
Anti-Semitism in the Academy: Jewish Learning in American Universities, 1914–1939

Harold S. Wechsler

The history of twentieth-century American higher education rings with laments that, at some usually unspecified time in the past, things were better. During this fictive Golden Age, the quality of students, faculty, scholarship, and even physical surroundings surpassed present-day conditions. Of course, memories are selective. Those who utter such laments rarely remember the *worst* students or the worst dissertations from their personal Golden Age, comparing instead the best of the past with the entirety of the present. Underlying this nostalgia is an image of an academy that was once smaller, more selective, more elite, and, for some, more Christian.

Practitioners of Jewish learning in American universities during the interwar period uttered similar laments. Morris Jastrow, who taught Semitics at the University of Pennsylvania for more than forty years, noted in 1919,

The preponderance of the natural sciences in this country at the present time is such that even among educated persons those who devote their careers to the old "Humanities" are looked upon as "back numbers," left over from a passing generation, while those who choose such outlandish subjects as Assyrian or Arabic or Sanskrit or Persian are regarded in the light of intellectual freaks.

But as opposed to the general laments, Jewish learning between the wars exhibits objective evidence of decline. "During the last decade," Jastrow continued, "no chairs for Semitics or Sanskrit have been established at our Universities, and very few during the past two decades."¹

The Early Years

Jewish learning entered the American university during the late nineteenth century, a period of university growth, usually within Semitics departments. The field took hold at six nascent universities: Harvard,



Jacob H. Schiff (1847-1920)

Columbia, the University of California, the University of Chicago, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Pennsylvania. These institutions were receptive because the introduction of Semitic philology increased the number of disciplines represented in their curriculum, and because each institution wished to increase ties with its local Jewish community—especially the assimilated Reform elements. Such ties enabled liberal Protestants to show that traditional links between specific denominations and colleges had diminished, and that their true constituency was the entire populace.

Reform Jews and reform Protestants, to use historian Richard Storr's phrase, also had common intellectual enemies: extreme forms of the higher criticism on the one hand and fundamentalism on the other.² Liberals had to demonstrate that abandoning a literal acceptance of the Bible did not imply the automatic acceptability of any interpretation offered by a "higher critic." Liberals also tried to show that recent scientific discoveries, especially the theory of evolution, could be reconciled with religion. The time could not have been better for cooperation. Jewish learning entered American higher education at a time of optimism about the future of the university and of American Judaism, and about the prospects for a successful encounter between the two.

A regression set in after World War I. Johns Hopkins almost replaced a Semitics program that contained a strong Jewish component with a law institute in 1926. Columbia's Richard Gottheil, appointed in 1886, remained the sole Semitics professor for most of his fifty-year tenure. The University of California's appointment of William Popper, a Jewish student of Richard Gottheil, to a Semitics post in 1906 was its last for many years.³ Chicago started in 1892 with Emil G. Hirsch, rabbi of Chicago Sinai Congregation. Despite several opportunities to change that pattern, Jewish learning at Chicago remained a part-time activity conducted by the rabbi of Chicago Sinai congregation until World War II. Pennsylvania took many years to follow the appointments of Morris Jastrow (1886) and Isaac Husik (1905).⁴ Indeed, during the mid-1920s, Harvard and Columbia unenthusiastically accepted two unsolicited endowments that rescued Jewish learning from near-disappearance at the founding institutions.

What caused this decline? Jastrow and his contemporaries correctly noted that the humanities did not fare well during this period. But by



Elliot Cohen (1899-1959)

most measures, the humanities in general fared better than Semitics and Jewish learning in particular. A better explanation is that the initial reception and the subsequent decline of Jewish learning were strongly conditioned by majority attitudes about the people represented by that learning, and by the role of knowledge in legitimating the place of Jews in the university and in American life.

