of the poor, instead of basing it on some positive form of proof, which is equally unavailable.

Mishnah Nedarim, as quoted earlier in this chapter, establishes the precedent of placing a value and providing guidelines for teaching. Fathers maintain their status as teachers but the text acknowledges the possibility of learning Midrash, Halakhot and Aggadot from another teacher. The Palestinian Talmud quoted earlier in the chapter declares that the guardians of a town are not necessarily the watchmen but its teachers. The texts place a high value on teaching as a profession while maintaining connections to the past (fathers) and establishing guidelines for developing systems (teachers and schools). The next chapter explores the development of schools in more detail.

⁵ Shmuel Safrai, p. 151.

CHAPTER FIVE

RABBINIC REFERENCES TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOOLS

Towards the end of the second Temple era historians point to evidence that there were several different subgroups existing within the Jewish community in Palestine. While the historical data is far from conclusive, four major Jewish subgroups are identified. The Essenes, a fairly radical faction, leave Jerusalem to establish their own, isolated society in the Judean desert. The Zealots, also a radical group, rebel against both the Romans and fellow Jews who they perceive as being complicit with the Romans. At the time of the actual destruction, Josephus relates that the Zealots flee to Masada, meeting their demise there. The Saducees were composed largely of the priestly class charged with officiating at the Temple. Historians and archeologists hypothesis that this Jewish sect lived amongst the Roman upper class although living a life strictly following the law of the Torah. The fourth sect, the Pharisees, were the Jews who were thought of as most openly embracing the Oral law and participating in synagogue services. It is the members of this last sect who left Jerusalem and eventually made their way to the Galilee in the North of Israel to begin the process of recording the Oral law leading to the development of the Mishnah and the Talmud. The Pharisaic sect, according to most scholars leads directly to what we know today as Rabbinic Judaism. This understanding of Judaism which emerged in the wake of the destruction of the Second Temple was committed to educational change and the institutionalization of an educational system.

At this point [the destruction of the Second Temple] we may note among these factors the existence of schools everywhere as well as the obligation to study which became increasingly widespread during the last generations of the Second Commonwealth and following the destruction of the Temple. The very idea of

disseminating the Torah and teaching it in public is basic to the world-view of the Pharisees. No doubt the founding of the school system and the formulation and inculcation of the obligation to study, as mentioned above, were due to the influence and prodding of the Pharisaic sages, whether or not we attribute the specific regulation to Shimon ben Shetah or to the high priest who was not numbered among the Pharisees. Although we possess no direct proof of this, it seems most likely that the great majority of the teachers of Scripture and certainly the teachers of the Oral Law, came from the circles of the Pharisees and their pupils.¹

This chapter will explore how Rabbinic literature treats the installation of teachers and the establishment of schools. Historians have established, with some certainty, a limited picture of what life was like at the time of the destruction of the Second Temple. A great deal of change was taking place on every level of the society: politically, economically, socially and culturally to be sure. The Rabbinic sources in this chapter describe some educational innovation but as stated earlier, refrain from offering explanations as to why, how or when much of these new educational practices came into being. Before discussing the Talmudic literature it may be helpful to present some secondary sources which discuss the educational changes in broad strokes. Drazin mentions one of the most earliest Rabbinic sources discussing the establishment of schools:

The Jerusalem Talmud records that he [Simon ben Shetach] decreed three new measures one of which was: "children should go to school." This ordinance meant the establishment of high schools for young adults from the ages of sixteen or seventeen years. Being the brother of Queen Salome and the vice-president of the Sanhedrin, Simon's decree presumably did not go unheeded, and secondary schools may have been established in all the large towns or districts of Palestine.²

¹Shmuel Safrai, "Elementary Education, Its Religious and Social Significance in the Talmudic Period," in: H.H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, eds., *Jewish Society Through the Ages*, NY 1971, pp. 148-168, 166-7.

²Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education: From 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 1940, p. 44.

In the Palestinian Talmud, Tractate Ketubot 8:32 C, the text states that Shimon ben Shetach (who lived in the Second Temple period from 103 to 76 B.C.E) decreed (היחקין) three things: a man may do business with his wife's ketubah (based upon its value), that children (תינוקות) should go to the house of the *sofer* and that glass vessels were impure. The educational adaptations being introduced in the Rabbinic literature eventually become norms and even requirements of Jewish communities. One thread that will be examined in the texts in this chapter referring to educational practice is the issue of standards of practice. Were the Rabbis imposing strict laws that were to be followed specifically in each community or were they suggesting an ideal level of practice that people should strive to meet but was not necessarily expected of all? One example of the issue of standards is seen in the mention of the ages of the students in the Palestinian Talmud. We will see in our exploration of the texts that the Rabbis suggest several different ages for different educational experiences. Another example of this issue of standards relates to how common schools and teachers actually were throughout the entire Jewish community. While the Rabbis explain that people of learning were required to live in communities that met exacting standards, we do not know to what extent these rulings were actually practiced.

It was taught in a Baraita: Any city that does not have the following ten things, a disciple is forbidden to dwell in its midst. A court that imposes flagellation and punishments, a charity fund collected by two and distributed by three, a synagogue, a bath, a convenience, a doctor, an artisan, a scribe, a slaughterer and a school teacher.³

A verse that must serve as a starting point in an investigation of how the Rabbis discuss educational change is Deuteronomy 11:19.

וְלִמְדָתָם אֹתָם אֶת-בְּנֵיהֶם לְדַבֵּר בָּם בְּשַׁבָּתָהּ בְּבֵיתָהּ וּבְלֶחְתָּהּ בְּדֶרֶךְ וּבְשַׂכְבָּהּ וּבְקוּמָהּ:

While this verse has been referred to earlier, it is discussed in different areas of Talmudic

³BT Sanhedrin 17b

literature with different implications and conclusions. The investigation of this verse begins with Mishnah Baba Batra 2:3. This Mishnah is concerned with the way people use and share space. Regarding the establishment of a shop within a residential courtyard, the Mishnah states that one resident has the right to block a shop keeper working in his residential courtyard by declaring that he is being prevented from sleeping due to the constant traffic of customers. However, a person who manufactures tools within the same courtyard (but does not have customers), cannot be prevented from working due to the noise of his work, the noise of the mill or the noise of the children (תינוקות). Without being explicit it seems as if the Mishnah includes the case of the tool manufacturer with the cases of others who may work in their homes; the miller and the teacher. The Mishnah acknowledges without addressing educational issues at all that there may have been teachers practicing their profession in their own homes.

This Mishnah addresses the rights of residents to practice their livelihood within the confines of their home. The one caveat seems to be that the business must conform to communal norms and standards. A person can not run a store in the same place he is living but he can undertake certain work. The Mishnah does not explicitly state either the reason children would be entering into the residential courtyard or why it is permissible for them and not for 'customers'. Presumably the children were not residents of the courtyard. The Babylonian Talmud, Baba Batra 21a, comments on this Mishnah attempting to clarify these two questions.

Whether or not the Rabbis intend it there is a connection between the home, the teacher and school children. The Talmud is about to take up issues involving first the father's obligation to teach his son and subsequently the installation of teachers to carry out the obligation. It is essential to keep in mind the focus on educational setting. The commandment upon the father assumes that learning takes place in and around the home. Yehoshua ben Gamla's injunction in Baba Batra 21a calls upon the father to bring his son

to various places in order to learn. Some of them are far from the home and some close by. The Rabbis respond to issues of proximity in relationship to learning in many of the discussions to follow.

Initially, the Talmud explains that the Mishnah must be speaking about activities taking place in two different courtyards in an effort to resolve the possible contradictions between the permissibility of some people and activities and the prohibitions placed on others. Rava offers another interpretation, declaring that the reference to children is related to children attending a school within the residential courtyard. Rava states explicitly that children were present for the purpose of being educated and he invokes the ruling of Yehoshua ben Gamla.

'Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav, remember for a good deed the name of Yehoshua ben Gamla. If not for him the Torah would have been forgotten from Israel. In the beginning he who had a father would teach him Torah. He who did not have a father would not learn Torah.'

The text states that the Biblical source for this original requirement is Deuteronomy 11:19. The fact that the word **אִתְּךָ** was written with the "י" missing seemed to lead the Rabbis to interpret this verse differently from the Rabbis in Kiddushin. Here they see this word as emphasizing the 'you' referring to the father as opposed to an emphasis on the 'them' of the sons.

Yehoshua ben Gamla's ruling in Baba Batra parallels the ruling found in Kiddushin in their shared desire to obligate the father to teach his son. However, in the case of the failure of the father the two rulings differ. Kiddushin obligates the son to provide an education for himself, while Baba Batra states that a son without a father simply does not learn. This distinction becomes relevant because the continuation of the discussion in Baba Batra seems to assume that if for some reason the father does not fulfil his obligation, other steps need to be taken to provide educational opportunities for children.

Without explanation the text continues with the Rabbis establishing a ruling to install teachers of children in Jerusalem. As a prooftext the text points to Isaiah 2:3:

וְהָלְכוּ עַמִּים רַבִּים וְאָמְרוּ לָכֵן וְנַעֲלֶה אֶל-הָר-יְהוָה אֶל-בֵּית אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב יִזְכְּנוּ מִדְּרָכָיו וְנִלְכֶּה בְּאַרְחֵיהֶוּ
כִּי מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תוֹרָה וְדָבָר יְהוָה מִיְרוּשָׁלַם:

"And the many peoples shall go and say, come, let us go up to the mountain of Adonai, to the house of the God of Jacob, that God may instruct us in God's ways, and we may walk in God's paths. For instruction shall come from Zion, the word of Adonai from Jerusalem." The Rabbis do not explain why they turn from discussing the obligation of fathers or the fathers' failure to fulfil their obligation to the installation of teachers.

Instead, the prooftext offers an explanation for the reason teachers are installed specifically in Jerusalem.

The fact that the first decree established schools only in Jerusalem indicates that these schools were intended primarily as centers of higher education. The great masters of the Law, the priests, the heads and the members of the highest tribunal in Israel were located then in the holy city of Jerusalem, hence colleges could be conveniently founded there.⁴

Torah comes forth from Jerusalem making it the optimal place to bring children to receive their education. This discussion will prove to be the foundation for the discussion of an organized system of education. The missing piece of the explanation as to why fathers were no longer the educational provider leaves a gaping hole in the discussion of educational progression in the Babylonian Talmud.

Baba Batra 21a explains specifically what it means that teachers will be installed in Jerusalem. 'He who had a father, the father would take him up to Jerusalem and teach him there.' The text is unclear as to whether the father would bring his son to a teacher in Jerusalem, which is most likely, or whether the father was to take his son to Jerusalem and teach him there. Subsequently, the Rabbis issue a ruling mentioned at the beginning

⁴Nathan Drazin, p. 39.

of this chapter stating that teachers would be placed in each district in order to teach sixteen and seventeen year old students. There is no explanation offered by the Rabbis regarding the specificity of this particular age group. This last ruling is the most clear in terms of the roles of the father and teacher. In this version the father is clearly outside of the educational process and the teacher is central. The text then discusses the situation of a teacher becoming angry with his student. The student simply rejects the authority of the teacher and leaves.

The inclusion of the Isaiah quote with this (Baba Batra) text only heightens the understanding that the establishment of these new schools were at an ideal level and not at the level of complete compliance across the entire community. The final chapter of this section of the thesis contains a detailed discussion regarding the possibility that these laws and enactments may not have been seen as hard and fast rules but rather as ideals.

A further development in the educational system occurs with Yehoshua ben Gamla's ruling that teachers of children should be placed in each district within every city. The text states that children aged six or seven would be enrolled to learn with these teachers. This ruling makes two significant changes. First, it requires a greater number of teachers to be installed in a greater number of locations. The Rabbis may have intended for more teachers to be available and more students eligible for learning with them. Second, the Rabbis lower the age of entering students from their late teens to age six or seven. While there is no explanation for this change in entry age, it would seem, from the preceding example given in the text that the Rabbis may have found that age seventeen is a difficult time for students to enter into a structured learning environment.

EMERGING METHODOLOGY WITHIN SCHOOLS

Regarding the age of the children in Baba Batra 21a, Rav said to Rav Shmuel bar Shilat, 'do not accept a child before age six. From six on accept him and fill him [with knowledge of Torah] like you would a ploughing ox.' The text now turns to managing the

behavior and learning styles of the children. Rav said to Rav Shmuel bar Shilat, 'when striking a child only strike him with a shoelace. If he reads, he reads, if he does not read, allow him to stay with his group of friends.' The Rabbis seem to be establishing important educational parameters. They believe that six is the ideal age to begin one's education and at that point to aggressively educate the child. At the same time that they advocate the use of a 'strong hand' they also warn against harsh discipline. Physically, they issue the prohibition against striking the child and pedagogically they also offer guidelines. They seem to be saying that different children learn different subjects at different rates. One interpretation of the advice about the child who is challenged by reading is that he should not be pushed and should not be ostracized. Another interpretation is that the child who is having difficulty reading should be placed with his friends, not abandoned. Possibly his friends will have a positive influence on his progress.

At this point the text of Baba Batra 21a returns to its original theme of the use of communal space and then discusses Yehoshua ben Gamla's rulings regarding education in more detail. Rava said,

'from Yehoshua ben Gamla's ruling and onwards one may not take a student from town to town [in order to study with a teacher] but it is permissible to take a child from one synagogue to another. If a river separates two regions it is not permitted to take the child. If there is a bridge one may take him. If that bridge is only a plank, he may not be taken.'

