

The 19th International Human Science Research Conference.

Long Island University, Southampton, New York, U.S.A.

From June 12 to June 15, 2000.

A Paper Presented from 4:30pm to 5:15pm. Tuesday June 13th, 2000.

**Openness in an Art of Asking Questions:
A Phenomenological Explication of
a Master Teacher's Practice**

Akihiro Yoshida, Ph.D. Professor(*)

Department of Psychology, Kawamura Gakuen Women's University

Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, Japan.

Table of Content

§ 1 . Introduction	1
§ 2 . Tentative Meanings of "Openness"	2
§ 3 . The Synopsis of the novelette "Run, Melos!" and its Part Taught	2
§ 4 . The Work of Art: the Whole Series of the 25 Questions by Takeda	3
§ 5 . Multiple Dimensions of "Openness" in Questions	4
§ 6 . Meaning and Structure of "Openness" in a Question and in a Series of Questions	13
§ 7 . Meaning and Structure of "Openness" in Teaching=Learning and in Education	16
§ 8 . Conclusion: Openness Practised	19
References	19
Appendix: Table of a Variety of [Openness #] Explicated	20

(*) Office: Sageto 1133, Abiko-shi, Chiba-ken, 〒 270-1138, Japan

Home: Miyoshino 1-22-501, Kawatsuru, Kawagoe-shi, Saitama-ken, 〒 350-1177, Japan

Discovery and creation of questions to be asked in the classroom teaching is a kind of an art. This study thematizes the "Openness" in the art of asking questions in the classroom teaching, in an attempt to explicate the meaning and structure of the "Openness".

A question and/or a series of questions created by a practicing classroom teacher implicitly embodies his/her whole life-history of experiences as a teacher and as a person, including the insights into the reality of classroom teaching practices, understanding of both children's and his own lived worlds, interpretation of teaching materials, and also the delicate sense of language, to name just a few. However, usually few practicing teachers ever attempt to explicate the whole complex of these, nor are tended to discuss them explicitly. Mr. Tsunco Takeda (武田常夫) (1929-1986), an excellent Japanese master teacher, for whom the author has a deep respect, was not an exception in this respect.

While thematizing the "Openness", this study attempts to explicate Takeda's insights, understanding, interpretation and sense, which are embodied in each of the questions and the series of questions created by him. In addition, the study hopes to explicate the meaning and structure of the "Openness" embodied in the process and the result of creation of the questions. This is partly for the purpose of inviting the readers to enter the lived world of the practicing master teacher Takeda, and of helping the younger teachers, whether practicing or prospective, who wish to learn from him as deeply and richly as possible.

At the very beginning, let me attempt to state explicitly some of the presuppositions already affirmed and accepted by this author. These are: (1) Takeda was an excellent master teacher with much talent and long years of teaching experiences of high quality. (2) He was particularly excellent in teaching literary works of art. (3) He devoted his whole energy to the interpretation of the novelette "Run Melos!" (「走れメロス!」) and to the creation of the series of questions for teaching it. (4) At the time when Takeda created the series, he was reaching one of the most matured stages as a practicing teacher. (5) The series of question for "Run, Melos!" was one of the works in which Takeda had very much confidence. (6) The children for whom Takeda imaginatively prepared these questions were those 5th graders, excellent at reading, in the well-known Takeda's class then in Shima elementary school (群馬県島小学校), whose principal at that time was the master teacher Kihaku Saito (斎藤喜博) (1911-1981). (7) Takeda was good at describing his experiences of teaching practices and his "inner world". And finally, (8) out of more than ten years of my deeply and personally involved experiences with both Saito and Takeda, I have strong confidence in the presuppositions (1) through (7).

Therefore, this is not at all a study without pre-suppositions, and in that sense, this is not entirely an "open" study either. The author is well aware that the readers of this paper may not and/or will accept to share the pre-suppositions above. The author only request that the reader understands the pre-suppositions as explicitly stated above and also reads the study as written with these pre-suppositions. Thus, the author will attempt the above mentioned explication, while putting these explicated pre-suppositions in the "bracket" for a while, and will concentrate on the explication of the meaning and structure of each of the concrete questions and the series of these questions themselves as prepared by Takeda for "Run, Melos!"

No defense for claiming the excellence of Takeda's questions will be made at this point. In these respects, the attempt for the explication here may be compared, in its spirit, to those attempts which explicate the meaning and structure of artistic works of art: such as Susumu Kaneda's phenomenological explicative interpretation of Diego Velasquez's work of art "Las Meninas" (1656) [金田 晋 (1990年) pp.315-318]. The excellence of the works of art is presupposed and explicated as the study itself develops.

In short, this study attempts to explicate the meaning and structure of the "Openness", embodied in a series of questions in a classroom teaching, by means of situating these questions in the lived worlds of the creative questioner and the questioned, i.e., the master teacher and his children, while thematizing the moments of "Openness".

§ 2 . Tentative meanings of "Openness"

First of all, what is "Openness"?

To be sure, dictionaries will give some general meanings of the word. The COD (Concise Oxford Dictionary, 4th ed.), a dictionary at hand, gives explanation not for "openness" but for its adjective form "open" as follows: "Not closed or blocked, allowing of entrance or passage or access, having gate or door or lid or part of boundary withdrawn, unenclosed, unconfined, uncovered, bare, exposed, undisguised, public, manifest, not exclusive or limited." A English-Japanese dictionary (岩崎民平監修『現代英和辞典』研究社) gives 「開放状態、開放性、率直、無私、寛大」 as Japanese equivalents for "Openness". The antonym for "openness" would be "closedness" (『閉鎖性』). There would be no "openness" where no "closedness" is possible, and vice versa. Therefore, "openness" seems to be always relative to "closedness". Let us accept this much clarification as a very tentative meanings of "Openness". However, the meaning and structure of "Openness" in the context of "openness in asking questions" is still very uncertain and ambiguous. We will have to use definitions in the dictionaries as a starting point or as a clue to observe and explicate the variety of "Openness" embodied in each of questions and/or in a series of questions.

For example, the questions such as following will have to be asked: Which question is open and which question is closed? When can we say that a question is open? Is a question either open or closed? Or, is a question either more open or less open? Why and how does a teacher prepare a question more open or less open? How, why and/or what do children experience when they are asked a more open question or a less open question? What do children perceive, feel and/or think, when they are asked a more open or less open question? ("Perceive, feel and/or think" as a whole is designated by J.S.Bruncr(1986) as "perfink", which will be used hereafter, if and when necessary.) As regard to a series of questions, can we say that it is more open or less open? How is the "openness" of a series of questions defined and/or determined? And so forth and so on.

"Openness" of "Open-ended question" would be just one aspect of "Openness" of questions, which we will keep in our view, and we will explore more meanings with regards to the questions and the series of questions.

Steiner Kvale, while discussing the "Plurality of Interpretations" in his book "InterViews"(1996), mentions "an openness to the questions with which the text confronts the reader"(p.211-212). The Openness concerns the contrast between : (1) the author's intended meaning vs. the meaning the text has for us today, (2) the letter of the text vs. its spirit, (3) one correct interpretation vs. a legitimate plurality of interpretations, and (4) the focus on the experiences and intentions of individuals vs. the focus on the social and material context the persons live in. The Openness is concerned with the researcher's way of interpreting the text of the InterViews. The discussion here urges this author to be aware of the limited scope of this paper, however the limitation, the closedness, has its merits as well as demerits, which will be touched upon at the end.

§ 3 . The Synopsis of the novelette "Run, Melos!" and its Part Taught

The novelette "Run, Melos!" by Osamu Dazai (太宰治)(1909-1948), a well known Japanese novelist, is based upon a F.Schiller's poem and ancient legend. The following is its synopsis.

A simple-minded naive shepherd Melos, out of his sense of justice, sneaked in the Castle Syracuse of King Dionysius and was arrested for the charge of plotting to assassinate the atrocious King who doubts and kills everyone around him. Melos was sentenced to death. Melos pleaded with the King for a three-days delay of the execution and a temporal release, on the condition that he will leave his best friend Scelinuntius as a hostage and that the hostage will be executed if Melos does not return in time before the sunset. Melos returns to his home village and

finishes the marriage ceremony of his only daughter. Then, he hurries back to the castle, in order to save the life of his best friend, now kept in hostage, and to get himself executed. However, on his way back, many unexpected difficulties waited him as ordeals. Overcoming all the ordeals, Melos run and run to the execution ground, almost naked, exhausted and his body covered with blood, to stop the execution and to get himself executed. On the way, he meets Philostratus, an apprentice to Selinuntius.

The following is the portion of the novelette "Run, Melos!" used by Takeda as the teaching material adapted for children in the 5th grade class in his elementary school.