Developments at Harvard

The fate of the Harvard Semitics department and of Harry Wolfson's first sixteen years at Harvard (1909-1925) are cases in point. In 1880, President Charles William Eliot appointed Crawford Howell Toy to a professorship in the newly-created Semitics department. Toy, who had run afoul of the Baptists for "heretical" thinking, recruited his student David Gordon Lyon for another faculty position. The two professors became the department's mainstays until Toy's retirement in 1910 and Lyon's in 1922. In 1905, Harvard added George Foot Moore. Moore is frequently acknowledged to have opened talmudic scholarship to Gentiles. The staff also included an Egyptologist and an Arabist.

In 1888, financier Jacob Schiff became interested in the Semitics department, and began a series of donations for constructing and equipping a Semitics Museum. Schiff's contributions continued for over twenty years. Schiff's friendships with Lyon, Toy, and especially President Eliot prompted him to subvent the department and museum. So did his interest in sponsoring a Harvard archaeological expedition to Palestine. By 1910, Harvard could look back on twenty years of growth in Semitics that resulted in important scholarly works and significant archaeological finds.⁵

All this changed once Abbott Lawrence Lowell assumed the Harvard presidency in 1909. From the outset, Lowell acted antagonistically towards the Semitics department. The president diverted a Schiff endowment from the Semitics department to the Divinity School to fund a New Testament scholar. Lowell committed no new university funds to Semitics; nor did he allow the department to raise money on its own. "To state the case mildly," Lyon wrote ruefully after his retirement, "no favors may be expected from the present administration." Schiff easily sensed Lowell's hostility. His contributions dwindled and soon ended completely.

Within a few years a once significant department found itself in a marginal position within the university. Broad considerations, such as society's "secularization," the onset of World War I, the resultant New England economic dislocations, and the intellectual preeminence of other university departments, explain some of Semitics' loss of status. Yet, the department's emphasis on Judaic Semitics, for example, the Palestine expedition, Moore's scholarship, and courses on Judaic topics, and its strong identification with Schiff, who, for all his prominence, remained a first-generation Jew with an accent, did not help in an era of increased anti-immigrant bias and anti-Semitism.

Shortly after Schiff's death, Lyon suggested that the museum host a small ceremony to honor its benefactor, and to exhibit a portrait Schiff had reluctantly sat for almost twenty years earlier on the stipulation that it not be displayed in his lifetime. Lowell tersely vetoed the suggestion.⁶

The Corporation felt that another celebration in connection with the exhibition of the portrait of Mr. Schiff would not be appropriate. The portrait is not for the first time presented to us, but has been in our possession all along; only in accordance with the desires of Mr. Schiff has it not been publicly shown.⁷

Seeking consolation, Lyon called upon Eliot. When he returned home, he wrote in his diary:

Told E. about Lowell's opposition to any celebration in connection with placing of Schiff's portrait on exhibition and about his continued opposition to efforts to raise money for the Sem. Museum. He says both acts spring from Lowell's fear of the Jews and his hostility to them.⁸

A few months later, Lowell precipitated a major debate over Harvard's "Jewish problem," and David Gordon Lyon led the opposition. Harry Wolfson's career was not unaffected by these developments.

Harry Wolfson came to Harvard at the urging of his high school principal in Scranton, Pennsylvania. He had previously studied in Russian *yeshivot* and at the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Seminary in New York (later part of Yeshiva University). At Harvard, Wolfson quickly impressed Lyon, who arranged for a scholarship underwritten by Schiff, and later for a travelling fellowship.

When Wolfson returned from Europe and defended his thesis in 1915, he began a decade as a marginal instructor at Harvard, always supported by communal contributions, and always on short-term contracts, renewed on very short notice. Lowell's adamant refusal to expend institutional resources on Wolfson's salary, and Wolfson's inability to obtain funds for publication of his thesis led him to despair of a permanent appointment. Indeed, he did not know that George Foot Moore had obtained a three-year appointment for him in 1921 only on condition that at the end of the period he would not be reappointed.