It is clear from this discussion that while Yehoshua ben Gamla's previous ruling sought to place a greater number of teachers in more locations there were still people discussing the issue of the appropriate distance and route which you could take a child in order to learn from a teacher.

This section of the text also reveals the struggle, at least in theory, between the welfare of the student as opposed to the requirement of the student to attend school.

There were not yet schools in every area within easy commuting distance for all children. The Rabbis set out some guidelines for parents to know how far a child was to travel and what obstacles were permitted to be crossed and which were too demanding. The Rabbis do not explain what is to be done with a student who lives too far away from a school or teacher.

The next methodological element page 21a of the Baba Batra text addresses is one of class size and teacher-student ratio. Rava said, 'the number for primary school teachers (מקרי דודק) is twenty five children. If there are fifty we place two teachers. If there are forty we place an assistant (ריש דוכנא - superintendent of the platform) and support is given.' The term for primary school teacher and teacher's assistant are used here without any introduction or explanation. The concern with limitations placed on the teacher unites this discussion with the previous topic of limits placed on the students. It is unclear what is meant when the Rabbis state that support will be given. This support may have been in the form of additional supervision, it may have referred to compensation, some form of benefits or status or it may have been mentioned in words only in an attempt to foster a better image of the position of teacher.

It is unclear in this discussion exactly how the Rabbis meant these numbers to be utilized. It is possible that twenty five was meant to be the maximum size of a class for one teacher. It is also possible that this reflected the average number of students the teachers at the time felt comfortable teaching. Another likely possibility was that the twenty five represented a minimum number necessary to justify the hiring of a teacher. The text only speaks of numbers of twenty five and higher leading one to believe that these might have been the numbers about which the communities most commonly encountered. Of course it is also possible that the Rabbis were simply setting out guidelines for teachers without connection to practical experience.

The text continues with an argument over different qualities a teacher must possess. A discussion regarding two teachers with different abilities and strengths reveals elements of what the Rabbis thought was important pedagogically. Rava said, 'if there is one teacher teaching (דגריט) and another teacher teaching at a faster rate, do not remove him (the slower) for he (the faster) may then become slower.' Rav Dimi from Nehardea said in possible disagreement with Rava, 'the threat of removal will only encourage the slower teacher to improve his practices, jealous scholars gain wisdom.' Rava said, 'if there are two teachers of children; one teaches quickly without care and one with care but not quickly, we prefer the one who is quick but not exact.' He bases this decision on the theory that, 'mistakes will eventually be corrected.' Rav Dimi disagreed with Rava declaring, 'he would prefer the careful to the quick teacher.' He states his general theory, 'mistakes that enter will remain.' The text proceeds to illustrate the potential results of the two different positions with an example based on a verse from Scripture. The example is from I Kings 11:16:

כִּי שֵׁשֶׁת חֳדָשִׁים יָשָׁב יוֹאָב וְכָל-יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד-הַכְרִית כָּל-זָכָר בְּאֶדְוֹם:

'For six months Joab remained there with all Israel, until he had cut off every male in Edom.' After killing all of the men of Edom the text of the Talmud states that Yoav appeared before David and David said to Yaov, "Why did you do this?" He said to him, "Because it is written," in Deuteronomy 25:19:

וְהָיָה בְּהֵנִיחַ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְךָ מְכַל-אֹיְבֶיךָ מִסָּבִיב בְּאֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר-יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ וְנָחֳלָה לְךָ שְׂמָתָה תִּמְחָה:

אֶת-זָכָר עֲמֹלֶק מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם לֹא תִשְׁכַּח:

'Therefore it shall be, when Adonai your God has given you rest from all your enemies around, in the land which Adonai your God gives you for an inheritance to possess, that you shall blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; you shall not forget it.' David declared that in this verse the word זָכָר is understood as the memory of

Amalek. At this point Yoav discovered that there was a possibility that he misunderstood the verse in the Torah. Yoav responded that he was taught that the word meant the males of Amalek. Yoav turned to his teacher who stated that the word should be read as the memory of Amalek. It is unclear at the end of the passage whether Yoav kills his teacher or lets him live. This narrative seems to support the theory of Rav Dimi. Yoav, in the story, seems to assert that his teacher was not precise in his teaching of the Bible, leaving Yoav with a poor understanding of the text that was never corrected and in this case led to fatal mistakes.

This story within the Talmudic text explains both the tremendous responsibility of teachers as well as the underlying opinion of the Rabbis that indeed teaching thoroughly is more important than teaching quickly or covering more material. In an effort to offer its own conclusion to the narrative the text continues with Rava saying, 'a teacher of children, a vine planter, a butcher, a bloodletter and the scribe all have been forewarned.' All of these positions in the society have community wide responsibilities. If they do not fulfil their jobs or violate the terms of their positions they are held to a higher level of responsibility. According to the Rabbis, the teacher who did not properly instruct Yoav was liable to some extent for the killings Yoav committed.

Once teachers and schools become commonplace, well after the destruction of the Second Temple, a norm of sending children to school begins to be encouraged in the Rabbinic literature. Again, due to the lack of evidence, it is impossible to know what percentage of any given community were following these rulings. What is possible to conclude by this stage is that the father was no longer the sole person capable of providing children with their education. Beyond this, the education children were receiving began to change as well.

Parents were publicly notified and made to realize that the religious obligation of teaching their children Torah could be discharged properly only by sending their boys to these elementary

schools where they would be given instruction daily by fully qualified and competent teachers. Those who refused to heed this advice were ostracized to a certain extent by the Jewish community which named them contemptuously *am haaretz*, (Berakoth 47b and Kiddushin 41a) "people of the country" or better "common, ignorant people."⁵

In the time of the Second Temple and in later years the Rabbis describe several classes of people. One that was mentioned frequently in Rabbinic literature was the *Am Haaretz*. This class of people was not considered to be learned but also not especially sinful or negligent of the law. One of the issues the Rabbis were concerned about was this segment of the society's potential neglect of the obligation to teach their children.

Who is an *Am Haaretz*? Whoever is unable to read the chapter of Shma in the evening and morning prayers...and whoever has sons and does not raise them in the study of Torah.⁶

On an ideal level the Rabbis may have desired to enable the entire community to increase their opportunities to learn and study. In practice, the text seems to portray a community within which only a segment of the population was learning with a teacher or attending school.

ECONOMIC ISSUES CONCERNING INSTITUTIONALIZED EDUCATION

The assumption of the Great Assembly that children would receive a complete elementary and secondary education from the hands of their parents did not work out in practice. Based on a strict reading of the law as stated in Kiddushin 29b, orphaned children were entirely deprived of an education. Similarly, many children whose fathers were living would also be neglected because the parents were too preoccupied in their daily work earning a livelihood, or because the fathers themselves might not be conversant with the elements of Jewish learning. In addition, since the students had to take care of their living expenses while in Jerusalem and also since the colleges charged

⁵Ibid., p. 46.

⁶BT Brachot 47b

an admission fee, children of poor parents or orphans could not hope to gain admission into the colleges. The Talmudic statement from Baba Batra 21a, "he that had a father was brought by him there to be taught," refers to the father who was able to provide his son, firstly, with a complete preparatory education, and, secondly, with enough money to enable him to meet all expenses while attending the school of higher learning in Jerusalem.⁷

Developing a national, compulsory system of education for children had many different implications throughout the entire society. One of the implications that the Rabbis wrote about was economic. The educational changes may have been initiated to enable more children to achieve a greater level of education but they also brought with them an additional expense or burden. The Rabbis discussed this issue both from the perspective of families having to decide whether they could afford to send their children to a teacher or school as well as teachers struggling with issues of salary.

In the Jerusalem Talmud Nedarim 4:38c the text states,

'Behold I have taught you statutes and judgments [as the Lord my God commanded me]' (Deuteronomy 4:5) - just as I taught you gratuitously, so you also [should teach] gratuitously. This might possibly also relate to Bible and Targum? It has been taught: 'statutes and judgments' you shall teach gratuitously, but you do not teach '*mikra*' and '*targum*' gratuitously. And indeed we see *mashnim* who take a salary. Rabbi Ishmael said: They take compensation for refraining from labor.

Possibly because of teaching's origins having been with the father in the home, the Rabbis hesitated to pay teachers a salary directly for teaching. There may have been a communal sense that one does not earn money for doing something that has been done without pay for so long. Because of this thinking, the Rabbis in the previous passage declare that teachers are compensated, not for teacher, but for refraining from partaking in other forms of labor.

⁷BT Baba Batra 21a

In an effort to clarify what might be seen as an unsettled issue, Rabbi Shimon ben Yohai in the Jerusalem Talmud Hagigah 1:76c taught, "If you see towns in the Land of Israel that have been uprooted, know that it is because they did not provide for the salary of teachers of Torah and Mishnah." The Rabbis reveal some of the tension that might have existed in their midst as well as within the larger Jewish populations regarding the educational change that was taking place. Was teaching a profession that was meant to be entered into in a manner similar to the tradition of father instructing his son or were these educational innovations meant to create a new attitude and approach to education throughout the community? These questions will be addressed in the following chapter detailing the roles of the father, son and teacher in the wake of these educational reforms.

CHAPTER SIX

EDUCATIONAL ROLES AND VALUES: FATHER, STUDENT AND TEACHER

The Bible, as has been discussed earlier, states in Exodus, Deuteronomy and Proverbs that the father is obligated to teach his son (and in some cases, includes the mother in this role). In Rabbinic literature we learn that this obligation is supplemented or possibly replaced by the gradual installation of teachers. They first appear in Jerusalem and then in larger scope throughout the wider Jewish community. The Rabbis do not provide any detailed description of the educational framework, but instead provide a small glimpse into selected areas. The Rabbis do not explain the transition of the role of educator from father to teacher. The Rabbis do not state that fathers were unable to educate or were failing to educate their children. At the same time, they do not explain that their motive was to improve the education offered to children. Similarly, the Rabbis make little if any connection between the overlap that might take place between the education offered to children by their fathers and then by outside teachers.

In an effort to fill the void surrounding this transition, we will explore the way Rabbinic literature discusses the relationship between teacher and student. The Rabbis demand that children relate to their teachers in a fashion that seems to be modeled after their obligations to their parents. The examples below might also raise the issue of how the relationship between child and parent changes as institutionalized education evolves.

A Baraita in Kiddushin 29b explores the father's need to study as opposed to his obligation to teach (or provide instruction) for his son. The text states that if it is a question of the father or the son, the father is to study first. Rabbi Yehuda qualifies this statement by adding that if the son shows promise as a student he should be sent to study

before the father. The Talmud inserts a story to illustrate the exception introduced by Rabbi Yehuda. Rav Yaakov the son of Rav Acha bar Yaakov was sent to study Torah with Abaye. When the son returned home the father realized that his son did not grasp well enough the material he had been sent to study. As a result, the father said to his son, "I prefer to go and you should remain here."

This Baraita acknowledges that there was an accepted alternate to the strict interpretation of Deuteronomy 6:7 and 11:19. Fathers did not have to literally teach their sons, rather it was permissible to send one's son to a teacher to learn and still fulfill one's obligation. The Baraita also acknowledges the nuance that a father is unable to teach his son if he himself does not have a sufficient education. The Baraita supports this assertion by stating originally that the father must learn before the son. Additionally, this raises the possibility of families with both a father and a son who desired to leave the family in order to learn. For many reasons such as family stability, security and finances as well as larger community obligations it may not have been possible for both men to leave. This may have been the subtext behind the discussion of how to respond to the possibility of both father and son seeking to study.

Rabbi Yehuda's statement favoring the son over the father may reflect some type of communal reality as well. Beyond the issue of limited resources discussed above, Yehuda may have been indicating a possible reluctance for fathers to leave the family and study. Yehuda may also have felt that the investment in the young who showed promise and desire to learn would be the best investment with limited resources.

The son's return from his training reveals several other noteworthy elements. The father is able to recognize that his son does not have a sufficient command over the material he was sent to learn. Up to this point the specific level of the father's education has not been revealed. One might conclude that a father who sends his son away to study did so because he himself was not able to teach his son for a variety of reasons. This

narrative within the text reveals that the father had enough prior training to be able to identify his son's deficiencies. One possible conclusion that can be drawn from this story is that sons are taught up to some basic level by their fathers and then sent away for more advanced study [provide source here for this theory]. This leads to the understanding that fathers are sending their sons to others for training. It is not clear from this text why fathers would send the sons away but the text does seem to imply that it is not because the fathers lack the knowledge to teach their children.

In describing the son's lack of mastery over his studies the text utilizes the word מְיָחָדֵן. This word means well studied, well versed or able to answer questions. The root יָחַד is defined as; to be sharp or pointed.¹ It is important to note the Rabbi's choice of this specific word to describe the student's preparation. He was not considered well versed or sharp enough and it was the father who made this determination. The use of this specific word is noteworthy because of its relationship to the root שָׁנָה. Deuteronomy 6:7 uses שָׁנָה to command the father to teach his son. One page later, in Kiddushin 30a, the text takes up the topic of the meaning and relevance of this verse. This repetition of different words with the same meaning, to sharpen, may have reflected a pedagogical practice utilized in Talmudic times. Sharp may also reveal a connection not only to cognitive learning but to practice as well. Many of the laws and rules a student learned would be meant for practice. The physical understanding of the word sharp might relate to how well a student was able to transfer his cognitive understanding of a lesson into actual practice. Proverbs 27:17 makes use of the root יָחַד in comparing how metal can be sharpened to the process of people "sharpening" one another.

בְּרִיךְ הַבְּרִיךְ יְחַד וְאִישׁ יְחַד פְּנֵי-רֵעֵהוּ:

¹Marcus Jastrow. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1992. p. 425.