"Ah, it's Melos, is it not?" A voice like a groan reached his ears along with the sound of the wind.

"Who speaks?" said Melos, without breaking stride.

"My name is Philostratus, sir, apprentice to your friend Selinuntius." The young man ran behind Melos, shouting his words. "You're too late, sir. It's hopeless. You needn't run now. You can no longer help him."

"The sun has yet to set."

"Even now he is being prepared for execution. You're too late, sir. Alas. If only you had only come but moments sooner!"

"The sun has yet to set." Melos felt as if his heart would burst. His eyes were fixed on the huge, red sun on the western horizon. There was nothing to do but run.

"Enough, sir. Stay, I beg you. It is your life that is important now. My master believed in you. Even when they dragged him onto the execution ground, he remained unconcerned. And when the king mocked and taunted him, all he said was, 'Melos will come.' His faith in you was unshaken to the end."

"That is why I must run. I run because of that faith, that trust. Whether I make it in time is not the question. Nor is it merely a question of one man's life. I am running because of something immeasurably greater and more fearsome than death. Run with me, Philostratus!" (Dazai, Osamu. (1988) pp. 130-131.)

§ 4. The work of art: the whole series of the 25 questions by Takeda.

The following 25 questions were created by Takeda (Takeda, Tsuneco(1964)) to help and teach children read deeper and richer the portion given above of "Run, Melos!".

After reading the sentence: "Ah, it's Melos, is it not?" ('Ah, Mr. Melos!')
A voice like a groan reached his ears along the sound of the wind." Takeda asks:

- 1) "Who spoke with a voice like a groan?" 「うめくような声でいったのはだれですか？」
- 2) "Why was Philostratus standing at the place like this?"
「フィロストラトスは どうしてこんなところにへ立っていたんだろう。」
- 3) "What was Philostratus looking at?" 「フィロストラトスはなにをみていたろう。」
- 4) "While waiting for Melos, what was Philostratus thinking about?"
「メロスを待ちながらフィロストラトスは何を考えていたろう。」
- 5) "What was his feeling just a minute and a second before Melos appeared?"
「メロスが姿をあらわす一分一秒前のかれの気持は？」
- 6) "In what kind of appearances did Melos come running?" 「メロスはどんなかっこうで走ってきた？」
- 7) "Looking at these dreadful appearances of Melos, what did Philostratus say?"
「このすさまじいメロスのようすをみたフィロストラトスはなんといったろう。」
- 8) "Why, 'with a voice like a groan', did he say only 'Ah, it's Melos, is it not?'"
「なぜ、うめくような声で、『ああ、メロスさま』とだけいったのか？」
- 9) "Melos said, 'Nor is it merely a question of one man's life', didn't he?"

Let us think about the meaning of these words."

「メロスは『ひとの命ももんだいではないのだ』といったね。このことばの意味をかながえよう。」

10) "Has Melos ever uttered such words before?"

「メロスは以前こんなことをいったことがあるだろうか。」

11) "What is referred to by the word 'Man's life'?"

「『ひとの命』というのはなにをさしているのですか？」

12) "For Melos, does his own life matter, now?" "Selinuntius' life?" "The lives of the two?"

「メロスはいま自分の命がもんだいなのですか。セリヌンティウスですか。二人のいのちですか。」

13) "What is Melos running for?" 「メロスは何のためにはしっているの？」

14) "Melos said 'I am running because of something immeasurably greater and more fearsome.....',
But was he clearly aware of what that something is?"

「わたしはもっとおそろしく大きいもののためにはしっているのだ」とメロスはいった。

「けどそれがどういうものかメロスにわかっていたのだろうか？」

15) "When did Melos begin to think that way?" 「メロスはいつからそんな考えになったの？」

16) "Who did make Melos utter the words 'something immeasurably greater'?"

「『もっとおそろしく大きなもの』というメロスのことばをひきだしたのはだれ？」

17) "What of, or which part of, these Philostratus's words did move Melos's heart?"

「この、フィロストラトスのことばのどこが何が、メロスの心をうったのだろうか。」

18) "Philostratus is saying a lot, isn't he? What is he saying?"

「フィロストラトスはいろいろなこといっているね。どういうこといっているのだろうか。」

19) "Melos said 'That is why I must run.' Of course, this is a response to Philostratus's words...
What does the words 'That is why.....' refer to?"

「『それだからしぬのだ』とメロスはいった。これはいうまでもなくフィロストラトスのことばをうけたことばだ。『それだから』というのはなにをさしているのだろうか。」

20) "He said, '... when the king mocked and taunted him,.....', didn't he?"

「『王さまがさんざんあの方をからかっても』といったね。」

21) "Did the king mock and taunt Selinuntius for his clothing?" or "Did he mock and taunt him for his face?" 「セリヌンティウスの服装のことなどからかったの？ それとも、顔のことかな？」

22) "Where is the king (seated)?" 「王はどこにいる？」

23) "What response did Selinuntius make when he was mocked and taunted by the king?"

「王にからかわているセリヌンティウスはなんとこたえた？」

24) "What would have occurred to Melos's mind and heart, when he thought of his friend mocked and taunted by the king in front of the crowd?"

「群衆の面前で王にからかわれている友を思ったとき、メロスの心には、どんな思いがうかんだだろうか？」

25) "What is the meaning of Melos's words: 'I am running because of something immeasurably greater and more fearsome.....'?"

「『私は、なんだか、もっとおそろしく大きいもののためにはしっているのだ』というメロスのことばの意味は？」

§ 5 . Multiple dimensions of "Openness" in questions

In this section, the multiple aspects/dimensions of "openness" of questions and asking questions will be explicated, while focusing on each of 25 questions in the given order.

Before beginning the examination of respective question, the nature of the series as a whole must be noticed. The point is that not all of created and prepared questions are expected, by Takeda, to be asked to children in the actual practice of his classroom teaching. Takeda writes:

" Which question to take and not to take, or what new question I may create on the spot, I cannot tell before I face children in the class. However, it would be certain that the teaching would be a failure, if I have to say all of the questions in the exact order." (Takeda, ibid. p. 138.)

While preparing these 25 questions with the detailed reasons elaborated in 40 pages of A5 size, Takeda thought that asking all the questions prepared would be a failure. Even prepared, not all questions are expected to be asked. The reason for this will be considered later. Here,

just take notice of Takeda's comment to the effect that whether to take or not to take will become clear only when he faces children in the class. Thus, the contrast against the closedness of being determined to ask all the prepared questions comes out.

[Openness 1] As regards the series of prepared questions, (X) the Closedness (or less openness), in the case of being rigidly determined to ask all the questions, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness (or more openness), in the case of remaining open and flexible whether to ask or not to ask any of the questions, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

Hereafter, for the sake of clarity, brevity and convenience, the terms "closedness" and "openness" will be used to in the places of "less open" and "more open".

[Openness 2] As regards the series of prepared questions, (X) the Closedness, in the case of being rigidly pre-determined which questions to ask and not to ask, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of not having decided which question to take and not to take, and also determined to hold the decision until actually facing the questionees, i.e. children, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

[Openness 1] and [Openness 2] remind us of the importance of the "Silence" and the "Tact" of passing "over something tactfully and leaves it unsaid" by H.G.Gadamer [(1975) p.16-17. : 邦訳 (1986), p.22.]. In other words, Takeda's way of perceiving his own preparation suggests that the questioning by a teacher must become a "tactful" one. This openness also leads to the importance of flexible and adaptable "coping" (or dealing 「対応」), which Kihaku Saito had always been emphasizing. If a teacher, for instance, ask a question, already getting superfluous in the given situation, only because he had prepared with much labor, then the tension (concentration) in the class will be lost and the children may be hindered and float away from concentrated thinking, and thus the teaching may become a failure.

[Openness 3] In the actual situation of classroom teaching, (X) Closedness, in the case of being rigidly determined to ask only prepared questions, on the one hand, and (Y) Openness, in the case of being prepared for creating new original questions on the spot, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

After reading the sentence: "Ah, it's Melos, is it not?" ('Ah, Mr. Melos!') A voice like a groan reached his ears along the sound of the wind." The first question:

1) "Who spoke with a voice like a groan?" 「うめくような声でいったのはだれですか？」

On this question writes Takeda, "This question is a very easy one. All children will answer, 'Philostratus' ". To this question, no other answer is thought of. The questioning teacher believes he knows the right answer, and asks it as an "easy question", foresees no difficulty for children to answer, and expects the right answer from the children. Thus:

[Openness 4] As regards a question, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner taking it for granted that the questionees (children) can--- or can not--- give the correct answer. on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the questioner not knowing whether the children can or cannot give the correct answer, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

[Openness 5] As regards a question, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner already knowing the correct answer and only wishing to see whether the children can give the correct answer, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the "genuine question", the questioner not knowing the correct answer and not knowing what answer will come out from the questionees, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

This dimension relates to the characteristics of a "teacher's question" pointed out by Merleau-Ponty (邦訳 (1966) 『眼と精神』 p.256) as the "question asked, by the one who knows, to the one who does not know," The kind of question he named as the teacher's may be considered as less open in terms of [Openness 5] .