In 1923, Stephen Wise's newly opened Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City offered to assure Wolfson's salary while splitting his services with Harvard. J.I.R. and Harvard would each have had the right to terminate the agreement on short notice. This arrangement would probably have gone on for a few years, after which either J.I.R. would have asked Wolfson to make a choice or Harvard would have ended the agreement. But the endowment of a chair in Jewish philosophy by Lucius Littauer, a Harvard alumnus, former congressman, prominent businessman, and Reform Jew, enabled Wolfson to return to Harvard full-time, where he remained for his entire career.

Jews and Higher Education

To place these events at Harvard in the context of the history of Jewish learning in American universities and colleges, we must first ask what the Jewish community saw in higher education. The answer, in a word, was recognition. In his introduction to the 1905 *Jewish Encyclopedia*, editor Joseph Jacobs wrote:

The impression that the Jews are a mysterious sect like the Gypsies and that their conduct is inspired by unsocial motives must disappear before the evidence presented in the *Encyclopedia* that they are men like other men, with their prejudices and feelings indeed, but also with their ideals which later are seen to be in most cases the foundations of the ideals of humanity.⁹

The Jewish community willingly supported academic innovation in general; Jewish learning in the hands of Wolfson and his colleagues demonstrated its value to a larger world that had heretofore rejected or ignored it. Individual Jews could advance knowledge in many

emerging disciplines, sometimes by emphasizing Judaic aspects of their subject that their colleagues neglected. In return, American Jews asked for an important intangible: recognition of their scholars, their learning, and their previous and potential social contributions. Whether scholarship and associated activities could effectively secure communal recognition was an open question. But both Judaica scholars and their communal supporters believed support of this field of learning was a promising strategy for group betterment, a not unlikely belief in an era that placed a premium on rational solutions to social problems.

By the 1920s, it became clear that American Jewry had emerged as a viable social and political force—and unanimous joy did not exist at this prospect. Some believed that Jewish gains came at a cost to other groups. Others felt that immigration, especially Jewish immigration, had produced an unassimilable population with values and traditions alien to American practice. American Jews therefore constituted a threat—a problem to be reckoned with.

The Jewish Problem

Indeed, a curious debate took place among university-associated Gentiles. The debate was not over the existence of a “Jewish problem”—all agreed that there was one—but over its origins. Some, such as Columbia College Dean Frederick P. Keppel (1910–1918), postulated that the individual characteristics of some Jews created a “problem,” and that one could distinguish between “desirable” and “undesirable” Jews in student admission and faculty appointments. “Jews who have had the advantage of decent social surroundings for a generation or two [usually German Jews] are entirely satisfactory companions,” he wrote in 1915. The more recent arrivals (usually those from East Europe) who by hard work and sacrifice had academically prepared themselves might create problems. In public, Keppel stated that universities had a responsibility to accord such Jews access and perhaps to help them overcome “undesirable traits.”¹⁰ In private, Keppel and other Columbia authorities experimented with measures to limit their numbers.¹¹

Others began with a different postulate—that Jews *as a group* posed a “problem” apart from any member’s individual characteris-

tics. "Jews form a distinct body, and cling, or are drawn, together," asserted Abbott Lawrence Lowell. To Lowell, the recent growth in Harvard's Jewish constituency raised the fear that "where Jews become numerous they drive off other people and then leave themselves."¹² He had little interest in the source of this phenomenon, whether it was Gentile prejudice, Jewish "clannishness," or a combination. Nor did he contemplate whether the group traits he perceived resulted from heredity or environment, whether Jews were a "race," and whether the passage of time could eliminate "Jewish traits." These issues proved too abstract for Lowell's world of alumni, parent, student, and faculty concern.¹³ Jews as a group constituted a "threat"; if they ceased to do so in the future, Harvard could reconsider its contemplated restrictions upon Jewish access.¹⁴

Such reasoning, as Lyon's diary entry indicates, may have been disingenuous. But it posed a grave challenge to those who insisted that the results of Jewish scholarship would undermine precisely the prejudices, fears, and stereotypes expressed by Lowell and thereby improve the lot of American Jews. Indeed, some of the strongest reactions against the Jewish presence in higher education occurred in institutions that heretofore had welcomed them (Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins). Decades of attempts to explain Jews and Judaism to the Gentile world appeared, for reasons not fully fathomed, to have gone for naught. The universalism characteristic of American Reform Jews, a stance appropriate in the late-nineteenth-century era of liberal religion and social melioration, appeared unreciprocated and indeed irrelevant to the post-World War I situation.