'Iron sharpens iron and a man sharpens (the face of) his neighbor.'

There is even less written in the Rabbinic period regarding the educational obligations of the son in relation to his teacher whether that be the father or an outside person. It is relatively clear that the Rabbis prefer that a child receive his education from a professional teacher. This may be in addition to the education offered by the father but the Rabbis view as ideal the attendance at a school for all children. Goldman confirms this and explains the reason a teacher may receive preferential treatment by stating that the honor due to a teacher was viewed almost the same as the reverence due to the Divine and therefore demanded such precedence over the father.² From this level of devotion comes the idea of *shimush ha-rav*. Students who attended schools spent most of their days with their Rabbis. When they were not studying, they had various responsibilities towards them, such as walking with them, traveling with them, buying, preparing and serving their food, helping them in the bath house, and visiting them if incarcerated, among other things. All of these services had to be provided with the utmost respect, in a befitting manner that would not embarrass the Rabbi. *Shimush ha-rav* seems to delineate clear lines of authority and subordination.

Some of the behaviors required of students in relation to their teachers parallel similar behaviors required of children in respect to their parents. In Mishnah Baba Metzia 2:11 the Rabbis raise the issue of the possibility of competing or conflicting duties that a student may have to his father and teacher. The Rabbis do not explicitly state their beliefs regarding the general or universal allegiances of the student to the teacher over the father but in three isolated situations they do state that the student should look after the needs of the teacher before the father.

The Mishnah is concerned with the obligations of a young man, his father and his

²Israel M. Goldman, *Lifelong Learning Among Jews: Adult Education in Judaism from Biblical Times to the Twentieth Century*, (Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1975) , p.53.

teacher when each of them has lost a piece of property.

If the question is between the student's lost property or that of his teacher's, the student's takes precedence. Between his father's and his teacher's, his teacher's takes precedence. His father brought him into this world, but his teacher that taught him wisdom will bring him into the world to come. But if his father is a sage, his father's lost property takes precedence. If his father and his teacher were carrying a load, he relieves the burden of his teacher and then afterwards that of his father. If his father and his teacher were held captive, the student is to ransom his teacher first and then afterward ransom his father. But if his father were a sage, ransom the father first and afterward ransom the teacher.³

The Mishnah seems to be saying that, at least in these situations, the student's attention and concern is to his teacher before his father. The text provides justification in one place, while the father was responsible for bringing the student into this world, the teacher has the responsibility of ensuring the student's place in the world to come. The status of scholar prevails over that of father as the Rabbis seem to view the potential impact of the teacher upon the student as more significant than the impact of the father. The Rabbis seem to be saying that the higher the rank of teacher, the more important the status within the life of the student.

The Babylonian Talmud elaborates on the discussion of the different obligations a student has to his father and teacher in a Baraita found in Baba Metzia 33a.

If his father and his teacher were carrying a load, etc....The Rabbis taught in a Baraita, the teacher that was referred to by the Rabbis was the teacher that taught him (the son) wisdom and not the teacher that taught him Scripture and Mishnah. These are the words of Rabbi Meir. Rabbi Yehuda says, it is regarding the teacher from whom one learned the majority of his wisdom. Rabbi Yossi says, even if one clarified only one Mishnah he is considered his teacher....Ulla said: Scholars from Babylonia stood for one another, rent their garments for one another but regarding the lost object (found in the domain of) the father, they did not return it unless it belonged to their teacher.

If it had been unclear up to this point the Rabbis make the unequivocal statement in this section of the text that the allegiance of the student goes to the person who is

³Mishnah Baba Metzia 2:11

teaching him. In the time of the Torah this person may have been understood as the father, but in the Talmudic era the student's allegiance, as depicted by the Rabbis, has firmly shifted to the teacher.

The Talmudic text takes the role of the teacher one step closer to that of parent with this example from the Babylonian Talmud Avodah Zarah 19a-b. Referring to Psalms 1:3 the text states,

Those of the school of Rabbi Jannai said, 'a tree transplanted,' not, 'a tree planted' - [which implies] whoever learns Torah from one master only will never achieve signs of blessing. Rabbi Hisda said to the students: I have a mind to tell you something, though I fear that you might leave me and go elsewhere: Whoever learns Torah from one master only will never achieve signs of blessing. They did leave him and went before Rabbah, who explained to them that the expression only applies to lessons of logical equations, as to oral traditions it is better to learn from one master only, so that one is not confused by the variation in the terms used.

The Rabbis struggle in this passage with the difficulty of separating from one's students. Just as parents have a difficult time acknowledging a child who has matured, so too the Rabbis of the Talmud.

OBLIGATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER AND STUDENT

Moshe Aberbach's book, *החינוך היהודי בתקופת המשנה והתלמוד*, provides an extensive, comprehensive account of the teacher-student relationship in Talmudic literature. Teachers and students both had particular obligations to each other, whether formal and methodological or informal and interpersonal in nature. Most of these obligations were particular to either students or teachers, though a few of them, such as accompanying one's teacher/student into exile, endangering one's life to save the other, caring for the sick teacher/student, and even standing in honor of one's teacher/student, were mutual obligations.⁴ This mutuality even extended to the seemingly clearly outlined

⁴Moshe Aberbach, "The Relations Between Master and Disciple in the Talmudic Age," in *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. H.J. Zimmels, J. Rabinowitz, and I. Finstein, (Soncino Press Limited, London, 1967)

roles of teacher as instructor and student as learner. Every learner was expected to be a teacher and every teacher a learner.⁵ "Rabbi said, 'I learned much from my teachers, and even more from my colleagues, but most from my disciples.'⁶

Included in the methodological obligations of the teacher were the qualities of a persistent, patient, guide who could become angry when a student misbehaved and criticize when necessary. Teachers were required to provide their students with stimulating lectures that would encourage them to learn. Students in turn, were warned not to ask questions that might embarrass their teachers. For example, students were not permitted to ask a teacher a question if they knew he did not know the answer. Yet, on the other hand, they were *required* to ask a question if they did not understand a particular subject.⁷ They had to take a certain amount of responsibility for their own learning.

But beyond the particulars of a formal learning setting, there existed many more guidelines for the interpersonal relationship that would develop between teacher and student. This relationship between the Rabbi and his disciple has been described by many as a father-son relationship, in which the Rabbi even referred to his student as 'בני.⁸ In many cases we see that in fact the student treats his teacher as he would his father and furthermore gives precedence to his teacher over his father in various situations, such as offering a ransom or carrying a burden (for more detail see section relating to the student's obligation to father and teacher). As stated earlier, the teachers also had to treat their students with respect; they were obligated to care for sick students, and comfort them in mourning. However, they did not have to serve their students. The status of teacher and student was very clear. Students did not call their Rabbis by name. But

⁵Israel M. Goldman, p. 50.

⁶BT Makkot 10a

⁷Moshe Aberbach, *החינוך היהודי בתקופת המשנה והתלמוד*, (Reuven Mass Publishers, Jerusalem, 1983), p.128-9.

⁸Moshe Aberbach, "The Relations Between Master and Disciple in the Talmudic Age," p. 1.

despite or perhaps in spite of this hierarchical relationship, there is evidence that points to a very close relationship between teacher and student.

Here begs the question, "Was this the intent of the Torah in obligating fathers to teach their sons? Can the same be said for the relationship between the Rabbis and their students?" Jewish scholars for the most part have not dealt with this particular question. One who does address this issue in a more general way is Boyarin. In his book, *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in the Talmudic Culture*, Boyarin highlights a *sugyah* from Baba Metzia to support his contention that the Rabbis were expressing an "enormous anxiety about the reproduction of men in the Rabbinic culture."⁹ In his treatment of the *sugyah* he deals with the question asked at the beginning of the paragraph. Was there an aspect to the Rabbinic teacher-student relationship that was on a more personal level? But he goes further than just this question and asks why the relationship was such. His analysis of the *sugyah* is fascinating and sheds light on the concept of the teacher-student relationship within the Talmud.

Boyarin claims that the Rabbis were extremely anxious about ensuring their continuity and therefore the continuity of the tradition. They viewed their relationships with their students within the context of a father-son relationship.

The signifier or biological filiation has a strong anchoring in the values of the [Rabbinic] culture. As such, the rabbinic mantle should have passed from father to son, as does the crown of priesthood. But it doesn't, at least not in any straight-forward way. On the one hand, the Rabbis have created a sort of meritocracy to replace the religious aristocracy that the Bible ordains. Filiation is no longer from father to son but from teacher to disciple. But the desire that genetic replicability be homologous with pedagogical replicability persists.¹⁰

The Rabbis were not confident that they would produce high caliber progeny. They therefore chose a different path to try to ensure their continuity. They chose their

⁹Daniel Boyarin, *Carnal Israel*, p.198.

¹⁰George MacDonald Ross, "Socrates Versus Plato: The Origins and Development of Socratic Thinking," in *Journal of the Institute of Education*, #14, 1993, p. 17.

students. All of the energy and devotion that they would have showered on their sons, they bring to their students. Boyarin relates the story of Rabbi Yohanan and Resh Lakish in order to concretize this theory. Rabbi Yohanan is bathing in the Jordan when Resh Lakish arrives on the scene. Resh Lakish vaults himself to the other side of the Jordan and engages in a brief conversation with Rabbi Yohanan. Rabbi Yohanan convinces Resh Lakish (through a deal in which Resh Lakish would get Rabbi Yohanan's sister in marriage) to return with him to be his student. Resh Lakish loses his physical strength and becomes the ideal man as a Torah scholar. According to Boyarin, Rabbi Yohanan has succeeded in creating a spiritual copy of himself.

ELISHA BEN ABUYAH AND RABBI MEIR: AN EXAMPLE OF A TEACHER STUDENT RELATIONSHIP

As mentioned above, part of this chapter deals specifically with the story of Elisha ben Abuyah, one of the four Rabbis to enter the legendary *pardes*. While much has been written on this Talmudic story, I will focus on the relationship between Rabbi Meir and his teacher, Elisha ben Abuyah after his exit from the *pardes*. What roles do each of them play? Do their words and actions reflect an adherence to the prescribed norms of teacher-student relationships?

How does the relationship between Elisha ben Abuyah and Rabbi Meir reflect any of the elements mentioned by Aberbach and Goldman? How does their relationship fit into Boyarin's claim of the Rabbis' insecurity regarding their continuity. The interactions between Elisha ben Abuyah and Rabbi Meir are few but rich. They are found in several different places including the Babylonian Talmud Haggigah 14b-15b and Palestinian Talmud Haggigah 2.1, Ruth Rabbah VI:4 and Kohelet Rabbah VII:8.

Here, I will deal with the story as presented in the Palestinian Talmud. For the purposes of this thesis, I will only look at the individual sections of the larger story in the Palestinian Talmud in an attempt to gain a picture of the relationship between this teacher-turned-heretic and his devoted student.

The portions that I will focus on in most detail are those sections of dialogue between Elisha and Meir; in addition, I will relate to the description of Elisha's illness and death. (The full section appears in Hebrew in the appendix.) The *sugyah* begins with the story of the four who went into the *pardes*. One died, one went crazy, one became a heretic, and one came out in peace. Elisha ben Abuyah is traditionally regarded as the one who came out of the *pardes* a heretic. In the Palestinian Talmud he is referred to as *Aher*. Rabbi Meir, we know, was a student of both Akiva and Elisha.

The *sugyah* opens with the story of the *pardes* and is followed by some negative stories about Elisha. Following these stories comes this passage:¹¹

Rabbi Meir was sitting teaching in the schoolhouse of Tiberias. Elisha, his master, passed by, riding on a horse on the Sabbath day. They came and said to him, "Look, your master is outside." He stopped his teaching and went out to him.

He said to him, "What were you expounding today?"

[Meir] said to him, "And the Lord blessed the latter days of Job more than his beginning." (Job 42:12)

Elisha said to him, "With what [verse] did you begin to expound it?"

He said to him, "And the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before," (Job 42:10) for he doubled for him all his wealth....

He said to him, "And what else have you been expounding?"

He said to him, "Gold and glass cannot equal it." (Job 28:17)

He said to him, "How did you begin to expound it?"

He said to him, "The words of Torah are hard to acquire like vessels of gold but easy to lose like vessels of glass. Just as vessels of gold and glass, when they are broken, can be repaired and become as they [originally] were, so a scholar who forgets his learning can turn and learn it [again] at the beginning."

¹¹Palestinian Talmud Haggigah 2:1 (Trans. from J. Neusner)

Here the "*shiur*" ends and Elisha, suddenly, without responding in his usual manner of quoting Akiva, falls further into teacher mode.

He said to him, "[You have gone] far enough, Meir. Here is the Sabbath limit."

He said to him, "How do you know it?"

He said to him, "From the steps [lit. hooves] of my horse which I am counting; he has gone two thousand cubits."

Even without the information provided us by Aberbach and Goldman, it is clear that Elisha and Meir shared a special relationship, one that seems typical of the Rabbinic ideal. As soon as Meir is told that his master is riding by (even though he is riding by on Shabbat) he puts down his own teaching and rushes out to greet him. (In addition, after Elisha's death, Meir is asked whether, in the world to come he will visit first his father or his master. Meir responds that first he will visit his master and then his father.) Meir has taken on the 'profession,' of his master. There is no greater testimony of respect and admiration one could pay to his teacher than to dedicate his own life to teaching. Just as a parent would be proud if a child entered into his or her profession, indicating some level of admiration and respect, so too a teacher must be extremely satisfied at this indication of success.