2) "Why was Philostratus standing at the place like this?"

「フィロストラトスはどうしてこんなところにへ立っていたんだろう。」

This question asks about an act of a person in the novelette: "Why this person did this?", a typical "Why-question" (Yoshida, A. (1992). p.39). Takeda writes he has two purposes in this question. One is to clarify the location of "the place like this". The other is to invite children think of, by themselves, the details of the Philostratus's acts and, especially what he had been "perfink"-ing at every moment. The latter aims at urging children to begin to "persue" on their own, accepting the teacher's question as a clue. Thus,

[Openness 6] As regards a question (a "why-question", for instance), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner aiming at urging questionees, children, to answer only the question posed and nothing more, on the one hand, and (Y) on the other hand, the Openness, in the case of the questioner aiming at urging the questionees not only to answer the original question given, but also to begin to pursue and to investigate to discover new questions by themselves. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

Needless to say, the Openness of this question does not guarantee the success of urging the children pursue, investigate, and discover. It may succeed, but it may fail. This determines whether or not the next few questions are going to be used after this actually in the class.

3) "What was Philostratus looking at?" 「フィロストラトスはなにをみていたろう。」

This is a typical "What-question" (Yoshida, A. (1992), p.39), in contrast to a "Why-question". "What-question" typically asks "What did this person see/feel/think when he did this?". Or to use J. Bruner's "perfink", it asks "What did this person 'perfink' when he did this?". The characteristics of this type of question has already been discussed elsewhere (ibid.), here, let us focus on the aspect of "Openness" only. This question asks about the person's perception only: i.e. "looking at". We could notice also that this question urges us to think about the meanings and the values that the things around the person had for the person him/her self. However, the question does not ask explicitly as "What would have been the things Philostratus was most concerned about? If so, then, what was he looking at?" The question does not dictate how to think about it. Therefore, children themselves must think about how to think in order to answer this question. Takeda writes, "Children will certainly answer: 'the sunset', 'the direction Melos is coming' and/or 'both but alternately'." In this limited sense, the degree of openness of this question is low with respect to [Openness 4] and [Openness 5]. However, the purpose of this question is to "relieve vividly the various emotions of Philostratus, such as inner agony, irritancy and doubts." Takeda is not sure whether children can achieve this task with this question only. In this sense, the degree of [Openness 4] of this question is high. For this very reason, the next few questions are prepared. Thus,

[Openness 7] As regards a question (a "what-question"), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner explicitly specifying and dictating how to think about getting the answer, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the questioner at least not explicitly specifying how to think about getting the answer, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

4) "While waiting for Melos, what was Philostratus thinking about?"

「メロスを待ちながらフィロストラトスは何を考えていたろう。」

This question is also a typical "What-question". However, different from question 3), the restriction "While waiting for Melos," is given. This is a restriction of the situation, in which the person concerned, Philostratus, is placed. In other words, this question implicitly, with the restriction, makes it easier for children think about the lived experiences of the person.

In addition, the focus is shifted from perceiving ("look at") in question 3) to thinking ("think about") in question 4), within the domain of "perfink".

[Openness 8] As regards a question (a "what-question"), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner explicitly restricting the situation in which the person is placed, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the questioner not restricting the situation in which the person is placed, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

From this perspective, the openness decreases from question 3) to question 4). Also, we

could notice, on the thematized "perfink", the shift from perception to thinking is made, partly in order to avoid monotony, which point will be touched upon later in relation to W. James. Thus: [Openness 9] As regards a series of questions ("what-question"s), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question freezing the thematized "perfink", on the same "perceiving" for instance, as the preceding question, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the question freely changing the thematized "perfink" away from the one in the preceding question, from perceiving to thinking, for instance, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

When we consider the [Openness 9], it is indeed very important to become conscious of, and also to keep in mind, the unity, integrity and simultaneity of perceiving/feeling/thinking, by naming the three together as "perfink", but it is also important to keep just as before the distinction between perceiving, feeling and thinking, in order to enable us to introduce "Openness" by variation. Also, we notice, keeping both "perfink" and "perceiving/ feeling/ thinking", the questioner could keep him/herself always reminded of the possibility of unity and variety, thus of "openness".

5) "What was his feeling just a minute and a second before Melos appeared?"

「メロスが姿をあらわす一分一秒前のかれの気持は？」

This question is also a typical "What-question", asking "perfink" of the person. This time, the restriction is imposed upon the objective time: "just a minute and a second before Melos appeared". This restriction is, on the surface, an objective time, but children are expected further to consider the meaning of this objective in terms of the subjective time experienced by Philostratus impatiently waiting for Melos. Also, we notice, in terms of "perfink", moving from "perceiving" in question 3) and "thinking" in question 4) to "feeling" in this question 5). Thus.

[Openness 10] As regards a question ("what-question"), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking the "perfink" of the person concerned, with the restriction in terms of time, for example, "a second before...", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the question asking the same but without any of such restrictions, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

[Openness 11] As regards a series of questions ("what-question"s) asking "perfink" of the person, (X) the Closedness, in the case of asking in a fixed predetermined order, such as in the sequence of perceiving first, then thinking and lastly feeling, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of asking in a free and flexible sequence, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

Incidentally, there are 6 (= 3!) possible sequences in total for the three components of "perfink".

6) "In what kind of appearances did Melos come running?" 「メロスはどんなかっこうで走ってきた？」

To this question, children reading the text are expected to give the correct answer with ease.

7) "Looking at these dreadful appearances of Melos, what did Philostratus say?"

「このすさまじいメロスのようすをみたフィロストラトスはなんといったろう。」

Takeda writes, "Children will answer 'He said "Ah, it's Melos, is it not?"' ("Ah, Mr. Melos!") with a voice like a groan'. I may say that the whole works so far have been set up so that this question pierce into children. That much significance do I put into this question." (ibid. pp. 136-7.).

However, in the sense that, on the surface, the exchange of the question and the answer can not be other than the one described above, the degree of [Openness 4] is low in this question. The major purpose of this question is to see whether, with this question only, children can begin on their own to pursue the inner agony of Philostratus. Takeda was not sure about the effect, however. In this sense, this question is high in the degree of [Openness 6].

We now realize for sure that a question could be open in terms of one kind of Openness, but could be closed in terms of other ones.

8) "Why, 'with a voice like a groan', did he say only 'Ah, it's Melos, is it not?'"

「なぜ、うめくような声で、『ああ、メロスさま』とだけいったのか？」

(In the Japanese original, this expression goes like 'Ah, Mr. Melos!' (「ああ、メロスさま」) and nothing more. So, the actual Japanese question prepared was: "Why, 'with a voice like a groan', did he say only 'Ah, Mr. Melos' (implying "and nothing more") ?")

Takeda writes, "Here, I would like to let my children vividly see that in the words expressed in a voice like a groan are contained every bit of Philostratus's inner agony, which we have been pursuing in the study up to this point." (Takeda, *ibid.*, p.138.) This Why-question contains the danger of ending up with superficial exchanges of question and answers. However, Takeda's aim was to let children understand the "a voice like a groan" as "an unintended spouting expression of Philostratus's inner agony". The word Takeda added in order to help children understand the point was the expression "only". In other words, if the Philostratus's inner agony was not so deep and serious, then he may not have said in "a voice like a groan" and also may have said much more. For example, he might have "in a bright cheerful voice", "in a calm voice", or "in a cold voice". Putting these other possibilities in the background, or in horizon, Takeda asks the meaning of the fact that Philostratus said only 'Ah, Mr. Melos' 'with a voice like a groan'. This question naturally and implicitly urges children to imagine other possible words of his in the situation, and to become aware that such imagined words would not have been suitable. By doing so, Takeda eventually let children understand the "voice" as "an unintended spouting expression of Philostratus's inner agony". Thus,

[Openness 12] As regards a question ("why-question"), after having shown a certain reality: (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking the reason and/or cause of the reality, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the question that asks why only the given reality and no other than the given reality could have happened, and that implicitly urges children to imagine many other possibilities, and further more, that invites children to think about the meaning of the given reality by putting the other imagined possibilities in the background, in the horizon. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

9) "Melos said, 'Nor is it merely a question of one man's life', didn't he? Let us think about the meaning of these words."