The encounters of Jacob Schiff and Harry Wolfson with Harvard illustrated the diminished expectations for Jews and Jewish learning in American universities. Indeed, the prospect of general adversity may have prompted interested Jews, such as Judge Julian Mack, to place a high priority upon retaining Jewish learning at Harvard—a prestigious and influential institution whose founding had antedated that of the American republic by a century and a half. Regarded by James Bryce as the most famous university on the North American continent,¹⁵ Harvard bestowed instant and undisputable legitimacy on all associated with it—a fact well-known to both Jacob Schiff and Harry Wolfson. And as a multi-constituency—even a national—institution with sufficient resources to permit retention of marginal subjects,

Harvard's bestowals could, indeed had to, depend on more than the prejudices of any one man—even its president. The Littauer chair was not part of an inexorable progression of Jewish learning into the universities, as some would have it, but an exception to a general trend better typified by Wolfson's first decade than by his subsequent tenure.

Jewish Responses

Let us summarize the change that took place along with the rise of anti-Semitism in the early twentieth century, and then examine the Jewish response. At the end of the nineteenth century, about fifteen American universities plus several theological schools offered significant work in Semitics; some granted the Ph.D. Jews comprised a goodly proportion of Semitics practitioners. While the number of Semitists remained relatively small as compared to practitioners in other fields, they at least commanded sufficient resources to assure a presence for the subject. Reform Jewish enthusiasm for the university movement in general and Semitics in particular reflected satisfaction with American customs and institutions as such and as a fulfillment of the ideal of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* (the movement among liberal European Jews for the "scientific" study of Judaism). Chicago rabbis Bernhard Felsenthal and Emil G. Hirsch went so far as to view the American university as a possible substitute for a Jewish seminary.

By 1920, few exhibited such enthusiasm. "The influences about American universities do not seem somehow altogether favorable to the Jewish ministry," wrote one commentator. "Experience would not warrant the Jewish people disbanding their special rabbinical courses in dependence upon Semitics departments of universities."¹⁶ The heightened anti-Semitism that replaced the philo-Semitism of the late nineteenth century raised questions of university support. Post-World War I presidents perceived less intellectual urgency for the subject, lacked their predecessors' concern for Jews, and were self-conscious budget-balancers, not entrepreneurial intellectuals. They offered neither personal support nor financial resources to Semitics in general and especially to any distinguishable Jewish slant.

However, the lack of such support was not in itself always fatal.¹⁷ Even at Harvard, where Lowell mobilized substantial resources in the

battle to restrict admission of Jewish students, he probably assured that Jewish learning would fade with Lyon's and Moore's retirements. Harry Wolfson's academic fate was not a major preoccupation. If Wolfson had left Harvard, precisely such an erosion would have taken place. However, confronted with the Littauer endowment, Lowell could do little but accept.

In the nineteenth century, *Wissenschaft des Judentums* failed to attain university acceptance anywhere in Germany.¹⁸ But contemporary American Jews, well aware of that story, optimistically emphasized the differences between the German and American situations—especially the admittance of Jewish learning and Jewish instructors at American institutions of higher learning. By the 1920s—faced with heightened Gentile hostility that translated into discrimination in faculty hiring and student admission—advocates of Jewish learning in American universities replaced their unrealistic aspirations with greater pragmatism. Short-run increases in Judaic representation appeared unlikely. At best, the field might maintain its current level of offerings. And in an institution whose president viewed the “problem” in group terms, anyone who “represented”—and desired recognition of—the beliefs of the “distinctive” group would experience substantial difficulty. During the 1920s Jewish learning ran a real danger of becoming, to use *Menorah Journal* writer Elliot Cohen's terms, little more than “a minor section of Semitic linguistics” or a “pre-Christian culture, interesting in the Biblical aspects and Christian relations, confined to Palestine; post-Biblical developments ignored.”¹⁹