The verbal exchanges between the two end in a very odd way. Meir speaks of vessels of gold and glass, which, once broken, can be repaired, and compares them to a scholar who forgets his learning, but can regain it. It is evident to Elisha what Meir is implying. Instead of responding to the quote directly, Elisha indicates that Meir must stop because he has reached the edge of the Sabbath limit. Meir, in a final attempt to convince Elisha to do *teshuva*, cries out, "You have all this wisdom, yet you do not repent!" Elisha confirms his words, insisting that there is not *teshuva* for Elisha ben Abuyah -- it has been determined *min hashamayim*. This is an argument that Meir will have difficulty

opposing.

This is the last interaction between the two contained in the text. Meir takes it upon himself to care for Elisha when he becomes ill and finally, when he dies, Meir continues to fight for the honor of his master's name.

I contend that the relationship between Elisha ben Abuyah and Rabbi Meir is an excellent example of the Rabbinic ideal, even though Elisha left the fold. Meir always relates to Elisha with the utmost respect, even when he is angry and frustrated with him. Elisha is allowed to be sharp with Meir and is so as he quotes Akiva. Furthermore, we see Meir accompany Elisha to his death bed. He will not even leave his beloved teacher at this final moment. One might think that the rules regarding teacher-student relationship would not be relevant if one's teacher became a heretic and degraded those very rules. Urbach claims that, "all questions of honour and status fell away perforce, wherever there was any danger of desecrating the Divine Name."¹² Whether Elisha's status as heretic connoted a desecration of the divine name is debatable, but here we see that the relationship was too close and intimate for Meir to treat his master in any other way.

EDUCATION AS AN IDEAL

While it is helpful to closely examine one relationship between teacher and student to learn more about educational values and practices, we can not assume that every relationship between teacher and student followed that of Elisha and Meir. As mentioned earlier in part two, there is a question among scholars as to the extent to which these educational practices were actually followed. Did the Rabbis intend for all of the educational rulings to be taken literally? Did they intend the rulings for the entire society or just a fraction? If choices had to be in terms of educational practice or participation, how would these decisions be made? Based on a close reading of the text, Drazin and

¹²Ephraim Urbach, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs*, (The Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1979) p.630.

Goldin, among others, conclude that most of these educational rulings were understood as ideal goals rather than strict legal rulings. Education was espoused by the Rabbis as an ideal as opposed to legal commandment that was required to be fulfilled to the letter of the law. "The survey of the educational ideals of the periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim revealed the close relationship existing then between education and the ideal good life."¹³

Needless to say, what such statements [regarding the importance of learning] reflect is an ideal, perhaps in truth so lofty an ideal, that even most of those who would assent to it cheerfully, would be unable to fulfill it. The significant thing, however, is that so extreme or hyperbolic a demand is not a priori dismissed as a manifest impossibility and therefore not to be taken seriously, or therefore to be excluded from codified programs for human conduct. A man's reach must exceed his grasp, or what's the Talmud for. In other words, the significant thing about the Talmudic views which Maimonides adopts and organizes is that they do serve as ideals, that they are regarded as *feasible*.¹⁴

It is also important to acknowledge that any significant change that is accepted on some level within an entire community, requires a significant amount of time before implementation is seen among the entire spectrum of the population. At the outset, the changes are understood by the Rabbis and the larger communities as being ideal. Gradually, as we saw with some of the language of the Rabbinic literature, stronger wording appears making education change towards a requirement rather than suggestion. What may have been seen as a radical shift away from one practice towards a new one eventually is accepted and given widespread approval throughout the community.

In examining the Rabbinic literature concerning the father, son and teacher we learn that the relationship between father and son is, to a significant extent, mirrored

¹³Nathan Drazin. *History of Jewish Education: From 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 1940, p. 27.

¹⁴J. Goldin, "Several Sidelights of a Torah Education in Tannaite and Early Amoraic Times," in: *Ex Orbe Religionum, Studia Geo Widengren Oblata*, Leiden 1972 pp. 176-191 (reprinted in H.Z. Dimitrovsky, ed., *Exploring the Talmud*, vol. 1, Education, NY 1976, pp. 3-18. P. 177.

between teacher and student. At the same time, emphasis shifts from the son's loyalty to the father towards increased loyalty to the teacher, even if the son is forced to choose between the two. What is unclear about this evidence is to what extent the texts reflect reality and to what extent the Rabbinic literature reflects ideals put forth by the Rabbinic authors. Isolated narratives within the texts are informative but can not be relied upon to provide conclusive information about either the relationship between father and son or between teacher and student.

CONCLUSION

אֲשֶׁר בָּנֵינוּ כְּנֹטְעִים מִגְדָּלִים בְּנוֹעָרֵיהֶם...

"Our sons are as plants grown up in their youth."¹

The Bible and later the Rabbinic literature places emphasis on the instruction of the children. The person responsible for the teaching varies as does the proscribed methodology. However, all throughout the Biblical and Rabbinic literature the analogy from Psalms remains relevant. Children are depicted as the focus of educational efforts. How they should be educated (how the plants are to be watered) and who is responsible for the watering changes within the texts. Additionally, the Rabbis reveal a developing understanding of who the child is as well as the depth of the relationship between teacher and student.

The only teachers mentioned explicitly in all of the Biblical literature are the parents. Learning is described in many different settings with a wide array of subject matter. Some scholars believe that the Biblical language implies the existence of teachers despite the fact that it never mentions them with specific language. There is no mention of schools in the Bible but again some scholars believe that some children were being taught by teachers in addition to their fathers. The foundation for instruction in the Biblical period was most definitely the learning that took place in and around the home carried out by the mother or father. The most essential subject matter was essential to everyday life. Learning was not something done for its own sake or to improve oneself but rather to fulfill one's obligations and continue traditional practices. Unlike the Talmudic literature, we do not have descriptions of the methodology employed by fathers in the teaching of their children. It is my belief that some aspect of the learning took place

¹Psalms 144:12

through deliberate instruction while another portion of education was conducted through the modeling of practices and rituals.

This individualistic principle [of the father's obligation to teach his children] dominated Jewish education, as far as its material organisation was concerned, throughout the Talmudic period and for long afterwards.²

The centrality of the role of the father is largely confirmed and built upon throughout the Rabbinic literature. Teachers are introduced and schools are defined but these institutions are predicated on the assumption that fathers are continuing to provide their sons with an educational foundation. The father is described as the only teacher eligible to teach his son Scripture. Only after the son has mastered this subject, with his father, will be able to go on to more advanced studies. The Rabbis did not develop an entirely novel educational system. This leads me to conclude that the reasons for the changes were not solely due to a widespread failure on the part of the father. Instead, I believe the demands of the educational goals grew to be too much for any one person, especially a parent already charged with many responsibilities.

In the Bible the child is mostly loved, sometimes hated, seldom understood. Methods of discipline are usually of a negative kind: suppression and restraint by means of the rod. At the best restraint takes the form of rebuke. In the Talmud we meet for the first time with the effort to understand the child, to awaken his interest, to win his active sympathy.³

Morris' assertion shares the same lack of justification with the Talmudic texts. The Talmud introduces educational developments and progressions but does not describe the reasons behind these changes. Socio-political forces must have had an effect which most likely forced people to develop an understanding of the child. The separation between home based education and school based learning may not have necessarily been in the

²Nathan Morris, *The Jewish School: An Introduction to the History of Jewish Education*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode 1937. p. 42.

³Ibid., p. 220-1.

best interests of the child, rather in the best interests of society and institutionalized education. The Bible contributes to the world of education a holistic, natural family based model. The Talmud brings a greater understanding of the person being educated, a definition of the process and institution but also an accompanying depersonalization and sense of constructed atmosphere as opposed to the more natural and familiar setting of the Bible.

The motives of the Rabbis may have been to develop an educational system that enabled all people, regardless of geographic location, economic background or social status to advance their learning. The establishment of schools and professional teachers inevitably made advanced learning more accessible. However, the institutionalization may also have contributed to the creation of a class of people who were more learned and more likely to participate in this institutionalization of learning. The Rabbinic texts do not speak about the absolute numbers of the population that may have participated in the developing educational system. Despite the fact that many of the references to the educational system speak of compulsory involvement, the references to the uneducated members of the community lead one to conclude that the entire community was not participating in the educational system. It seems to be evident that the Rabbis had constructed a system with the goal of ensuring that their scholarship and tradition would be maintained.

Learning and teaching were essential values of the Jewish people with roots found in the earliest Biblical texts and scattered throughout almost every important writing from that period onward. The Rabbis might not have been able to create a system that encouraged or enabled the entire society to reach the lofty goals they espoused. What they did create was a system that ensured that at least some aspect of the population continued learning. It was far from a perfect system. Such a small amount of evidence is at our disposal that an attempt to examine the development of the educational system

results in the generation of many more questions than answers.

Instead of understanding education as a tool fundamentally necessary to live one's life as it was in the time of the Bible, education becomes a mechanism for the Rabbis, not to preserve life, but to preserve Jewish life. Education becomes the system relied upon to preserve Jewish life in the absence of obvious physical and tangible signs of Jewish life. In the wake of the destruction of the central focus of the Jewish world, the Temple, the Rabbis resort to a system that was previously effective at passing on information from one generation to the next within families. They widen this understanding to attempt to pass on information from one generation to the next on the community wide level.

The subject matter is broader, the personnel are more widely defined and the system becomes more complex. The Rabbis might have realized that education is more complicated than the mere watering of a plant. At the same time, just as plants require water, the Jewish community requires a functioning system of education.

1. Sifre Deuteronomy Piska 310

ספרי דברים פסקא שי

(ז) זכור ימות עולם, אמר להם הזכרו מה שעשיתי לדורות הראשונים מה שעשיתי לאנשי דור המבול ומה שעשיתי לאנשי דור הפלגה ומה שעשיתי לאנשי סדום בינו שנות דור ודור, אין לך דור שאין בו כאנשי דור המבול ואין לך דור שאין בו כאנשי סדום אלא שנרון כל אחד ואחד לפי מעשיו.

שאל אביך ויגדך, אלו נביאים כענין שנאמר +מ"ב ב יב+ ואלישע רואה וחוא מצנח אבי אבי, זקניך ויאמרו לך, אלו זקנים כענין שנאמר +במדבר יא טז+ אספה לך שכעים איש מזקני ישראל.

דבר אחר זכור ימות עולם, אמר להם כל זמן שהקדוש ברוך הוא מביא עליכם יסורים הזכרו כמה טובות ונחמות עתיד ליתן לכם לעולם הבא.

בינו שנות דור ודור, זה דורו של משיח שיש בו שלשה דורות שנאמר +תהלים עב ה+ יראוך עם שמש ולפני ירת דור דורים.

שאל אביך ויגדך, למחר עתידים ישראל לחיות רואים ושומעים כשומעים מפי הקדוש ברוך הוא שנאמר +ישעיה ל כא+ ואזניך תשמענה דבר מאחריך לאמר ואומר +שם ישעיה/ ל כ+ לא יכנף עוד מוריד והיו עיניך ראות את מורידך. זקניך ויאמרו לך, מה שהראיתי לזקנים בהר כענין שנאמר +שמות כד א+ ואל משה אמר עלה אל ה' סליק פסקא

2. Mishnah Kiddushin 1:7

משנה מסכת קידושין פרק א משנה ז

כל מצות הבן על האב אנשים חייבין ונשים פטורות וכל מצות האב על הבן אחד אנשים ואחד נשים חייבין וכל מצות עשה שהזמן גרמה אנשים חייבין ונשים פטורות וכל מצות עשה שלא הזמן גרמה אחד אנשים ואחד נשים חייבין וכל מצות לא תעשה בין שהזמן גרמה בין שלא הזמן גרמה אחד אנשים ואחד נשים חייבין חוץ מכל תשחית וכל תקיף וכל תטמא למתים:

3. Babylonian Talmud Kiddushin 29a

תלמוד בבלי מסכת קידושין דף כט עמוד א

במי מאי כל מצות הבן על האב? אילימא כל מצות דמיחייב ברא למיעבד לאבא, נשים פטורות? והתניא: איש - אין לי אלא איש, אשה מניין? כשהוא אומר: ויקרא יט+ איש אמו ואביו תיראו - הרי כאן שנים! אמר רב יהודה, היק: כל מצות הבן המוטלות על האב לעשות לבנו - אנשים חייבין, ונשים פטורות. תנינא להא דת"ר: האב חייב בבנו למולו, ולפרותו, וללמדו תורה, ולהשיאו אשה, וללמדו אומנות; וי"א: אף להשיטו במים; רבי יהודה אומר: כל שאינו מלמד את בנו אומנות - מלמדו ליסטות. ליסטות ס"ד? אלא, כאילו מלמדו ליסטות.

למולו. מנלן? דכתיב: +בראשית כא+ וימל אברהם את יצחק בנו. והיכא דלא מהליה אביו - מיחייבי ביה דינא למימהליה, דכתיב: +בראשית יז+ המול לכם כל זכר; והיכא דלא מהליה ביה דינא - מיחייב איהו למימהל נפשיה, דכתיב: +בראשית יז+ וערל זכר אשר לא ימול את בשר ערלתו ונכרתה. איהו מנלן דלא מיחייבא? דכתיב: +בראשית כא+ כאשר צוה אותי אלהים, אותו - ולא אותה. אשכחן מיד, לדורות מנלן? תנא דבי ר' ישמעאל: כל מקום שנאמר צו - אינו אלא זירח מיד ולדורות; זירח - דכתיב: +דברים ג+ וצו את יהושע וחזקוהו ואמצהו, מיד ולדורות - דכתיב: +במדבר טו+ מן היום אשר צוה ה' והלאה לדורותיכם.