「メロスは『ひとの命ももんだいではないのだ』といったね。このことばの意味をかんがえよう。」

In the original in Japanese language, this expression goes like: 'Man's life does not matter either. 'What this 'Man's life' means is vague in Japanese, because whether it is singular or plural is not evident in Japanese expression. This question by Takeda touches upon this point.

This is merely a rhetorical question, and in fact a notice to confirm and a proposal for children to pursue further. Of course, Takeda is expecting an affirmative answer "Yes" from children. In this sense, the degree of [Openness 4] is low in this question. This question will not invite any explication. "This is not yet a question for teaching." writes Takeda.

10) "Has Melos ever uttered such words before?"

「メロスは以前こんなことをいったことがあるだろうか。」

Takeda writes, "I think this question will have a significant response from children". This question 10) has a similar structure to the question 8). This question first presents as a fact the fact that Melos uttered "such words", that is 'Man's life does not matter either' and lets children notice it, then asks whether or not he could have uttered "such words" at any time other than "that time". By so doing, The question urges children to notice that there is no possibility of Melos having said "such words" at any other time. Thus, the question helps children notice the grave significance "that time" had for Melos. This is its structure. In other words, This is the kind of question, in which the teacher, first presents a reality, and urges children to imagine other possible realities, and then putting these other possibilities in the background, or in horizon, invites to become aware of the meaning/significance of the very reality presented first.

[Openness 13] As regards a question, after having shown a certain reality as a fact at a specified time: then, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking the meaning of the factual reality, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the

question that asks whether that factual reality could have been at some/any other time than the specified time. Thus, the question implicitly urges children imagine other possibilities (or other possible facts) at some/any other time, and then let them put those possibilities as a background of that first particular fact, so that the children think of the actual meaning/significance of the fact, considered as one possibility among others, and also in contrast with other possibilities. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

11) "What is referred to by the word 'Man's life?'"

「『ひとの命』というのはなにをさしているのですか？」

In English translation by Ralph E. MacCarthy, the unambiguous expression "one man's life" is used, whereas in the Japanese original the ambiguous expression 「ひとの命」 is used. Therefore, in the Japanese original, whether it is singular or plural is ambiguous. Naturally, what the words point to becomes also ambiguous. The question by Takeda in Japanese is to make sure of and clarify this ambiguity in the Japanese expression. Therefore, in the Japanese text, the words could refer to the possibilities of "a) Celinuntius's life, b) Melos's life, c) the lives of the two, d) the human lives/life including the lives of the two, e) the human life beyond individuals", whereas, in the English translation, the possibilities of c), d), e) will be eliminated. In a sense, we may say that the elementary school 5th graders were expected to go beyond the understanding of the English translator (MacCarthy) in the interpretation of the Japanese words 「ひとの命」.

[Openness 14] As regards a question asking "What is it/this?": (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question of there being only one answer without any ambiguity, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question of, because of some ambiguity, there being multiple possibilities left. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

12) "For Melos, does his own life matter, now?" "Selinuntius' life?" "The lives of the two?"

「メロスはいま自分の命がもんだいなのですか。セリヌンティウスですか。二人のいのちですか。」

This question corresponds to Question 11) and gives three choices of the meaning for Melos of "Man's life", at the point of "now". Just as the question 5), with the restriction imposed upon the objective time, i.e. "now", it asks about the situation at that moment. In this sense, it is closed in the sense of [Openness 10]. However, this is a multiple-choice question (in this case, three choices question), in contrast to the "open-ended question" in the everyday ordinary sense. This question is relatively closed, with less openness. Thus,

[Openness 15] As regards a question: (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question to answer by choosing among the multiple choices provided, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question to answer by writing a "Free description", without any given multiple choices. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

On this dimension of [Openness 15], the questions with two choices such as "right/wrong", "agree/disagree" and/or "yes/no" are less open than the ones with three choices such as "right/wrong/don't know", "agree/disagree/don't know" and/or "yes/no/don't know". And the latter questions are, in its turn, less open than the ones to be answered with "Free description".

13) "What is Melos running for?" 「メロスは何のためにはしているの？」

The word "running" implicitly implies the time is restricted on "now". The question "What for" asks the "in-order-to motive", in contrast to the "because-motive" (Schutz, A. (1989). p. 84-89.). Thus, we find a new possibility of openness.

[Openness 16] As regards a question asking "Why?": (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking explicitly either of the because-motive or the in-order-motive, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question asking not explicitly either or both of the two kinds of motives. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

In the latter question, there is more openness, more freedom and autonomy, on the part of the children as to which of the two kinds of motives to choose to answer.

14) "Melos said 'I am running because of something immeasurably greater and more fearsome....',
But was he clearly aware of what that something is?"

「わたしはもっとおそろしく大きいもののためにはしているのだ」とメロスはいった。
「けどそれがどういふものかメロスにわかっていたのだろうか？」

Interesting enough, in the English translation, Melos answers with the word "because of" to the "What for" question. The translation had better been answered by "for something" rather than "because of something", perhaps. However, this may be showing, incidentally, the mixture/confusion and/or loose distinction of the two kinds of motives in everyday language.

This question is not directly asking what it is that is "something immeasurably greater and more fearsome". At least on the surface, the question itself asks simply whether he was clearly aware of it or not. In other words, it asks only the answer of "yes or no". In this sense, this is a question with less openness. However, as the series of the questions that follows will show, in its intent, the question is to pose a problem on the content of "something immeasurably greater and more fearsome".

15) "When did Melos begin to think that way?" 「メロスはいつからそんな考えになったの？」

Here again, the problem is on the time. Melos's thought "now" has now been clarified, then the next question is "from when" has it become Melos's thought. In order to answer this question, children must examine the experiences of Melos following through the flow of the time and the events. This examination would eventually mean to follow the entire history of Melos's lived experiences. In this sense, this seemingly simple question has a great openness. For example, this has greater openness than the question such as "At the time of wedding ceremony of his sister, was Melos thinking that way?" Evidently, the former question will require children to examine Melos's thinking at far more points of the time than the latter one. Thus, [Openness 17] As regards to a question asking the time when a certain state of affairs occurred, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking, "At such and such particular point of time, was the state of affair existing or not?", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question asking "When did this state of affair come into existence?" There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

16) "Who did make Melos utter the words 'something immeasurably greater'?"

「『もっとおそろしく大きなもの』というメロスのことばをひきだしたのはだれ？」

This is also a question in the series of questions that are intended to clarify the content of Melos's word "something immeasurably greater and more fearsome". The question asks in the form of "Who made him say the word?" In order to answer this, children are supposed to thematize the word first, then to imagine his "perfork" while saying the word, and to ask who and/or what made or let him say the word. This question-answer exchange is not in the form of "Is it A?": "yes/no", neither in the form of "Is it A, or is it B?": "It is A", "It is B" or "None of the two". In this sense, the question has more openness, keeping the range of possibilities wider open. Thus,

[Openness 18] As regards to a question, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question to be answered by "yes" or "no", or by choosing one of the choices given, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question to be answered by an answer which is to be discovered by the questionee him/herself. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

This [Openness 18] may correspond approximately to the adjective "open" or "open-ended" usually used to modify a question.

17) "What of, or which part of, these Philostratus's words did move Melos's heart?"

「この、フィロストラトスのことばのどこが何が、メロスの心をうったのだろうか。」

The implicit assumption of this question is that not all of "these Philostratus's words" equally moved Melos's heart and that there is/are some part(s) that moved Melos's heart most. Then, the question asks, if there is some such part(s), then which part or what was it. Thus, the question urges children to examine and think about each of the possible parts one by one. This question is also a relatively open one as regards [Openness 18].

18) "Philostratus is saying a lot, isn't he? What is he saying?"

「フィロストラトスはいろいろなことっているね。どういふことっているのだろうか。」

This question 18) urges children to pursue further the inquiry supposedly initiated by the question 17). However, this question itself does not yet show the choices of words. Pressed by this question, children will begin to enumerate the possible choices from Philostratus's words. In this sense, this question urges the activity of enumeration and selection of possible choices. Further, from among the choices selected, children are supposed to choose the answer. However, on the surface, the question remains to seek only to discover, enumerate and order the possible choices. As regards "openness", this is more open than the coming question 21) which urges children to choose from among the choices directly shown.

19) "Melos said 'That is why I must run'. Of course, this is a response to Philostratus's words. What does the words 'That is why....' refer to? "

「『それだからしぬのだ』とメロスはいった。これはいうまでもなくフィロストラトスのことばをうけたことばだ。『それだから』というのはなにをさしているのだろう。」

This question ask about the reference of the words 'That is why....'. However, the intention of the questioner, the teacher, is to prepare children for the question 25). In that sense, this question constitutes a part of the whole scheme of the inquiry. As regards openness, the question is high in [Openness 15], because it ask only "What does it refer to?", without giving any further suggestions or choices. However, the question picks up and focuses upon the words 'That is why....'. In that sense, it is less open than a question such as "What does these Philostratus's words all mean?".

