

is to strive ^{achieve} to be the best that ^{one can} ~~be~~ ^{achieve}. When we do that we are bound to be most individual and most universal at the same time. For the very notion of best ^{implies} a universal standard. In trying to be our best we strive at attaining a universally approved standard. Yet one ^{has to} ~~has to~~ ^{rationally} explore ^{oneself} to the utmost to discover one's best and is therefore bound to be most intensely individual.

The modern equivalent to the traditional emphasis on the revealed character of ^{the scriptures} ~~the scriptures~~ would be the following:
 1) A way of life is a nation's most important asset, and 2) To be that it must be a means to individual and collective salvation.

In other words, the course would consist of translating the root-meaning concepts into the modern universe of discourse.

Last Thursday I worked out the following adaptation from "Analysis of Piety" by Abraham Heschel:

The Pious Man

What is piety? Is it abandonment of the world?

Is it scrupulous performance of rites or fanatic zeal?

Let us observe the pious man and probe into his soul.

We shall discover in it that which transcends man

That which surmounts the visible and available,

Steadily preventing him from immersing himself in sensation or ambition,

From yielding to passion or striving for a career.

For his life takes place amid horizons that range beyond the span of years.

He senses the significant in small things,

He is alive to the sublime in common acts and simple thoughts.

He feels the warmth of good beneath the thick crust of evil.

In the rush of the passing, he notes the stillness of the eternal.

He complies with destiny.

He is at peace with life.

Every experience opens to him the door into a temple of light, though the vestibule be dark

Though the vestibule be dark and dismal.

His responsibility to God is the scaffold on which he stands,

As daily he builds his life.

He serves family, friend, community and nation;

There never become for him blind alleys

They ever remain thoroughfares to God.

With sacrifice and single-mindedness he continues on his way.

His conscience is attuned to listen to the voice of God.

His concern is for the will of God.

He turns his back on human vanity.

He contemns the shallowness of human selfishness

And deplores the meagerness of human service.

He abhors shining, a smiling countenance or miracles' part

When they cover vice or blasphemy.

He loathes great temples and monuments of worldly glory

When built by sweat and tears of suffering slaves.

The pious man lays no claim to reward.

For him self-exclusion, self-forgetfulness, unobtrusiveness is the rule.

Engrossed in the beauty of what he worships, he shows self-depny.

The wise man, master of himself, deems himself author of his mastery;

Not so the pious who, no less master of himself, administers his life in God's name.

The wise man seeks to penetrate into the soul of the sacred;

The pious man ever strives to be penetrated by it.

Faith engages a man's mind;

Piety, his entire life.

Faith precedes piety;

Piety is faith's achievement

Faith desires to meet God

Piety to abide by Him;

Faith, to know his will;

Piety, to do it;

Faith, to hear his voice,

Piety, to respond to it.

The pious man is never alone,

For God is within his reach of his heart.

In affliction, though desolate for a moment, he need but turn his eyes,

To discover his grief outflanked by God's compassion

Having achieved understanding, he believes.

Having acquired, he gives away

Having lived, he knows how to die

He craves not vainly for the endless rotation of his own life's wheel,
 but is content to merge his being into that of the God he loves.

Abraham Heschel happened to call on me today before returning to Cincinnati, the teacher at the Hebrew Union College. I showed him my adaptation of his essay and he was very much pleased with it. It was at his suggestion that I broke up what I first had as longer lines into shorter ones.

In discussing with him Scholem's recent book he found fault with its failure to do justice to the piety and spirituality of the Zohar, the omission of Lurker's contribution, ^{and} its very inadequate treatment of Hasidism. Not long ago I had occasion to discuss the same book with Solomon Zeitlin. Zeitlin took strong exception to Scholem's ^{exalting} ~~minimizing~~ ^{halting} ~~Shabbetai Zevi's~~ ^{halting} ~~personal~~ ^{halting} ~~greatness~~. According to Zeitlin, halting was nothing but a charlatan.

Wed. Sept. 23/42

Time and again we are told that the accumulation of bits of learning is no more like what real education ought to be than is a pile of bricks, lumber and steel thrown together, haphazard or even when arranged in separate piles, anything like a building. In the one as well as in the other the pattern is the thing. Education has meaning or value only when the individual elements of knowledge are thrust together or integrated into a pattern or design for living, a design which constantly unfolds and grows in content and in meaning to meet the changing and ever widening conditions of life. But what is to be that pattern? That we are never told. It seems to me that Soleris supplies the much needed answer.

Soleris as related to education

How is it difficult to indicate how Soleris can be worked into the educational process. It does not have to constitute a distinct subject anywhere in the process before the upper high school or college grades. But it should be the philosophy of education which every teacher from the most elementary grades up should be required to master. That, however, is only the first step. In the elementary and lower classes of high school ^{all} the teachers should be required to meet from time to time - about once a month to correlate their subject matter from the ^{potential} point of view. In the ^{upper} high school grades and in college the students should be called together from time and the aspect of correlation among their different subjects discussed by them and their teachers.

Yesterday the University Faculty had its first session of the new academic year. Baskin injected a challenging note into the discussion of one of the applicant's ^{examination} ~~records~~ records, when he asked how it was possible for a student who did not have the most elementary reading knowledge of Hebrew to ^{get} ~~score~~ more than passing marks in both and Hebrew? He said that if the particular applicant under discussion were admitted, he would not continue examining any applicant in Hebrew. Thereupon Louis Ginzberg piped up that