לפרותו. מנלן? דכתיב: +שמות יג+ כל בכור בניך תפרה. והיכא דלא פרקיה אביו - מיחייב איהו למפרקיה, דכתיב: +במדבר יח+ פרה תפרה. ואיהו מנלן דלא מיפקדה? דכתיב: תיפרה תפרה, ת' בחיריק פ' בקמץ ד' בסגול/ כל שמצווה לפרות את עצמו - מצווה לפרות את אחרים, וכל שאינו מצווה לפרות את עצמו - אינו מצווה לפרות אחרים. ואיהו מנלן דלא מיחייבא למיפרק נפשה? דכתיב: תפרה ת' בחיריק פ' בקמץ ד' בסגול/ תיפרה, כל שאחרים מצווים לפרותו - מצווה לפרות את עצמו, וכל שאין אחרים מצווים לפרותו - אין מצווה לפרות את עצמו. ומנין שאין אחרים מצווין לפרותה? דאמר קרא: +שמות יג+ כל בכור בניך תפרה, בניך - ולא בנוחך. תנו רבנן: הוא לפרות ובנו לפרות - הוא קודם לבנו; רבי יהודה אומר: בנו קודמו, שזה מצותו על אביו, וזה מצות בנו עליו. אמר רבי ירמיה: הכל מודין.

3. Babylonian Talmud Kiddushin 29b

תלמוד בבלי מסכת קידושין דף כט עמוד ב

כל היכא דליכא אלא חמש סלעים - הוא קודם לבנו מאי טעמא? מצות דגופיה עדיפא, כי פליגי - היכא דאיכא חמש משועבדים וחמש בני חורין, דיהודה סבר מלוה דבתיב בתורה ככתובה בשטר דמיא, כהני חמש פריק לכריה, ואזיל בהן וטרקי ליה לחמש משועבדים לדידיה; ורבנן סברי: מלוה דכתיב באורייתא לאו ככתובה כשטר דמיא, והילכך מצוה דגופיה עדיף. ת"ר: לפדות את בנו ולעלות לרגל - פודה את בנו ואחר כך עולה לרגל; ר' יהודה אומר: עולה לרגל ואח"כ פודה את בנו. שני מצות עובדה, הוה מצוה שאינה עובדה. בשלמא לר' יהודה - כדקאמר טעמא, אלא רבנן מאי טעמיהו? דאמר ר' יוסה: שמות לד' כל בכור בניך תפדה, והדר לא יראו פני דיוסף, ת"ר: מנין שאם היו לו חמשה בנים מחמש נשים, שחייב לפדות כולן? ת"ל: כל בכור בניך תפדה. פשיטא, בפטר רחם תלא רחמנא! מהו דתימא נילף בכור בכור מנחלה, מה להלן ראשית אונן, אף כאן ראשית אונן, קמ"ל.

ללמדו תורה. מנלן? דכתיב: +דברים יא+ ולמדתם אותם את בניכם. והיכא דלא אנמריה אבוא - מיחייב איהו למיגמר נפשיה, דכתיב: ולמדתם. איהי מנלן דלא מיחייבא? דכתיב: ולימדתם ולמדתם, כל שמצווה ללמוד - מצווה ללמד, וכל שאינו מצווה ללמוד - אינו מצווה ללמד. ואיהי מנלן דלא מיחייבה למילף נפשה? דכתיב: ולימדתם ולמדתם, כל שאחרים מצווין ללמוד - מצווה ללמד את עצמו, וכל שאין אחרים מצווין ללמוד - אין מצווה ללמד את עצמו. ומנין שאין אחרים מצווין ללמוד? דאמר קרא: ולמדתם אותם את בניכם - ולא בנותיכם. ת"ר: הוא ללמוד ובנו ללמוד - הוא קודם לבנו; ר' יהודה אומר: אם בנו זרע וממולח ותלמודו מחקים בידו - בנו קודמו. כי הא דרב יעקב בריה דרב אחא בר יעקב שרריה אבוא לקמיה דאביי, כי אתא חזייה דלא הוה מיחדדין שמעתייה, א"ל: אנא עדיפא מינך, תוב את דאזיל אנא. שמע אביי דקא הוה אתי, הוה החוה מזיק בי רבנן דאביי, דכי הוה עיילי בתרין אפי' כיממא חוה מיתזקי, אמר להו: לא ליתבי ליה אינש אושפיזא, אפשר דמתרחיש ניסא. על, בת בהחוא בי רבנן, אידמי ליה כתנינא דשבעה רישותיה, כל כריעה דכרע נתר חר רישיה. אמר להו למחר: אי לא איתרחיש ניסא, סכינתין. ת"ר: ללמוד תורה ולישא אשה - ילמוד תורה ואח"כ ישא אשה, ואם א"ל לר' בלא אשה - ישא אשה ואח"כ ילמוד תורה. אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל, דלכת: נושא אשה ואח"כ ילמוד תורה. ר' יוחנן אמר: ריחיים בצוארו ויעסוק בתורה? ולא פליגי: הא לן, והא להו.

משתבח ליה רב חסדא לרב הונא בדרב המנונא דארס גדול הוא, א"ל: כשיבא לירך הביאהו לידי. כי אתא, חזייה דלא פריס סודרא, א"ל: מאי טעמא לא פריסת סודרא? א"ל:

דלא נסיבנא. אהדרינהו לאפיה מיניה, א"ל: חזי, דלא חזית להו לאפי עד דנסבת. רב הונא לטעמיה, דאמר: בן עשרים שנה ולא נשא אשה - כל ימיו בעבירה. בעבירה סלקא דעתך? אלא אימא: כל ימיו בהרהור עבירה. אמר רבא, וכן הנא דבי ר' ישמעאל: עד כי שנה, יושב הקב"ה ומצפה לאדם מתי ישא אשה, כיון שתגיע כ"ו ולא נשא, אומר: חיפה עצמותיו. אמר רב חסדא: האי דעדיפנא מחבראי - דנסיבנא בשיתסר, ואי הוה נסיבנא בארביסר,

3. Babylonian Talmud Kiddushin 30a

תלמוד בבלי מסכת קידושין דף ל עמוד א

הוה אמינא לשטן גירא בעיניך. א"ל רבא לר' נתן בר אמי: ארידך על צוארי דברוך.
 משיתסר ועד עשרים ותרתין. ואמר ליה: מתמני סרי עד עשרים וארבעה. כתנאי: +משלי
 כב: חנוך לנער על פי דרכו - ר' יהודה ורבי נחמיה, חד אמר: משיתסר ועד עשרים
 והרתין. וחד אמר: מתמני סרי ועד עשרים וארבעה. עד היכן חייב אדם ללמד את בנו
 תורה? אמר רב יהודה אמר שמואל: כגון זבולון בן דן. שלימדו אבי אביו מקרא ומשנה
 והלמוד. הלכות ואגדות. מיתבי למדו מקרא - אין מלמדו משנה: ואמר רבא: מקרא - זו
 תורה! זבולון בן דן ולא זבולון בן דן. כזבולון בן דן - שלמדו אבי אביו. ולא זבולון בן
 דן - דאילו התם מקרא, משנה ותלמוד. הלכות ואגדות. ואילו הכא מקרא לבד. ואבי אביו
 מי מחייבו? והתניא: +דברים יא+ ולמדתם אותם את בניכם - ולא בני בניכם, ומה אני
 מקיים +דברים ד+ והודעתם לבניך ולבני בניך? לומר לך, שכל המלמד את בנו תורה,
 מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו למדו לו ולבנו ולבן בנו עד סוף כל הדורות. הוא דאמר כי האי
 תנא: דתניא: ולמדתם אותם את בניכם - אין לי אלא בניכם, בני בניכם מניין? ת"ל:
 והודעתם לבניך ולבני בניך; א"כ, מה ת"ל בניכם? בניכם - ולא בנותיכם. אמר ריב"ל: כל
 המלמד את בן בנו תורה, מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו קבלה מהר סיני, שנאמר: והודעתם
 לבניך ולבני בניך, וסמך ליה: יום אשר עמדת לפני ה' אלהיך בחורב. רבי חייה בר אבא
 אשכחיה לריב"ל, דשדי ריסנא ארישיה וקא ממטי ליה לינוקא לבי כנישתא, א"ל: מאי
 כולי האי? א"ל: מי זוטא מאי דכתיב והודעתם לבניך, וסמך ליה יום אשר עמדת לפני ה'
 אלהיך בחורב? מכאן ואילך, רבי חייה בר אבא לא טעים אומצא, עד דמקרי לינוקא
 ומוספיה. רבה בר רב הונא לא טעים אומצא, עד דמיתיה לינוקא לבית מדרשא. אמר רב
 ספרא משום ר' יהושע בן חנניא, מאי דכתיב: +דברים ו+ ושננתם לבניך? אל תקרי ושננתם
 אלא ושלשתם, לעולם ישלש אדם שנותיו, שליש במקרא, שליש במשנה, שליש בתלמוד. מי
 יודע כמה חייו לא צריכא - ליומי. לפיכך נקראו ראשונים סופרים - שהיו סופרים כל
 האותיות שבתורה, שהיו אומרים: וא"ו +ויקרא יא+ דגחון - חציון של אותיות של ס"ת,
 +ויקרא י+ דרש דרש - חציון של תיבות, +ויקרא יג+ והתגלח - של פסוקים, +תהלים פ+
 יכרסמנה חזיר מיער - עי"ן דיער חציון של תהלים, +תהלים עח+ והוא רחום יכפר עון -
 חציון דפסוקים. בעי רב יוסף: וא"ו דגחון מהאי גיסא, או מהאי גיסא? א"ל: ניתי ס"ת
 ואימנינח! מי לא אמר רבה בר בר חנה: לא חזו משם עד שהביאו ספר תורה ומנאום? א"ל:
 אינהו בקיאי בחסירות ויתרות, אנן לא בקיאינן. בעי רב יוסף: והתגלח מהאי גיסא, או
 מהאי גיסא? א"ל: אביי: פסוקי מיהא ליתו לימניו? בפסוקי נמי לא בקיאינן, דכי אתא רב
 אחא בר אדא אמר, במערבא פסקי ליה לחזאי קרא לתלתא פסוקי: +שמות יט+ ויאמר ה'
 אל משה דנה אנכי בא אליך בעצ הענן. תנו רבנן: חמשת אלפים ושמונה מאות ושמונים
 ושמונה פסוקים הוו פסוקי ס"ת, יתר עליו תהלים שמונה, חסר ממנו דברי הימים שמונה.
 תנו רבנן: ושננתם - שיהו דברי תורה מחודדים בפך, שאם ישאל לך אדם דבר - אל
 תגמגם ותאמר לו, אלא אמור לו מיד, שנאמר:

4. Babylonian Talmud Ketubot 50a

תלמוד בבלי מסכת כתובות דף נ עמוד א

ועשייתנהו לזניה: אי אמרת בשלמא לאו דינא משום הכי עשייתהו, אלא אי אמרת דינא, עשייתהו בעי? א"ר אילעא: באושא התקינן. המכזבז - אל יבזבו יותר מחומש. תניא נמי הכי: המכזבז - אל יבזבו יותר מחומש, שמא יצטרך לבריות, ומעשה באחד שבקש לבזבו יותר מחומשן ולא הניח לו חבירו, ומגו? רבי ישבב, ואמר רב יהושע, ולא הניחו חבירו, ומגו? רבי עקיבא. אמר רב נחמן, ואיתרמא רב אחא בר יעקב: מאי קרא? ובראשית כ"ח, וכל אשר תתן לי עשר אעשרנו לך, והא לא המי ציטורא בתרא לעיטורא קמא? אמר רב אשי: אעשרנו לבתרא כי רמא, אמר רב ישימי בר אשי: ושמועות דאלו מתמעטות והולכות, וסימניך: קטנים כתבו ובזבו, אמר רב יצחק, באושא התקינן, שיהא אדם מתגלגל עם בנו עד שתים עשרה שנה, מכאן ואילך יורד עמו לחייו, איני? והא אמר ליה רב לרב שמואל בר שילת: בציר מבר שית לא תקביל, בר שית קביל וספי ליה כתורא? אין, ספי ליה כתורא, מיהו אינו יורד עמו לחייו עד לאחר שתים עשרה שנה, ואב"א, לא קשיא: הא למקרא, הא למשנה; דאמר אביי, אמרה לי אם: בר שית למקרא, בר עשר למשנה, בר תליסר לתעניתא מעת לעת, ובתינוקת - בת תריסר, אמר אביי, אמרה לי אם: האי בר שית דטרקא ליה עקרבא ביומא דמישלם שית - לא חי; מאי אסותיה? מרתא דדיה חיורתא בשיכרא, נשפיה ונשקיה, האי בר שתא דטריק ליה זיבורא ביומא דמישלם שתא - לא חי; מאי אסותיה? אצותא דריקלא במיא, נשפיה ונשקיה, אמר רב קטינא: כל המכנים את בנו פחות מכן שש - רץ אחריו ואינו מגיעו, איכא דאמרי: חבירו רצין אחריו ואין מגיעין אותו, ותרדיהו איתנהו, חליש וגמיר, איבעית אימא: הא דכחיש, הא דבריא, אמר רבי יוסי בר חנינא: באושא התקינן, האשה שמכרה בנכסי מלוג כחיי בעלה ומתה - הבעל מוציא מיד הלקוחות, אשכחיה רב יצחק בר יוסף לר' אבהו דהוה קאי באוכלוסא דאושא, אמר ליה: מאן מרה דשמעתא דאושא? אמר ליה: רבי יוסי בר חנינא; תנא מיניה ארבעין זימנין, ודמי ליה כמאן דמנחא ליה בכיסתיה, +תהלים ק"ו+ אשרי שומרי משפט עושה צדקה בכל עת - וכי אפשר לעשות צדקה בכל עת? דרשו רבותינו שביבנה, ואמרי לה רבי אליעזר: זה הזן ובנותיו כשהן קטנים, רבי שמואל בר נחמני אמר: זה המגדל יתום ויתומה בתוך ביתו ומשיאן, +תהלים קי"ב+ חון ועושר בביתו וצדקתו עומדת לעד - רב הונא ורב חסדא, חד אמר: זה הלומד תורה ומלמדה, וחד אמר: זה הכותב תורה נביאים וכתובים ומשאילן לאחרים, +תהלים קכ"ח+ וראה בנים לבניך שלום על ישראל - אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: כיון שבנים לבניך שלום על ישראל, דלא אתי לידי חליצה ויבום, רבי שמואל בר נחמני אמר: כיון שבנים לבניך שלום על דייני ישראל, דלא אתי לאינצוי.