20) "He said, '... when the king mocked and taunted him,.....', didn't he?"

「『王さまがさんざんあの方をからかっても』といったね。」

This question picks up a part of the novelette's description, and confirms that description. In this sense, at least on the surface, it could be answered by "yes" or "no", or "Yes, he did." or "No, he didn't.", with small openness with two choices. However, the intention of this question is to direct children's attention to the words cited. In this sense, it is a restrictive and closed question.

21) "Did the king mock and taunt Selinuntius for his clothing?" or

"Did he mock and taunt him for his face?"

「セリヌンティウスの服装のことなどからかったの？ それとも、顔のことかな？」

Here, just after the question 20, this question gives two concrete choices and asks children to choose. Therefore, this is a closed question as regards the [Openness 18]. However, the two choices given are both inadequate, so that children are expected to find out these two given choices as inadequate to negate them, and to begin to search for the new content of "mock and taunt" by themselves. In this sense, this question looks as if giving two choices, it actually works just the same as the question: "What did the king mock and taunt S. for?". Takeda writes, "Children will not listen to my words of the question to the end. They will surely say, 'No, no. It is not that'. Then, I will ask: 'Then, what did the king mock and taunt? ". In other words, the intent of the question is to challenge children and make it an opportunity to ask the latter question. This challenging question is not intended to end with the answer to itself only. In this sense, it is an open question as regards the [Openness 6].

22) "Where is the king (seated) ?" 「王はどこにいる？」

This question asks about the content that is not at all described in the original novelette. In the original, there is not a mention as to where the king is. Thus, if children read the original literally and remain there, they will never be able to answer. Nevertheless, it could also be admitted that the common image may be shared of the king as "sitting perhaps on the high throne looking down upon Selinuntius, the king himself surrounded by many of his retainers", as Takeda writes, "if those images of the king are richly called forth, which have been carefully read and formed from the first half of the novelette". The point is not so much to get the "high throne" as the only right answer as to form an adequate image harmonious with the tense atmosphere of the encounter between the king and Selinuntius. Thus the "high throne" is an adequate and right answer, so far as it is adequate to draw the image to satisfy the conditions above. And, if children were able to draw some adequate images that satisfy the conditions above, even if not the

"high throne", then it proves to the teacher that children have grasped the character of the king, the tense atmosphere of the encounter, the different perspectives and "perfink"s of the two toward Melos, and/or the different "perfink"s of the two toward human being in general. This is the structure and meaning of this question. In this sense, there is no single right answer to be found in the original, but there are many possible inadequate answers that do not satisfy the conditions above.

The question can be understood as the one that urges "concretization" of "Places of Indeterminacy" [Ingarden, Roman (1973). pp.53-55.] Then, among the possible answers to the question, there can be, after Ingarden, "permissible" ones, "not permissible" ones and "desirable" ones. And, after Takeda, for the concretization of this "Place of Indeterminacy", the "high throne" is the most "desirable" answer as the image, in view of the reading of the work so far. We can understand this question as the one requesting the most "desirable" "concretization" of the "place of indeterminacy" in the work.

[Openness 19] As regards a question asking the understanding and interpretation of a literary work of art, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question to be answered by "faithfully describing the "places of determinacy" that are already given in the original, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question to be answered by a "desirable" "concretization" of,--- but beyond "permissible" or "not permissible" ones, ---the "places of indeterminacy" in the work. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

This is an openness as a question what seeks the completion of the work of art by the receptive actions of the reader.

23) "What response did Selinuntius make when he was mocked and taunted by the king?"

「王にからかわているセリヌンティウスはなんとこたえた？」

The answer to this question would be, as given in the text : "All he said was 'Melos will come.'" However, if this is all the question asks, then, this question is just confirm what is given in the text. However, in response to this question, children are expected to read "All he said was 'Melos will come' as "He said 'Melos will come' and nothing more." and further to read the meaning of "said nothing more" as "It is unnecessary to say anything more" and/or "He firmly believed that Melos would certainly come." and answer that way. In this sense, the degree of openness of this question is also high.

Takeda writes, " In order to read, out of a few lines of sentences in the text, the the scene of the execution ground, the figure of the king, Selinuntius confronting him quiet and undisturbed, all such scenes of smothering confrontation betting the human life, there is no other way than to develop our reading by dialoguing." (Takeda, *ibid.*, p.158). From this citation, it is evident that Takeda is aiming at the concretization of the places of indeterminacy, as pointed earlier.

24) "What would have occurred to Melos's mind and heart, when he thought of his friend mocked and taunted by the king in front of the crowd ?"

「群衆の面前で王にからかわれている友を思ったとき、メロスの心には、どんな思いがうかんだらうか？」

This question asks about Melos's imagination and "perfink", while focusing upon a particular short period of time. In this sense, the question is relatively closed and less open in [Openness 10], as compared with the kind of questions with no such focusing on the time. However, there is no description given, in the original text, of Melos's imagination and/or "perfink" at that particular period of time. What is sought in this question is, just the same as the question 22), the "concretization of the place of indeterminacy". In this sense, this question is high in the degree of openness of [Openness 19].

25) "What is the meaning of Melos's words: 'I am running because of something immeasurably greater and more fearsome.....'?" 「私は、なんだか、もっとおそろしく大きいもののためにはしているのだ」というメロスのことばの意味は？」

The expected answer to this question is 「信実」 ("sincerity/ honesty/ faithfulness/ fidelity". However, at this very last moment of teaching, Takeda is not actually expecting to ask this question and hear the answer from his children.

Takeda writes, "I would think that the development of the classroom teaching which must ask the meaning of these Melos's words at the very last moment is the worst one. Actually, without dragging the question to the last moment, there should be many occasions to tackle this question on the way. If my interpretation of the material and the method of development is accurate, then opportunities will come without fail. And, if my encounter and confrontation with children is actualized there, then the class becomes enlivened. If the preparation is made perfect, and if the class proceeds just as prepared, then that teaching may perhaps be without failure but also without either creative clash or new discovery. There will be no shaking or tension created in the spirits of children." (ibid., p.163-164)

This question, then, is prepared but is not expected to be asked at least in the very last moment of the class. Takeda prays for the situation where this prepared question 25) be abandoned and not be asked. He had prepared it only to be thrown away. Thus,

[Openness 20] As regards a question prepared beforehand, (X) the Closedness, in the case of assuming to ask the question without fail, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of assuming that, according to the situation, the question may be asked but may not be asked. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

In addition to the [Openness]es so far explicated, the following three kinds of [Openness]es have also been found not specifically in relation to any particular questions.

[Openness 21] As regards a series of questions consisting of sub-series of questions, each sub-series thematizing different theme (such as, Melos's inner world, the king's inner world, and so on), (X) the Closedness, in the case of every sub-series rigidly taking the same uni-directional change of openness, for instance, always only from "open to close", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of each sub-series flexibly taking its own direction of change of openness, either from "open to close" or from "close to open": for instance, from either "from multiple choices to open description" or "from open description to multiple choices". There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

[Openness 22] As regards a multiple-choice question giving plural choices, (X) the Closedness, in the case of giving no or only one choice of "realistic possibility", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of giving all the choices with "realistic possibility". There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases. On the surface, (X) and (Y) may look the same but in depth, they are so different, in that (X) is in reality only a pretense/disguise/mask of openness. while (Y) is an honest sincere true openness.

[Openness 23] As regards a situation of two persons encountering to exchange their views, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the one person talking (questioning) all the time and giving the other no chance to talk (question), on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of both persons giving to each other chances to talk (ask questions) freely, and each quietly listening to the other talking (questioning). There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases.