Practitioners of Jewish learning generally responded to their field's diminished position within the university by developing an activist, internally oriented scholarly agenda. “If I am not for myself,” wrote Professor Israel Friedlaender of the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1914, quoting Hillel's dictum, “who is for myself?” And, he continued, “If not now, when then?” Friedlaender's was the first of many discussions of Jewish learning to emphasize its potentially salutary effects on issues internal to the American Jewish community. Specifically, he accorded Jewish learning high strategic importance in dealing with the questions Jews and Judaism had to confront as a result of mass Jewish migration to America.

But if the predominant tone of Friedlaender's remarks emphasized the internals, it did so as a corrective to a perceived overemphasis on

the universal by Jewish Semitists and the Jewish community. Friedlaender's ultimate stance was mediative.²⁰ A culture's intellectual preoccupations, he argued, ultimately arise out of its immediate concerns: intellectuals will seek answers outside the context of Judaism if necessary, but given the traditional importance of scholarship in Jewish life, Jewish scholars could participate in the general discourse, offering solutions compatible with Judaism's essential tenets.²¹ University-based advocates of Jewish learning echoed these sentiments for many decades.

Developments Since World War II

The anti-Semitism of the interwar years in Europe and America did not result in abandonment of the universalistic aspects of Jewish learning. New York University's offerings in Jewish learning just after World War II included *modern* Hebrew language and literature. At the time, many of these works were by Zionists, and about Zionism and Palestine. In enumerating the advantages of these offerings, Professor Abraham I. Katsh listed "the great contribution of Judaism to Western civilization and American democracy."²²

Similarly, Cecil Roth, a British historian of Jewry, wrote while in America that serious study of Jewish history would serve a host of internal needs. "It is for him [the Jew] not merely a record; it is at once an inspiration and an apologia," he insisted. "It is only from an appreciation of his past that he can be imbued with self-respect and hope for his future." However, his ultimate stance resembled Friedlaender's. "It will not only reestablish decent Jewish pride and inspire the world at last with true respect, but will be a significant and absorbing contribution to universal history, an intellectual achievement of vast importance."²³

The field of Jewish learning responded to heightened anti-Semitism with formulations that emphasized Jewish distinctiveness in a pluralistic framework. These formulations replaced more general and universalist agendas for Jewish learning that failed to forestall enmity, much less gain "recognition." Subjects that appeared between the wars as candidates for college and university inclusion, such as modern Hebrew and Jewish history, were identifiably Jewish. These subjects held greater appeal for the undergraduate Jewish constituency

than did courses in Semitic philology. Their backers found it difficult to gain footholds for them in the curriculum because they appeared too "narrow," and because of continued discrimination against Jewish faculty, students, and potential students.

By the 1970s and 1980s, most discrimination had ended and Jewish learning could be found at hundreds of colleges and universities. The trends toward undergraduate offerings, modern rather than biblical Hebrew, the social sciences, and broader rather than deeper courses continued. If pre-World War I Jewish scholarship may be classified as predominantly "universalist," and interwar scholarship as predominantly "pluralist," that is, looking outward and inward at the same time, then recent Jewish scholarship contains a strong element of "particularism."²⁴

The word "particularism" carries pejorative overtones. There are not many academic rewards for "narrow" scholarship, although what is considered "narrow" in one field may be acceptable in another. But in the case of Jewish learning the field's history provides reasons for particularism's prominence. Earlier in this century, pressure from Harvard alumni reinforced the proclivities of Harvard authorities to limit the presence of Jewish learning and the number of Jewish faculty and students. The rejection of universalistic claims made for Jewish learning and the inability of graduate students trained during the interwar years to find university positions may have affected subsequent generations of Judaica scholars.