זה מדרש דרש ר"א לפני חכמים כו'.

5. Sifre Deuteronomy Piska 46

ספרי דברים פסקא מו

ויט) ולמדתם אותם את בניכם. בניכם ולא בנותיכם דברי רבי יוסי בן עקיבה מיכן אמרו כשהתינוק מתחיל לדבר אביו מדבר עמו בלשון הקודש ומלמדו תורה ואם אין מדבר עמו בלשון קודש ואינו מלמדו תורה ראוי לו כאילו קוברו שנאמר ולמדתם אותם את בניכם לדבר בם. אם למדתם אותם את בניכם למען ידברו ימיכם וימי בניכם, ואם לאו למען יחצרו ימיכם שכך דברי תורה נדרשים מכלל הן לאו ומכלל לאו הן סליק פסקא

6. Tosefta Hagigah 1:2

תוספתא מסכת חגיגה (ליברמן) פרק א הלכה ב

קטן יוצא בעירוב אמו וחייב בסוכה ומעריבין עליו מזון שתי סעודות בעירובי תחומין יודע לנענע חייב בלולב יודע להתעטף חייב בציצית יודע לדבר אביו מלמדו שמע ותורה ולשון קודש ואם לאו ראוי לו שלא בא לעולם יודע לשמר תפילין אביו לוקח תפילין אליו כיצד בודקין אותו מטבילין אותו ונותנין לו חולין לשם תרומה יודע לשמר גופו אוכלין על גופו טהרות ידיו אוכלין על ידיו טהרות יודע לפרוש חוקו חולקין לו על הגורן יש בו דעת לישאל ספיקו ברשות היחיד טמא ברשות הרבים טהור יודע לשחוט שחיטתו כשירה יכול לוכל כזית דגן פורשין מצואתו וממימי רגליו ארבע אמות כזית צלי שוחטין עליו את הפסח ר' יהודה אומ' לעולם אין שוחטין עליו את הפסח אלא אם יודע הפרש אכילה אי זו היא הפרש אכילה כל שנותנין לו ביצה ונוטלה אבן חורקה

7. Mishnah Yoma 8:4

משנה מסכת יומא פרק ח משנה ד

החינוקות אין מענין אותן ביום הכפורים אבל מחנכין אותם לפני שנה ולפני שנתיים בשביל שיחיו רגילין במצות:

8. Mishnah Nedarim 4:2-3

משנה מסכת נדרים פרק ד משנה ב

המודר הנאה מחבירו שוקל את שקלו ופורע את חובו ומחזיר לו את אבדתו מקום שנוטלין עליה שכר תפול הנאה להקדש:

משנה מסכת נדרים פרק ד משנה ג

ותורם את תרומתו ומעשרותיו לדעתו ומקריב עליו קיני וזבין קיני יולדות חטאות ואשמות ומלמדו מדרש הלכות ואגדות אבל לא ילמדנו מקרא אבל מלמד הוא את בניו ואת בנותיו מקרא חן את אשתו ואת בניו אף על פי שהוא חייב במזונותיהם ולא יזון את בהמתו בין טמאה בין טהורה רבי אליעזר אומר זן את הטמאה ואינו זן את הטהורה אמרו לו מה בין טמאה לטהורה אמר להן שהטהורה נפשה לשמים וגופה שלו וטמאה נפשה וגופה לשמים אמרו לו אף הטמאה נפשה לשמים וגופה שלו שאם ירצה חרי הוא מוכרה לעכו"ם או מאכילה לכלבים:

9. Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin 17b

תלמוד בבלי מסכת סנהדרין דף יז עמוד ב

ומה נחש שממית ומרבה טומאה - טהור. שרין שאינו ממית ומרבה טומאה - אינו דין שיהא טהור. ולא היא. מיד דהוה אקוין בעלמא.

אמר רב יהודה אמר רב: כל עיר שאין בה שנים לדבר ואחד לשמוע - אין מושיבין בה סנהדרין. ובביתר הוו שלשה. וכיבנה ארבעה: רבי אליעזר, ורבי יהושע, ורבי עקיבא, ושמעון התימני דין לפנייהם במדבר. מיתבי: שלישית - חכמה. רביעית - אין למעלה הימנה: הוא דאמר כי האי תנא. דתניא: שניה - חכמה. שלישית - אין למעלה הימנה.

למידין לפני חכמים - לוי מרבי. דנין לפני חכמים - שמעון בן עזאי, ושמעון בן זומא. וחנן המצרי, וחנניא בן חנינאי. רב נחמן בר יצחק מתני חמשה: שמעון, שמעון, ושמעון, חנן. וחנניה רבותינו שבבבל. רב ושמואל. רבותינו שבארץ ישראל - רבי אבא. דייני גולה - קרנא. דייני דארץ ישראל - רבי אמי ורבי אסי. דייני דפומבדיתא - רב פפא בר שמואל. דייני דנהרדעא - רב אדא בר מניומי, סבי דסורא - רב הונא ורב חסדא. סבי דפומבדיתא - רב יהודה ורב עינא, חריפי דפומבדיתא - עיפא ואבימי בני רחבה. אמוראי דפומבדיתא - רבה ורב יוסף. אמוראי דנהרדעי - רב חמא. נהרבלאי מתנו - רמי בר ברבי. אמרי בי רב - רב הונא. והאמר רב הונא: אמרי בי רבו - אלא: רב המנונא. אמרי במערבא - רבי ירמיה. שלחו מתם - רבי יוסי בר חנינא. מחכו עלה במערבא - רבי אלעזר. והא שלחו מתם לדברי רבי יוסי בר חנינא - אלא איפוך: שלחו מתם - רבי אלעזר, מחכו עלה במערבא - רבי יוסי בר חנינא.

וכמה יהא בעיר ויהא ראוייה לסנהדרין מאה ועשרים וכו'. מאה ועשרים מאי עבדתייהו? - עשרים ושלשה כנגד סנהדרי קטנה, ושלש שורות של עשרים ושלשה - הרי תשעים וחרתי. ועשרה בטלנין של בית הכנסת - הרי מאה וחרתי. ושני סופרים, ושני חזנים, ושני בעלי דינים ושני עדים, ושני זוממין, ושני זוממי זוממין - הרי מאה וארביסר. ותניא: כל עיר שאין בה עשרה דברים הללו אין תלמיד חכם רשאי לדור בתוכה: בית דין מכין ועונשין, וקופה של צדקה נגבית בשנים ומתחלקת בשלשה, ובית הכנסת, ובית המדרש, ובית הכסא, רופא, ואומן, ולבלר, (וטבח), ומלמד חינוקות. משום רבי עקיבא אמרו: אף מיני פירא, מפני שמיני פירא מאירין את העינים. רבי נחמיה אומר וכו'. תניא רבי אומר:

10. Mishnah Baba Batra 2:3

משנה מסכת בבא בתרא פרק כ משנה ג

לא יפתח אדם חנות של נחתומין ושל צבעין תחת אוצרו של חבירו ולא רפת בקר באמה
 ביין התירו אבל לא רפת בקר חנות שבחצר יכול למחות בידו ולומר לו איני יכול לישן
 מקול הנכנסין ומקול היוצאין עושה כלים יוצא ומוכר בתוך השוק אבל אינו יכול למחות
 בידו ולומר לו איני יכול לישן לא מקול הפטיש ולא מקול הרחים ולא מקול התינוקות:

11. Babylonian Talmud Baba Batra 21a

תלמוד בבלי מסכת בבא בתרא דף כא עמוד א

סיפא אתאן לתינוקות של בית רבן, ומתקנת יהושע בן גמלא ואילך. דאמר רב יהודה אמר
 רב: ברם זכור אותו האיש לטוב ויהושע בן גמלא שמו, שאלמלא הוא נשתכח תורה
 מישראל; שבתחלה, מי שיש לו אב - מלמדו תורה, מי שאין לו אב - לא היה למד תורה, מאי
 דרוש? +רבירים י"א+ ולמדתם אותם - ולמדתם אתם, התקינו שיהו מושיבין מלמדי תינוקות
 בירושלים, מאי דרוש? +ישעיהו ב' + כי מציון תצא תורה; ועדיין מי שיש לו אב - היה מעלו
 ומלמדו, מי שאין לו אב - לא היה עולה ולמד, התקינו שיהו מושיבין בכל פלך ופלך;
 ומכניסין אותן כבן ט"ז כבן י"ז, ומי שהיה רבו כועס עליו - מבעיט בו ויצא, עד שבא
 יהושע בן גמלא ותיקן, שיהו מושיבין מלמדי תינוקות בכל מדינה ומדינה ובכל עיר ועיר,
 ומכניסין אותן כבן שש כבן שבע. אמר ליה רב לרב שמואל בר שילת: עד שית לא תקביל,
 מכאן ואילך קביל ואספיליה כתורא. וא"ל רב לרב שמואל בר שילת: כי מחית לינוקא,
 לא תימחי אלא בערקתא דמסנא, דקארי - קארי, דלא קארי - ליהוי צווחא לחבריה.
 מיתבי: אחד מבני חצר שביקש לעשות רופא, ואומן, וגרדי, ומלמד תינוקות - בני חצר
 מעכבין עליו! הכא במאי עסקינן - בתינוקות דעכו"ם. ת"ש: שנים שיושבין בחצר, וביקש
 אחד מהן לעשות רופא, ואומן, וגרדי, ומלמד תינוקות - חבירו מעכב עליו; ה"נ בתינוקות
 דעכו"ם. ת"ש: מי שיש לו בית בחצר השותפין - ח"ל לא ישכירנו לא לרופא, ולא לאומן,
 ולא לגרדי, ולא לסופר יהודי, ולא לסופר ארמאי! הכא במאי עסקינן - בסופר מתא. אמר
 רבא: מתקנת יהושע בן גמלא ואילך, לא ממטינן ינוקא ממתא למתא, אבל מבי כנישתא
 לבי כנישתא ממטינן, ואי מפסק נהרא לא ממטינן, ואי איכא תיתורא ממטינן, ואי איכא
 גמלא לא ממטינן. ואמר רבא: סך מקרי דרדקי - עשרין וחמשה ינוקי, ואי איכא חמשין -
 מותבין תרי, ואי איכא ארבעין - מוקמינן ריש דוכנא, ומסייעין ליה ממתא. ואמר רבא:
 האי מקרי ינוקי דגרים, ואיכא אחרינא דגרים טפי מיניה - לא מסלקינן ליה, דלמא אתי
 לאיתרושולי. רב דימי מנהרדעא אמר: כ"ש דגרים טפי, קנאת סופרים תרבה חכמה. ואמר
 רבא: הני תרי מקרי דרדקי, חד גרים ולא דייק וחד דייק ולא גרים - מותבין חווא
 דגרים ולא דייק, שבשתא ממילא נפקא. רב דימי מנהרדעא אמר: מותבין דדייק ולא
 גרים, שבשתא כיון דעל - על; דכתיב: +מלכים א' י"א+ כי ששת חדשים ישב שם יואב וכל
 ישראל עד הכרית כל זכר באדום, כי אתא לקמיה דרוד, אמר ליה:

12. Babylonian Talmud Brachot 47b

תלמוד בבלי מסכת ברכות דף מז עמוד ב

במדרבנן: ככל מעשרתיכם תרימו. ומה ראית? האי אידגן והאי לא אידגן.

מעשר שני והדרש שנפדו. פשיטא! הכא במאי עסקינן - כגון שנתן את הקרן ולא נתן את החומש. והא לא משמע לן. דאין חומש מעכב. השמש שאכל כזית פשיטא! מהו דתימא שמש לא רביע. לא משמע לן.

ידברתי מזמני עדתי. אמאי? לא יהא אלא עם הארץ. ותניא. אין מזמנין על עם הארץ! אבוי אמר. בכיתיה דבר. רבא אמר. אפילו תימא בכותי עם הארץ. והכא בעם הארץ דרבנן דפליגי עליה דרבנן מאיר עסקינן. דתניא. איזהו עם הארץ? כל שאינו אוכל חוליו בשחרה. דברי רבי מאיר. וחכמים אומרים: כל שאינו מעשר פירותיו כראוי. והני כותאי. עשורי מעשרי כדחזי. דבמאי דכתיב באורייתא מזהר זהירי דאמר מר: כל מצוה שהחזיקו בה כותים. הרבה מדקדקין בה יותר משראל.