§ 6. Meaning and Structure of Openness in a Question and in a Series of Questions

Throughout the explicative process so far, we have been attempting to observe the concrete appearances of "Openness" seen in the individual questions and/or in the series of questions, which were prepared in the plan by a master teacher Tsuneo Takeda for teaching the novelette "Run Melos!". The assumption underlying this explication was that the plan itself is a work of art. To intuit the "Openness-Closedness" dimensions, the basic question that has been asked in the free imaginative variation is: "What would the teacher, the questioner, and/or the children, the questionees, could possibly experience if and when this particular question and/or this particular series of questions were asked ?" Through this process of free imaginative variation, we have explicated at least possible 23 invariable dimensions of "Openness-Closedness" at various levels of concreteness (or abstractness). We may consider each question as a concretization of "Openness" formulated in the dimensions exemplified in each of [Openness]

discovered so far. A question can be considered as a concretized profile of formulated idea [Openness]. Or, each formulated [Openness] can be considered as an idea intuited through the process of the imaginative free variation of the particular concrete questions, and/or the particular concrete series of questions, which are to be assumed as a profile (an adumbration) of the idea. On the other hand, each formulated [Openness] can be considered as a profile of the more general idea "Openness", so that the idea "Openness" can be formulated as an invariant essence to be intuited through the process of the free imaginative variation of formulated [Openness]-es of various kinds. We could imagine "Openness" at various levels and of various kinds: on the concrete level of concrete questions, on the relatively abstract level of formulated [Openness]-es, and/or on the far more abstract level of an idea "Openness". We might conceive an hierarchically organized structure of "Openness". The elements of each level correspond two-ways to the elements of another level in one-to-many relations. For instance, a question could be explicated as relatively open in one formulated [Openness] but as relatively closed in another formulated [Openness], which we have already observed with some of the questions in the process of our explication. And also, one [Openness] could obviously be concretized in many questions in many ways.

Now, let me briefly summarize a few of the observations gathered in the explicative processes so far attempted.

First of all, the openness of question is not limited to a single dimension, such as the commonly used everyday distinction between "Open-ended question" and "Closed-ended question", such as multiple-choice question. Even with regards multiple choice questions, a question with three choices would look more open than a question with two choices. There are also openness observed only in a specific kind of questions, such as "Why-question" or "Perfink-question", for instance. In short, there are various kinds of openness for various kinds of questions. Openness of questions has many appearances, therefor constitutes a rich phenomenon..

Second, with each of [Openness], we could assume a dimension from the most open to the least open, or the most closed. In other words, there are various degrees of openness among questions, with regards to the same kind of openness. This has been repeatedly observed when to define a dimension of openness in our attempt.

Third, with regards to various kinds of series of questions, there are various kinds of openness. We observed such kinds of openness with series of questions as: for instance, [Openness 1] between the pre-determination to use all questions and the preparation to decide on the spot, and [Openness 2], between pre-determination as to whether to adopt or to drop particular questions, and the flexibility of which to adopt and which to drop.

Fourth, there are various degrees of openness among series of questions. This will need no further explanation.

Fifth, the openness on the level of a question and the openness on the level of a series of questions are to be distinguished. If we call the former a "Micro-openness" and the latter a "Macro-openness", then we could say that a "Macro-openness" is not a mere accumulation of "Micro-openness". Openness of a series of questions is created and actualized not necessarily by a series of uniformly and evenly open questions, rather it is created but by a series of diversely open questions constituting the series. In other words, diversity in Micro-openness is a necessary condition for Macro-openness.

Sixth, within a series of questions, Micro-openness of questions could vary either from an open question to a closed one or vice versa. A series may be composed of many sub-series. And we may conceive a rhythm or a wave of the variations of openness within a larger series consisting of sub-series.

Seventh, the purposes of the questions and series of questions creatively planned are: (A) to help children experience entering the world of the work of art, and (B) with the accumulation of these experiences, to help children, in the future, become able to enter the worlds of the works of art autonomously on their own. In the long run into the future, children

are expected to reach the stage of reading on their own imaginatively and multi-perspectively. The questions by a teacher are to help them approach this desired stage, rather than to keep them limited and restricted by the questions now posed, only to be blocked from reaching that stage. Thus, among the teachers, there is a maxim: "Help them only when and if necessary".

Eighth, it is not that the openness perse is unconditionally important, but that the openness is important in so far as it contributes to help children reach the desired stage of autonomous, imaginative and multi-perspective reading of high and rich quality.

Ninth, as for the form of a plan for teaching, we find we could formulate in at least in three kinds of forms: (A) an ordinary uni-dimensional linear temporally sequential plan, in which the sequence of asking questions is determined in one sequential order: "Ask this one first, then this next". A little more Openness could be introduced by allowing to change the order of asking by moving or jumping back and forth from one question to another. If we push a little further, then we will get: (B) a two-dimensional, geographical-map-like plan. With this kind (B) of map-like plan, the temporal constraint becomes far less than the kind (A) of uni-dimensional plan. Actually, the late Takeji Hyashi (林竹二: 1906-19xx) used such a form of plan for teaching. If we push still further, then we will get: (C) a multi-dimensional plan, structured, metaphorically speaking, like a three, or more, dimensional neuro-network. This will be with the least predetermined (pre-planned) temporal constraints. In that sense, it will be the most open plan in terms of the order of asking.

Tenth, as regards to the plan for teaching, there is a saying among teachers, "Prepare and forget!" (:meaning "Prepare well and make as detailed a plan as possible, but, in the actual teaching, just forget the plan, not to be constrained by the plan"). You might ask why do you prepare and plan, if you are to forget it. In my understanding, if the plan is too detailed and perfect, then chances are the teacher would be restricted by the plan and lose the freedom and flexibility to adapt on the spot to the reality of children. In order to respond flexibly and adaptively to children's real responses in situ, the teacher had better forget the pre-prepared plan, regardless of the time and the labor he had invested to make the plan detailed and perfect. Would the plan be then useless and vain? Not at all. The preparation and the plan itself make the teacher more attentive and perceptive to the children's responses, which, without the preparation and the plan, would have easily been overlooked or overheard. The plan will make the teacher more perceptive to children's responses, even when it is forgotten on the surface, lost from explicit consciousness. In addition, the plan forgotten will give the teacher more freedom, flexibility and adaptability than when no plan were made at all.

Eleventh, at least in teaching a literary work of art, teacher's question can be directed to the explication of an aspect of "perfink" (perceiving/feeling/thinking) of every main character of the work, either in specific time/place and/or in the situation not specified. With this principle in mind, a teacher will have no difficulty, at least in suggesting possible questions, if not excellent questions. Hopefully, some formulated [Openness]-es will serve as hints and clues to discover questions for teaching.

Twelveth, we had started our explication of Takeda's 25 questions, making pre-suppositions on their quality as a work of art suited for thematizing the "Openness" in questions. Needless to say that the Takeda's 25 questions on "Run, Melos!" could never exhaustively cover all the possible good questions in teaching. However, upon looking back on our explication, our pre-suppositions turned out at least functional to help us reveal the structure and meaning of Openness in questions. This was because these questions are based upon the history of Takeda's rich teaching experiences. These questions are, as you see, so much varied among themselves that many dimensions of Openness in questions naturally appear to the surface, to help me carry out the explication. While explicating these questions, I was tempted to recall the following "prescription" for teachers by William James:

"The prescription is that the subject must be made to show new aspects of itself; to prompt new questions; in a word, to change." From an unchanging subject the attention inevitably wanders away. You can test this by the simplest possible case of sensorial attention. Try to attend

steadfastly to a dot on the paper or on the wall. You presently find that one or the other of two things has happened: either your field of vision has become blurred, so that you now see nothing distinct at all, or else you have involuntarily ceased to look at the dot in question, and are looking at something else. But if you ask yourself successive questions about the dot, ---how big it is, how far, of what shape, what shade of color, etc.; in other words, if you turn it over, if you think of it in various ways, and along with various kinds of associates, ---you can keep your mind on it for a comparatively long time. This is what the genius does, in whose hands a given topic coruscates and grows. And this is what the teacher must do for every topic if he wishes to avoid too frequent appeals to voluntary attention of the coerced sort. The teacher who can get along by keeping spontaneous interest excited must be regarded as the teacher with the greatest skill. (James, W. (1958), pp. 79-80.) James touches upon this same point to the same effect also in his great work The Principles of Psychology (1890/1981) (Harvard U.P. pp. 400-401). Judging even only from the 25 questions by Takeda, I may be allowed to say that he was "a teacher with the great skill". The 25 questions by him were at least a good sample of high quality to start our explicative attempt of Openness.

Thirteenth, it is observed that the children are expected not only to answer the questions posed by their teacher but also to ask themselves the kinds of questions once asked by their teacher. Children learn not only how to answer but also how to ask questions. This is a part of their way to achieve their own autonomous reading. In a sense, teachers' questions are incorporated into the repertoire of children's questions, so that children begin to "perfind" on their own what, at the beginning, only the teacher was able to "perfind". In this way, children broaden and deepen their lived worlds by learning to read with their teacher. This also points to the importance of the question posed in the class by the teacher.

Fourteenth, Openness seems to be related to the possibilities left to the teacher and children to decide themselves. The more possible choices/alternatives/decisions are left for the teacher and children to choose from and decide on, the more open the situation, the question, the series of questions will be. Briefly, Openness is the possibilities left. Therefore, Openness in general will tend to lead to autonomy in favorable cases, and to confusion in unfavorable cases.