תנו רבנן: איזהו עם הארץ? כל שאינו קורא קריאת שמע ערבית ושחרית, דברי רבי אליעזר, רבי יהושע אומר: כל שאינו מניח תפילין, בן עזאי אומר: כל שאין לו ציצית בבגדו, דברי נתן אומר: כל שאין מוחה על פתחו, רבי נתן בר יוסף אומר: כל שיש לו בנים ואינו מגדלם לתלמוד תורה, אחרים אומרים: אפילו קרא ושנה ולא שמש תלמידי חכמים הרי זה עם הארץ. אמר רב הונא: הלכה כאחרים. רמי בר חמא לא אומין עליה דרב מנשיא בר תחליפא דתני ספרא וספרי והלכתא. כי נח נפשיה דרמי בר חמא, אמר רבא: לא נח נפשיה דרמי בר חמא אלא דלא אומין ארב מנשיא בר תחליפא. והתניא, אחרים אומרים: אפילו קרא ושנה ולא שמש תלמידי חכמים הרי זה עם הארץ! - שאני רב מנשיא בר תחליפא דמשמע להו לרבנן, ורמי בר חמא הוא דלא דק אכתריה. לישנא אתרינא: דשמע שמעתתא מפומייהו דרבנן וגריס להו - כצורבא מרבנן דמי.

אכל טבל ומעשר וכו'. טבל - פשיטא. לא צריכא - בטבל טבול מדרבנן. היכי דמי - בעציץ שאינו נקוב. מעשר ראשון כו'. פשיטא! - לא צריכא - כגון שחקדימו בכרי. מהו דתימא: כדאמר ליה רב פפא לאבוי - קא משמע לן, כדשני ליה. מעשר שני וכו'. פשיטא! לא צריכא שנפדו ולא נפדו כדלכתן; מעשר שני - כגון שפדאו על גבי אסימון, ורחמנא אמר: דברים י"ד + וצרת הכסף בידך - כסף שיש (לו) עליו צורה, הקדש - שחללו על גבי קרקע ולא פדאו בכסף, ורחמנא אמר: ויקרא כ"ז + ונתן הכסף וקם לו. והשמש שאכל פחות מכזית. פשיטא! - אידי דתנא רישא כזית, תנא סיפא פחות מכזית. והנכרי אין מזמנין עליו. פשיטא! חבא במאי עסקינן - בגר שמל ולא טבל, דאמר רבי זירא אמר רבי יוחנן: לעולם

12. Babylonian Talmud Berachot 47b - Continued

אינו גר עד שימול ויטבול, וכמה דלא טבל נכרי הוא.

נשים ועבדים וקטנים אין מזמנין עליהן. אמר רבי יוסי: קטן המוטל בעריסה מזמנין עליו. והא תנן: נשים ועבדים וקטנים אין מזמנין עליהם! - הוא דאמר כרבי יהושע בן לוי. דאמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: אף על פי שאמרו קטן המוטל בעריסה אין מזמנין עליו - אבל עושין אותו סניף לעשרה. ואמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: תשעה ועבד מצטרפין. מיתבי: מעשה ברבי אליעזר שנכנס לבית הכנסת ולא מצא עשרה. ושחרר עבדו והשלימו לעשרה: שחרר איך לא שחרר לא? - תרי אצטריכו. שחרר חד ונפיק בחד. והיכי עביד הכי? והאמר רב יהודה: כל המשחרר עבדו עובר בעשה, שנאמר: +ויקרא כד+ לעלם בהם תעבדו. לדבר מצוה שאני. - מצוה הבאה בעבירה היא! - מצוה דרכים שאני. ואמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: לעולם ישכים אדם לבית הכנסת כדי שיזכה וימנה עם עשרה הראשונים, שאפילו מאה באים אחריו - קבל עליו שכר כולם. שכר כולם - סלקא דעתך? אלא אימא: נוחנין לו שכר כנגד כולם.

אמר רב הונא: תשעה וארון מצטרפין. אמר ליה רב נחמן: וארון גברא הוא? - אלא אמר רב הונא: תשעה נראין כעשרה מצטרפין. אמרי לה: כי מכנפי; ואמרי לה: כי מבדרי. אמר רבי אמי: שנים ושבת מצטרפין. אמר ליה רב נחמן: ושבת גברא הוא? - אלא אמר רבי אמי: שני תלמידי חכמים המחדדין זה את זה בהלכה מצטרפין. מחוי רב חסדא: כגון אנא ורב ששת. מחוי רב ששת: כגון אנא ורב חסדא.

אמר רבי יוחנן: קטן פורח מזמנין עליו. תניא נמי הכי: קטן שהביא שתי שערות מזמנין עליו, ושלא הביא שתי שערות - אין מזמנין עליו, ואין מדקדקין בקטן. הא גופא קשיא! אמרת: הביא שתי שערות - אין, לא הביא - לא, והדר תני: אין מדקדקין בקטן, לאתויי מאי? לאו

13. Mishnah Baba Metzia 2:11

משנה מסכת בבא מציעא פרק ב משנה יא

אבדתו ואבדת אביו אבדתו קודמת אבדתו ואבדת רבו שלו קודמת אבדת אביו ואבדת רבו של רבו קודמת שאביו הביאו לעולם הזה ורבו שלמדו חכמה מביאו לחייב העולם הבא ואם אביו חכם של אביו קודמת היה אביו ורבו נושאים משאוי מניח את של רבו ואחר כך מניח את של אביו אביו ורבו בבית השבי פודה את רבו ואחר כך פודה את אביו ואם היה אביו חכם פודה את אביו ואחר כך פודה את רבו:

14. Babylonian Talmud Baba Metzia 33a

תלמוד בבלי מסכת בבא מציעא דף לג עמוד א

+שמות כ"ג+ רבין. ולא רבצן. רבין. ולא עומד. תחת משאו. ולא מפורק. תחת משאו. משאוי שיכול לעמוד בו. ואי אמרת צער בעלי חיים דאורייתא, מה לי רובין ומה לי רבצן ומה לי עומד? - הא מני. רבי יוסי הגלילי היא, דאמר צער בעלי חיים דרבנן. - הכי נמי מסתברא, דקתני: תחת משאו. משאוי שיכול לעמוד בו. מאן שמעת ליה דאית ליה האי סברא. רבי יוסי הגלילי, שמע מינה. - ומי מצית מוקמת לה כרבי יוסי הגלילי? והא קתני טיפא. תחת משאו. ולא מפורק. מאי לא מפורק? אילימא לא מפורק כלל. - הא כתיב: דברים כ"ב+ הקם תקים עמו. אלא פשיטא: לא מפורק. בחנם. אלא בשכר. מאו שמעת ליה דאית ליה האי סברא. רבנן! - לעולם רבי יוסי הגלילי היא, וכטעינה סבר לה כרבנן.

תנו רבנן: +שמות כ"ג+ כי תראה יכול אפילו מרחוק. - תלמוד לומר: כי תפגע. אי כי תפגע יכול פגיעה ממש. - תלמוד לומר: כי תראה. ואיזו היא ראייה שיש בה פגיעה. - שיערו חכמים אחד משבע ומחצה במיל, וזה הוא ריס. תנא: ומדרה עמו עד פרסה. אמר רבה בר בר חנה: ונוטל שכר.

משנה. אבדתו ואבדת אביו. - אבדתו קודמת, אבדתו ואבדת רבו. - שלו קודם. אבדת אביו ואבדת רבו. - של רבו קודמת, שאביו הביאו לעולם הזה ורבו שלמדו חכמה מביאו לחיי העולם הבא. ואם אביו חכם. - של אביו קודמת. היה אביו ורבו נושאים משאוי. - מניח את של רבו, ואחר כך מניח את של אביו. היה אביו ורבו בבית השבי. - פודה את רבו ואחר כך פודה את אביו. ואם אביו חכם. - פודה את אביו ואחר כך פודה את רבו.

גמרא. מנא הני מילי? - אמר רב יהודה אמר רב: אמר קרא +דברים ט"ו+ אפס כי לא יהיה בך אביון. - שלך קודם לשל כל אדם. ואמר רב יהודה אמר רב: כל המקיים בעצמו כך. - סוף בא לידי כך.

היה אביו ורבו נושאים משאוי וכו'. תנו רבנן: רבו שאמרו. - רבו שלמדו חכמה, ולא רבו שלמדו מקרא ומשנה, דבדי רבי מאיר. רבי יהודה אומר: כל שרוב חכמתו הימנו. רבי יוסי אומר: אפילו לא האיר עיניו אלא במשנה אחת. - זה הוא רבו. אמר רבא: כגון רב סחורה, דאסברין זוהמא ליסטרון. שמואל קרע מאניה עליה ההוא מרבנן דאסבריה אחד יורד לאמת השחי ואחד פותח כיון. אמר עולא: תלמידי חכמים שבבבל עומדין זה מפני זה, וקורעין זה על זה. ולענין אבדה במקום אביו. - אינן חוזרין אלא לרבו מובהק. קבעי מיניה רב חסדא מרב הונא: תלמיד וצריך לו רבו מאי? - אמר ליה: חסדא חסדא, לא צריכנא לך, את צריכת לי עד ארבעין שנין. איקפדי אהדרי ולא עיילי לגבי הדדי. יתיב רב חסדא ארבעין תעניתא משום דחלש דעתיה דרב הונא, יתיב רב הונא ארבעין תעניתא משום דחשדיה לרב חסדא. איתמר, רב יצחק בר יוסף אמר רבי יוחנן: הלכה כרבי יהודה, רב אחא בר רב הונא אמר רב ששת: הלכה כרבי יוסי. ומי אמר רבי יוחנן הכי? והאמר רבי יוחנן: הלכה כסתם משנה, ותנן: רבו שלמדו חכמה. - מאי חכמה. - רוב חכמתו.

תנו רבנן: העוסקין במקרא. - מדה ואינה מדה, במשנה. - מדה ונוטלין עליה שכר, בתלמוד. - אין לך מדה גדולה מזו, ולעולם הוי דין למשנה יותר מן התלמוד. הא גופא קשיא, אמרת: בתלמוד איז לך מדה גדולה מזו, והדר אמרת: ולעולם הוי דין למשנה יותר מן התלמוד! -

15. Babylonian Talmud Avodah Zarah 19a

חלמוד בבלי מסכת עבודה זרה דף יט עמוד א

אברהם אבינו, שלא הלך בעצת אנשי דור הפלגה, שרשעים היו, שנאמר: +בראשית יא+
הבה נבנה לנו עיר; וכדרך חטאים לא עמר - שלא עמר בעמדת סדום, שחטאים היו,
שנאמר: +בראשית יג+ ואנשי סדום רעים וחטאים לה' מאד; וכמושב לצים לא ישב - שלא
ישב במושב אנשי פלשתים, מפני שלצנים היו, שנאמר: +שופטים טז+ ויהי כטוב לבם
ויאמרו קראו לשמשון וישחק לנו; +תהלים קיב+ אשרי איש ירא [את] ה' - אשרי איש ולא
אשרי אשה? א"ר: עמרם אמר רב: אשרי מי שעושה תשובה כשהוא איש ר' יהושע בן לוי
אמר: אשרי מי שמתגבר על יצרו כאיש במצותיו חפץ מאד - אר"א: במצותיו - ולא בשכר
מצותיו. והיינו דתנן, הוא היה אומר: אל תהיו כעבדים המשמשין את הרב על מנת לקבל
פרס, אלא היו כעבדים המשמשין את הרב שלא על מנת לקבל פרס. כי אם בתורת ה'
חפצו - א"ר: אין אדם לומד תורה אלא ממקום שלבו חפץ, שנאמר: +תהלים א+ כי אם
בתורת ה' חפצו. לוי ור"ש ברבי יחזיקיה דרבי יוקא פסקי סידרא, סליק ספרא, לוי
אמר: ליתו [לן] משלי, ר"ש ברבי אמר: ליתו [לן] תילים, כפייה ללוי ואייתו תילים, כי
מטו הכא כי אם בתורת ה' חפצו, פרוש רבי ואמר: אין אדם לומד תורה אלא ממקום שלבו
חפץ, אמר לוי: רבי, נתת לנו רשות לעמוד. אמר ר' אבדימי בר חמא: כל העוסק בחורה -
הקב"ה עושה לו חפצו, שנאמר: כי אם בתורת ה' חפצו. אמר רבא: לעולם ילמוד אדם
תורה במקום שלבו חפץ, שנאמר: כי אם בתורת ה' חפצו. ואמר רבא: בתחילה נקראת על
שמו של הקב"ה ולבסוף נקראת על שמו, שנאמר: בתורת ה' חפצו ובתורתו יהנה יומם
ולילה. ואמר רבא: לעולם ילמד אדם תורה ואח"כ יהנה, שנאמר: בתורת ה', והדר
ובתורתו יהנה. ואמר רבא: לעולם ליגרים איניש, ואע"ג דמשכח ואע"ג דלא ידע מאי
קאמר, שנאמר: +תהלים קיט+ גרסה נפשי לתאבה, גרסה כתיב ולא כתיב טחנה. רבא רמי,
כתיב: +משלי ט+ על גפי, וכתיב: +משלי ט+ על כסא! בתחלה על גפי, ולבסוף על כסא.
כתיב: +משלי ה+ בראש מרומים, וכתיב: עלי דרך! בתחלה בראש מרומים, ולבסוף עלי
דרך. עולא רמי, כתיב: +משלי ה+ שתה מים מבורך, וכתיב: ונחלים מתוך בארץ בתחלה
שתה מבורך, ולבסוף ונחלים מתוך בארץ. אמר רבא אמר רב סחורה אמר רב הונא, מאי
דכתיב: +משלי יג+ הון מהבל ימעט וקובץ על יד ירבה? אם עושה אדם תורתו חבילות
חבילות מתמעט, ואם קובץ על יד ירבה. אמר רבא: ידעי רבנן להא מילתא ועברי עלה.
אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: אנא עבדתה וקיים בידך. אמר רב שחבי משמיה דר"א בן עזריה,
מאי דכתיב: +משלי יב+ לא יחרוך רמיה צידו? לא יחיה ולא יאריך ימים צייד הרמאי;
ורב ששת אמר: צייד הרמאי יחרוך. כי אתא רב דימי אמר: משל לאדם שצד צפרין, אם
משבר כנפיה של ראשונה - כולם מתקיימות בידו, ואם לאו - אין מתקיימות בידו. +תהלים
א+ ויחיה כעץ שתול על פלגי מים - אמרי דבי ר' ינאי: כעץ שתול ולא כעץ נטוע, כל
הלומד תורה מרב אחר - אינו רואה סימן ברכה לעולם. אמר להו רב חסדא לרבנן:

מוכר הוא על מנת לקוץ.

גמ'. מנהגי מילי? אמר רבי יוסי בר חנינא,

16. Babylonian Talmud Makkot 10a

תלמוד בבלי מסכת מכות דף י' עמוד א

דכתיב: +הושע ד+ גלעד קרית פועלי און עקובה מרם. מאי עקובה מרם? א"ר אלעזר:
 שהיו עוקבין להרוג נפשות. ומאי שנא מהאי גיסא ומהאי גיסא דמרחקי, ומאי שנא
 מצינאי דמקרבין? אמר אביי: בשכס נמי שכיחי רוצחים, דכתיב: +הושע ו+ וכחכי איש
 גדודים חבר כהנים דרך ירצחו שכמה וגו'. מאי חבר כהנים? א"ר אלעזר: שהיו מתחברין
 להרוג נפשות. ככהנים הללו שמתחברין לחלוק תרומות בבית הגרנות. ותו ליכא? והא
 כתיב: +במדבר ל"ה+ ועליהם התנו ארבעים ושתים עיר! אמר אביי: דללו קולטות בין
 לדעת בין שלא לדעת. הללו לדעת קולטות. שלא לדעת אינן קולטות. וחברון עיר מקלט
 הוא? והכתיב: +שופטים א+ ויתנו לכלב את חברון כאשר דבר משה! אמר אביי: פרוודהא,
 דכתיב: +יהושע כ"א+ ואת שדה העיר ואת חצריה נתנו לכלב בן יפנה. וקדש עיר מקלט
 הוא? והכתיב: +יהושע י"ט+ וערי מבצר הצדים צר וחמת רקת וכנרת [וגו'] וקדש ואדרי
 ועין חצור, ותניא: ערים הללו, אין עושין אותן לא טירין קטנים ולא כרכים גדולים אלא
 עיירות בינוניות! אמר רב יוסף: תרתי קדש הוא. אמר רב אשי: כגון סליקום ואקרא
 דסליקום. גופא: ערים הללו, אין עושין אותן לא טירין קטנים ולא כרכין גדולים אלא
 עיירות בינוניות; ואין מושיבין אותן אלא במקום מים, ואם אין שם מים - מביאין להם מים;
 ואין מושיבין אותן אלא במקום שווקים; ואין מושיבין אותן אלא במקום אוכלוסין,
 נתמעטו אוכלוסייהו - מוסיפין עליהו, נתמעטו דיוריהו - מביאין להם כהנים לויים
 וישראלים; ואין מוכרין בחן לא כלי זיוין ולא כלי מצודה, דברי רבי נחמיה, וחכמים
 מתירין; ושויין, שאין פורסין בתוכן מצודות, ואין מפשילין לתוכן חבלים, כדי שלא תהא
 רגל גואל הדרם מצויה שם. א"ר יצחק: מאי קרא? +דברים ד+ ונס אל אחת מן הערים האל
 וחי, עביר ליה מידי דתהוי ליה חיותא. תנא: תלמיד שגלה - מגלין רבו עמו, שנאמר: וחי,
 עביר ליה מידי דתהוי ליה חיותא. אמר ר' זעירא: מכאן שלא ישנה אדם לתלמיד שאינו
 הגון. א"ר יוחנן: הרב שגלה - מגלין ישיבתו עמו. איני? והא א"ר יוחנן: מנין לדברי תורה
 שהן קולטין? שנאמר: +דברים ד+ את בצר במדבר וגו', [וכתיב בתריה:] +דברים ד+ וזאת
 חתורה! לא קשיא: הא בעידנא דעסיק בה, הא בעידנא דלא עסיק בה. ואי בעית אימא:
 מאי קולטין? ממלאך המות. כי הא דרב חסדא הוה יתיב וגריס בבי רב, ולא הוה קא יכול
 שליחא [דמלאכא דמותא] למיקרב לגביה, דלא הוה שתיק פומיה מגירסא; סליק וייתיב
 אארזא דבי רב, פקע ארזא ושתיק, ויכיל ליה. א"ר תנחום בר חנילאי: מפני מה זכה ראובן
 לימנות בהצלח תחלה? מפני שהוא פתח בהצלח תחלה, שנאמר: +בראשית ל"ז+ וישמע
 ראובן ויצילהו מידם. דרש רבי שמלאי, מאי דכתיב: +דברים ד+ אז יבדיל משה שלש
 ערים בעבר הירדן מזרח [שמש]? אמר לו הקב"ה למשה: חורח שמש לרוצחים. איכא
 דאמרי, א"ל: חורחת שמש לרוצחים. דרש רבי סימאי, מאי דכתיב: +קדלת ה+ אוהב כסף
 לא ישבע כסף ומי אוהב בהמון לא תבואה? אוהב כסף לא ישבע כסף - זה משה רבינו,

16. Babylonian Talmud Makkot 10a - Continued

שהיה יודע שאין שלש ערים שבעבר הירדן קולטות עד שלא נבחרו שלש בארץ כנען.
 ואמר: מצוה שבאה לידי אקיימנה; ומי אוהב בהמון לא תבואה. למי נאה ללמד בהמון? מי
 שכל תבואה שלו. והיינו דא"ר אלעזר, מאי דכתיב: +תחלים ק"ו+ מי ימלל גבורות ה'
 ישמיע כל תהלתו? למי נאה (ללמד) [למלל] גבורות ה'? מי שיכול להשמיע כל תהלתו.
 ורבנן, ואיתימא רבה בר מרי אמר: מי אוהב בהמון לו תבואה, כל האוהב (ללמד) בהמון
 לו תבואה. יהבו ביה רבנן עינייהו ברבא בריה דרבה. וסימן: אשי ללמוד רבינא ללמד.
 רב אשי אמר: כל האוהב ללמוד בהמון - לו תבואה. והיינו דא"ר יוסי בר' חנינא, מאי
 דכתיב: +ירמיהו נ"ז+ חרב אל הכדים ונואלו? חרב על צוארי שונאיהם של ת"ח שיושכין
 ועוסקין בתורה בד בבד; ולא עוד, אלא שמטפשיה, כתיב הכא: ונואלו, וכתיב התם:
 +במדבר י"ב+ אשר נואלנו, ולא עוד, אלא שחוטאין, שנאמר: ואשר חטאנו. ואיבעית
 אימא, מהכא: +ישעיהו י"ט+ נואלו שרי צוען. רבינא אמר: כל האוהב ללמד בהמון - לו
 תבואה. והיינו דאמר רבי: הרבה תורה למדתי מרבתי, ומחבירי יותר מהם, ומתלמידי
 יותר מכולן. א"ר יהושע בן לוי, מאי דכתיב: +תחלים קכ"ב+ עומדות היו רגלינו בשעריך
 ירושלים? מי גרם לרגלינו שיעמדו במלחמה? שערי ירושלים שהיו עוסקים בתורה. וא"ר
 יהושע בן לוי, מאי דכתיב: +תחלים קכ"ב+ שיר המעלות לדוד שמחתי באומרים לי בית ה'
 נלך? אמר דוד לפני הקדוש ברוך הוא: רבש"ע, שמעתי בני אדם שהיו אומרים מתי ימות
 זקן זה ויבא שלמה בנו ויבנה בית הבחירה ונעלה לרגל, ושמחתי; אמר לו הקב"ה: +תחלים
 פ"ד+ כי טוב יום בחצריך מאלף, טוב לי יום אחד שאתה עוסק בתורה לפני, מאלף עולות
 שעתיד שלמה בנך להקריב לפני על גבי המזבח.

ומכוונות להם דרכים וכו'. חנינא, ר' אלעזר בן יעקב אומר:

PRIMARY SOURCES

The Hebrew Bible

The Mishnah

Yoma 8:4
Nedarim 4:2-3
Kiddushin 1:7
Baba Metzia 2:11
Baba Batra 2:3

Tosefta

Hagigah 1:2

The Babylonian Talmud

Brachot 47b
Ketubot 50a
Kiddushin 29a-30a
Baba Metzia 33a
Baba Batra 21a
Sanhedrin 17b
Makkot 10a
Avodah Zarah 19a-b

The Jerusalem Talmud

Hagigah 1:76c
Haggigah 2:1
Ketubot 8:32c
Nedarim 4:38c

Sifre Deuteronomy

Piska 46 and 310

SECONDARY SOURCES

Aberbach, Moshe, "The Relations Between Master and Disciple in the Talmudic Age," in *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. H.J. Zimmels, J. Rabinowitz, and I. Finestein, Soncino Press Limited, London, 1967, pp. 1-24.

_____, *HaHinuch Hay'hudl B't'kufat HaMishna V'ha-Talmud*, Reuven Mass Publishers, Jerusalem, 1983, pp. 93-221. [Hebrew]

Aron, Isa, "Teaching As Sharing," in *The Melton Journal*, #14, Spring, 1982.

Boyarin, Daniel, *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1993.

Buttrick, George Arthur, ed. *Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Abingdon Press: 1962.

- Carmichael, Calum M., *The Laws of Deuteronomy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 1974.
- Castle, E.B., *Ancient Education and Today*, Penguin Books, Ltd., England, 1961.
- Clarke, M. L., *Higher Education in the Ancient World*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1971.
- Cohen, Yehezkel, *Tana'im V'Amora'im*, Daf Khen Publishers, Jerusalem, 1971. [Hebrew]
- Crenshaw, James L., *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press: 1998.
- _____, *Education in Ancient Israel: Accross the Deadening Silence*, New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Dewey, John, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, The MacMillan Company, New York, 1916.
- Drazin, Nathan, *History of Jewish Education: From 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press: 1940.
- Elon, Menachem, *Jewish Law: History, Sources, Principles*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society: 1994.
- Finkelstein, L., ed. *Sifre Deuteronomy*. Germany: 1939, New York: 1969.
- Goldin, J., "Several Sidelights of a Torah Education in Tannaite and Early Amoraic Times," in: *Ex Orbe Religionum, Studia Geo Widengren Oblata*, Leiden 1972. Reprinted in H.Z. Dimitrovsky, ed., *Exploring the Talmud*, vol. 1, Education, NY 1976.
- Goldman, Israel, M., *Lifelong Learning Among Jews: Adult Education in Judaism from Biblical Times to the Twentieth Century*, Ktav Publishing House, New York, 1975.
- Gorman, Alfred H., *Teachers and Learners: The Interactive Process of Education*, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1969.
- Herford, R. Travers, "Elisha ben-Abuyah: An Historical Study," in *Essays Presented to J.H. Hertz Chief Rabbi*, ed. I Epstein, E. Levine, and C. Roth, The St. Ann's Press, London, 1942.
- Jastrow, Marcus, ed., *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1992.
- Kozberg, Cary, "Fostering Yichud: Reflections on the Potential of a Process," in *The Melton Journal*, #14, Spring, 1982.

- Levine, Lee I., *The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity*, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, Jerusalem, 1989.
- Libes, Yehuda, *Khent'o Shel Elisha: Arba She'nikhn'su la Pardes V'Tevah Shel HaMistikah Ha-Talmudit*, Akademon, Jerusalem, 1990.[Hebrew]
- Maller, Julius B., "The Role of Education in Jewish History," in *The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion*, ed. Louis Finkelstein. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1949.
- Marrou, H.I., *A History of Education in Antiquity*, Sheed and Ward, London, 1956.
- Morris, Nathan. *The Jewish School: An Introduction to the History of Jewish Education*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode 1937.
- Neusner, Jacob, *Talmud Yerushalmi, Nedarim English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Omer-Man, Jonathan, "The Teacher as Role Model," in *The Melton Journal*, #14, Spring, 1982.
- Percy, William A., *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1996.
- Plaut, W. Gunther, *Book of Proverbs: A Commentary*, New York: UAHC 1961.
- Pritchard, J.B., ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* Princeton: University of Princeton: 1969.
- Ross, George MacDonald, "Socrates Versus Plato: The Origins and Development of Socratic Thinking," in *Journal of the Institute of Education*, #14, 1993.
- Safrai, Shmuel, "Elementary Education, Its Religious and Social Significance in the Talmudic Period, in: H.H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, eds., *Jewish Society Through the Ages*, NY 1971.
- Steinsaltz, Adin, *The Talmud: A Reference Guide*. Random House: New York, 1989.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H., *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society: 1996.
- Tov, Shulamit, *D'muyot Min Ha-Talmud*, Daf Khen Publishers, Jerusalem, 1988.
[Hebrew]
- Ulich, Robert, *Three Thousand Years of Educational Wisdom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Urbach, Ephraim, *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs*, The Magnes Press, Jerusalem, 1979.