Finally, for brevity's sake, avoiding to repeat the 23 [Openness], let me mention some of the unexpected discoveries that were at one time or other very surprising and instructive at least to me: Openness such as [Openness10], [Openness12], [Openness13], [Openness16], [Openness17], [Openness19], [Openness22].

These are some of the observations so far made in the process of explicating the [Openness] of questions and series of questions created by Takeda for teaching the novelette "Run, Melos!".

§ 7 . The Meaning and Structure of Openness in Teaching=Learning and in Education

授業と教育における「開放性」の意味と構造

To push the matter a little further, let me attempt to explicate the meaning and structure of "Openness" in the context of teaching=learning and/or education in general.

"To educate" is etymologically interpreted and explicated as "to lead out of" (educere. Lat.) an old world and "to lead into" (educare. Lat.) a new world (Max van Manen. (1991)). In teaching a literary work of art, for instance, the teacher attempts to lead children out of their everyday worlds and to lead children into the world of the artistic work, including the worlds of the characters appearing in the work. By reading and studying a novelette in the class, children are given the opportunity to experience the worlds of the characters, the world of the novelette and the literature. By so doing, children enrich their lived worlds in the way impossible otherwise.

In Japanese language, the master teacher Enosuke Ashida's maxim "Let us grow together" (「共に育ちましょう」) 芦田恵之助 (1873-1951) points to the same idea of "leading out of" and "lead into", because the Chinese character 「育」 for the word "grow" represents a newborn baby coming out

of the world of the mother's womb and entering into the world outside. The idea of "to lead out of" and "to lead into" seems to be shared in the East and the West.

The Japanese word "Doshi" (「導師」), which literally means the teacher (師) who leads (導), is a noun to designate a kind of a teacher who leads the common people into the state of Buddhist enlightenment. Here again, the idea of "to lead out of" and "to lead into" is shared in the East and the West.

Now, our question is what is the meaning and the structure of "Openness" in the context of teaching=learning and "education" understood as "to lead out of/to lead into".

In terms of the "to lead out of/to lead into", there seems to be distinguished at least four stages of leading "out of / into".

(1) Within everyday life world, to lead out of the old lived world of "not knowing that/how" into the new lived world of "knowing that/how". A learner learns new things, in everyday life world, still in an old world. Teaching as giving information will be included in this category.

(2) To lead out of the old lived world of everyday world of taken-for-grantedness into the new world of non-everyday world of the learner (A.Schutz's moving between "finite provinces of meaning" may suit here). A learner learns to live in a new lived world. Teaching as a revelation of a new world would be included in this category.

(3) To lead out of the old lived world of waiting passively to be led "out of" and "into", further to lead into the new lived world of not waiting but going actively "out of" and "into", autonomously by oneself, into the various new worlds. A passive learner becomes an active learner of living into new worlds. Teaching a learner to acquire the "voluntarily active learning attitude", which is emphatically asserted by Enosuke Ashida (「発動の学習態度」 芦田恵之助) to be the very essence of education, will be included in this category.

(4) To lead out of the old lived world of "being led out of/into" by the other and to lead into the new world of "leading" the other "out of/into". A learner becomes a teacher for the other(s) of moving into new worlds. Teaching a learner to be a good teacher will be included in this category.

Let me avoid complicating the matter too much by introducing the iterative multiple-layered nest-box structure, with the above (1),(2),(3),(4) getting into the learning of the other(s) of the stage (4) and so on.

The purpose of education is, in a sense, to change from the state of the teacher being necessary for learner(s) to the state of being unnecessary. My mentor Kanji Hatano (1905-) once told me: "Education is the progressive processes of stages for a teacher of making himself unnecessary." In our context, we might say, the education is complete when the teacher succeeds in leading his students from the stage (1), through (2) and (3) to the stage (4) and finally in making himself unnecessary (for these students). A teacher who is always and forever needed by his students may be a failure as a teacher, because he may perhaps have failed to help students grow stage by stage from stage(1) to stage(4).

In order to help a learner grow from the stage (1), through (2) and (3), to the stage(4), a teacher will have to respond to the learner, keenly, warmly and empathetically observing how the learner is at that moment, in as much flexible, responsive and adaptive manner as possible. For example, when teaching the meaning of a word, flexibly adapting to how in reality children are, a teacher may sometimes give the meaning in words and tell them to memorize it verbatim correctly, may sometimes ask them to check with the dictionary themselves, may urge them to attempt to guess the possible meaning from the given context, may ask them to explain it in their own way in their own words, or may challenge them to write a sentence using the word or even a short story using the word as the title, and so on.

Flexibility, adaptativeness, responsiveness, correspondence, harmonization, conformation, challenging, provocative, freedom, autonomy,are the pivot characteristics of good teaching. Openness we are concerned here seems to be the necessary condition for this pivot. Openness allows the teacher and children spontaneously choose on their own from variety of possibilities, to allow both of them to be flexible, adaptive, responsive, correspondent, harmonious, conforming,

challenging, provocative, free, autonomous,.....

Takeda once wrote, "Not to teach is to teach. To spare and spare and spare to the end what the teacher, in heart, wishes to teach is education, I thought. As much as the teacher spare, children approach the teacher with all their will and act. In this encounter, education comes into existence. For a teacher to be (seemingly) idle and lazy is to spare, on his own responsibility, what he really wishes to teach ." (Takeda(1990). p.43).

Within our "Openness" in teaching and education, included are "Not to teach (in order) to teach" as a repertoire of a teacher to be chosen on his own responsibility. Paradoxically enough, he should be allowed to choose "not to teach", in order that he can teach children in a much deeper sense. This "Not to teach to teach" is grounded on the deep respect of the teacher for the possibility of the children as human existence. Openness in education should embrace "Not to teach to teach".

Thus, the "Silence" will also be included as a possibility of a teacher's repertoire of actions for teaching. Silence may work sometimes as a provocative challenge or as a warm encouragement for children to explore questioning and investigation in their own ways on their own initiative and responsibility. No, it may be the "Silence" of the teacher to listen children which would help children grow. Max Picard wrote in his "Die Welt des Schweigens": "In the world today, there is no more men who remain silent. No, there is no more the distinction between men talking and men being silent. The only distinction that exists is between men talking and men not talking. And since there is no men silent, there is no men listening. In fact, today, men cannot listen any longer." (The translation is from the Japanese translation: マックス・ピカート著(1964)、佐野利勝訳「沈黙の世界」みすず書房. p.181.) Silence of the teacher, as well as of children, not noisy questioning but quiet listening, would lead to nurturing the autonomy and independence in children.

We have seen the dialectic relation between Openness in a question and the Openness in a series of questions. This relation will also apply to the relation between a sub-series and a series. Indeed, there was observed both Openness and Closedness in a question. However, if one construct a series of questions that are all open without exception, would that series be very much open? Definitely, No! A series with all questions open will be very closed as a series in the sense that no question can be closed thus the series is without the possibility of closing and without having a variety of questions, thus the series will lose the freedom, flexibility,, that would have been possible otherwise. Just the same argument will apply with a sub-series and the whole series too.

We could conceive the dialectic relation, in general, between the Openness of a part and the Openness of a whole.

Openness of a part or parts does not assure Openness of a whole. Furthermore, paradoxically, a whole with all parts open will not be perfectly open but only relatively open. Obsession with Openness, without exception, would not be really open at all but it would rather be rigidly closed to Openness. We may name this Openness as "Obsessed Openness". Openness to choose freely and flexibly from both openness and closedness would be the authentic Openness.

Here, we find "Dialectics of Openness and Closedness" and "Openness through Closedness", or, to push a little further, "Openness as a whole through Diversity of Openness of parts" or "Openness through Diversity" which may sound very much like "Unity through Diversity".

While meditating on "Openness", it occurred to me that the Openness discussed here might essentially be the same as the "freedom and spontaneity" of Musashi (宮本武蔵), the "ordinary [or tranquil] mind that knows no rules" of Munenori (柳生但馬守宗矩), or the "Unfettered Mind" of Takuan (沢庵禪師) (Takuan Soho(1986)).

Their teachings seem to tell us: Attempting to be open and not to be closed is not being open but being closed. To be open and to be closed freely and naturally is truly being open. There seems to be much to explore in this direction, but let me stop here before it gets too open for me.

§ 8. Conclusion: Openness Practised

What will be the Conclusion from all this ?

I believe that the Conclusion at this stage should be kept open, because the issue of "Openness", either in "Asking a question and/or a series of questions" or in "Teaching=learning" and "Education" turned out to be so vast and rich that any conclusion to be drawn with this tiny study at this point cannot but be premature. If there is any conclusions worth while, then they should have already been contained in the main body of this study above. I would not like to be constricted within a possible brief conclusion expected by the readers to be placed in this short section.

Besides, after studying "Openness", I am beginning to feel like to practice "Openness" myself in my presentation here today, by intentionally leaving it open for you, participants, to explore further and draw your own conclusion on the meaning and the structure of "Openness".

Thank you for your silent listening.

References

文 献

Bruner, Jerome S. (1986) Actual Minds, Possible Worlds. Harvard U.P.

ブルーナー (1998)「可能世界の心理」(田中一彦訳)、みすず書房

Dazai, Osamu. (1988) Run, Melos! and other stories. (Trans. by Ralph F. MacCarthy). Kodansha, Tokyo

Gadamer, Hans-Georg, (1975): Truth and Method. The Seabury Press.

ガダマー、ハンス=ゲオルグ (1986)「真理と方法 I」(樽田 収 他訳) 法政大学出版局

Ingarden, Roman (1973): The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art. (trans. Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson) Northwestern U.P.

James, William (1958): Talks to Teachers. Norton.

James, William (1981/1890): Principles of Psychology. Harvard U.P.

Kaneda, Susumu (1990) Phenomenology of Works of Art. Sekai-shoin. (in Japanese).

金田 晋 (19xx)『芸術作品の現象学』世界書院

Kvale, Steinar (1996): InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing, Sage Publications.

Mannen, Max van, (1991): Tact of Teaching: The Meaning of Pedagogic Thoughtfulness. SUNY.

Merleau-Ponty ((1964) The Primacy of Perception. (ed. James M. Edie) Northwestern U.P.

メルロ=ポンティ、邦訳 (1966)『眼と精神』(滝浦静雄・木田元訳)みすず書房。

Picard, Max (1948) "Die Welt des Schweigens". Eugen Rentsh Verlag.

ピカート、マックス (1964)「沈黙の世界」。(佐野利勝訳) みすず書房

Schutz, Alfred (1989). The Structures of the Life-World, vol. II. (trans.) Northwestern U.P.

Straus, Erwin. (1966) Man: A Questioning Being. Chap. 6 in Phenomenological Psychology. Basic Books. pp. 166-187.

Takeda, Tsuneo (1971): Shinno Jugyousha wo Mezashite. (Toward an Authentic Teacher) (in Japanese). Kokudoshu.

武田常夫 (1971)『真の授業者をめざして』国上社

Takeda, Tsuneo (1964): Bungaku no Jugyou. (Teaching of Literature) (in Japanese). Meiji-Tosho.

武田常夫 (1966)『文学の授業』明治図書

Takuan Soho (1986). "The Unfettered Mind". (trans. William Scott Wilson). Kodansha International.

Yoshida, Akihiro. (1992) On the Why-What Phenomenon: A Phenomenological Explication of the art of asking questions. Human Studies. 15:35-46.

Appendix: Table of a Variety of [Openness #] explicated

[Openness 1] As regards a series of prepared questions, (X) the Closedness (or less openness), in the case of being rigidly determined to ask all the questions, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness (or more openness), in the case of remaining open and flexible whether to ask or not to ask any of the questions, on the other. There appears a dimension of "Openness" between the two cases. (This underlined statement will be omitted hereafter, but it is understood as always concluding each of the [Openness #] statemnets.)

[Openness 2] As regards a series of prepared questions, (X) the Closedness, in the case of being rigidly pre-determined which questions to ask and not to ask, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of not having decided which question to take and not to take, and also determined to hold the decision until actually facing the questionees, i.e. children, on the other.

[Openness 3] In the actual situation of classroom teaching, (X) Closedness, in the case of being rigidly determined to ask only prepared questions, on the one hand, and (Y) Openness, in the case of being prepared for creating new original questions on the spot, on the other.

[Openness 4] As regards a question, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner taking it for granted that the questionees (children) can--- or can not--- give the correct answer. on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the questioner not knowing whether the children can or cannot give the correct answer, on the other.

[Openness 5] As regards a question, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner already knowing the correct answer and only wishing to see whether the children can give the correct answer, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the "genuine question", the questioner not knowing the correct answer and not knowing what answer will come from the questionees, on the other.

[Openness 6] As regards a question (a "why-question", for instance), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner aiming at urging questionees, children, to answer only the question posed and nothing more, on the one hand, and (Y) on the other hand, the Openness, in the case of the questioner aiming at urging the questionees not only to answer the original question given, but also to begin to discover, to pursue and to investigate new questions by themselves.

[Openness 7] As regards a question (a "what-question"), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner explicitly specifying and dictating how to think about getting the answer, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the questioner at least not explicitly specifying how to think about getting the answer, on the other.

[Openness 8] As regards a question (a "what-question"), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the questioner explicitly restricting the situation in which the person is placed, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the questioner not restriction the situation in which the person is placed. on the other.

[Openness 9] As regards a series of questions ("what-question"s), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question freezing the thematized "perfink", on the same "perception" for instance, as the preceding question, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the question freely changing the thematized "perfink" away from the one in the preceding question, from perception to thinking, for instance, on the other.

[Openness 10] As regards a question ("what-question"), (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking the "perfink" of the person concerned, with the restriction in terms of time, for example, "a second before...", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the question asking the same but without any of such restrictions, on the other.

[Openness 11] As regards a series of questions ("what-question"s) asking "perfink" of the person, (X) the Closedness, in the case of asking in a fixed predetermined order, such as in the sequence of perception first, then thinking and lastly feeling, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of asking in a free and flex sequence, on the other.

[Openness 12] As regards a question ("why-question"), after having shown a certain reality: (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking the reason and/or cause of the reality, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, in the case of the question that asks why only the given reality and no other than the given reality could have happened, and that implicitly urges children to imagine many other possibilities, and further more, that invites children to think about the meaning of the given reality by putting the other imagined possibilities in the background, in the horizon.

[Openness 13] As regards a question, after having shown a certain reality as a fact at a specified time: then, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking the meaning of the factual reality, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question that asks whether that factual reality could have been at some/any other time than the specified time. Thus, the question implicitly urges children imagine other possibilities (or other possible facts) at some/any other time, and then let them put those possibilities as a background of that first particular fact, so that the children think of the actual meaning/significance of the fact, considered as one possibility among others, and also in contrast with other possibilities.

[Openness 14] As regards a question asking "What is it/this ?": (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question of there being only one answer without any ambiguity, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question of, because of some ambiguity, there being multiple possibilities left.

[Openness 15] As regards a question: (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question to answer by choosing among the multiple choices provided, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question to answer by writing a "Free description", without any given multiple choices.

[Openness 16] As regards a question asking "Why?": (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking explicitly either of the because motive or the in-order-motive, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question asking not explicitly either or both of the two kinds of motives.

[Openness 17] As regards to a question asking the time when a certain state of affairs occurred, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question asking, "At such and such particular point of time, was the state of affair existing or not?", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question asking not "When did this state of affair come into existence?"

[Openness 18] As regards to a question, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question to be answered by "yes" or "no", or by choosing one of the choices given, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question to be answered by an answer which is to be discovered by the questionee him/herself.

[Openness 19] As regards a question asking the understanding and interpretation of literary work of art, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the question to be answered by "faithfully describing the 'places of determinacy' that are already given in the original, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of the question to be answered by a "desirable "concretization" of,--- but beyond "permissible" or "not permissible" ones, ---the "places of indeterminacy" in the work.

[Openness 20] As regards a question prepared beforehand, (X) the Closedness, in the case of assuming to ask the question without fail, on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of assuming that, according to the situation, the question either may be asked or may not be asked.

[Openness 21] As regards a series of questions consisting of sub-series of questions, each sub-series thematizing different theme (such as, Melos's inner world, the king's inner world, and so on), (X) the Closedness, in the case of every sub-series rigidly taking the same uni-directional change of openness, for instance, always only from "open to close", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of each sub-series flexibly taking its own direction of change of openness, either from "open to close" or from "close to open": for instance, from either "from multiple choices to open description" or "from open description to multiple choices".

[Openness 22] As regards a multiple-choice question giving plural choices, (X) the Closedness, in the case of giving no or only one choice of "realistic possibility", on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of giving all the choices with "realistic possibility". On the surface, (X) and (Y) may look the same but in depth, they are so different, in that (X) is in reality only a pretense/disguise/mask of openness. while (Y) is an honest sincere true openness.

[Openness 23] As regards a situation of two persons encountering to exchange their views, (X) the Closedness, in the case of the one person talking (questioning) all the time and giving the other no chance to talk (question), on the one hand, and (Y) the Openness, on the other hand, in the case of both persons giving to each other chances to talk (ask questions) freely, and each quietly listening to the other talking (questioning).