So too may have changes in the Jewish community. Assimilation, upward mobility, and economic prosperity brought a new communal agenda to the fore. By the 1970s, American Jewry concerned itself more with the contributions that Jewish learning could make to assuring communal survival than with recognition from Gentiles. This concern implied an inward-looking agenda for Judaica practitioners.

Indeed, the self-perceived status of Jews in American society likely will continue to predict the orientation of Jewish learning within American universities.

Notes

1. Morris Jastrow, "Supplementary Account of Thirty Years Progress in Semitic Studies, and Discussion of Dr. Peters' Paper," in Roland G. Kent, ed., *Thirty Years of Oriental Studies Issued*

in *Commemoration of Thirty Years of Activity of the Oriental Club of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: Intelligencer Printing Co., 1918), pp. 67, 69.

2. Richard Storr, *Harper's University: The Beginnings* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), pp. 39–40.

3. See Harold S. Wechsler, "Community and Academy: Jewish Learning at the University of California, 1870–1920," *Western States Jewish History* 18 (January 1986): 131–142.

4. See Harold S. Wechsler, "Pulpit or Professoriate: The Case of Morris Jastrow," *American Jewish History* 74 (June 1985): 538–555, and Paul Ritterband and Harold S. Wechsler, "A Message to Lushtamar: The Hilprecht Controversy and Semitic Scholarship in America," *History of Higher Education Annual* 1 (1981): 5–41.

5. Schiff was probably disappointed when the most important discovery on the Samaria expedition turned out to be the palace of Ahab.

6. David Gordon Lyon, "Relations of Jacob Schiff to Harvard University," David Gordon Lyon Papers, Harvard University Archives (hereafter HUA), HUG 1541.30, pp. 23–24.

7. Lowell to Lyon, December 1, 1921, Abbott Lawrence Lowell Papers, HUA (1919–1922), file 791: "Jacob H. Schiff." On this occasion Lowell also vetoed Lyon's request to embark on a fund-raising drive. On the Semitic Museum's current status, see Janet Tassel, "The Semitic Museum Rises Again," *Harvard Magazine* 84 (March/April, 1982): 40–46. See also Nitza Rosovsky, ed., *The Jewish Experience at Harvard and Radcliffe: An Introduction to an Exhibition* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1986).

8. David Gordon Lyon Journals, January 8, 1922, HUA, HUG 1541.10.

9. Joseph Jacobs, *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Guide to Its Contents, an Aid to Its Use* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906), p. 139.

10. Frederick Paul Keppel, *Columbia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1914), pp. 179–180, and idem, *The Undergraduate and His College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1917), pp. 81–84.

11. See Harold S. Wechsler, *The Qualified Student: A History of Selective College Admission in America* (New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1977), chap. 7.

12. Lowell to W. E. Hocking, May 19, 1922, Abbott L. Lowell Papers, HUA, file 1056, "Jews," and Henry Aaron Yeomans, *Abbott Lawrence Lowell, 1856–1943* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948), pp. 210–212. See also Harold S. Wechsler, "An Academic Gresham's Law: Group Repulsion in American Higher Education," *Teachers College Record* 88 (Summer 1981): 567–588.

13. The literature on Jews as a race was voluminous at the time. See especially Irwin Edman, "Race and Culture," *Menorah Journal* 10 (November 1924): 421–427; Charles W. Eliot, "The Potency of the Jewish Race," *ibid.* 1 (June 1915): 141–144, Alexander A. Goldenweiser, "Concerning 'Racial Differences,'" *ibid.* 9 (October 1922): 309–316, and A. L. Kroeber, "Are the Jews a Race?" *ibid.* 3 (December 1917): 290–294.

14. See Harold S. Wechsler, "The Rationale for Restriction: Ethnicity and College Admission in America 1910–1980," *American Quarterly* 36 (Winter 1984): 643–667. In line with this reasoning, Lowell proposed restrictions upon the total number of Jews admitted to Harvard (called, wrote his biographer, "by Jewish writers a numerus clausus" or quota) irrespective of the individual qualities of those admitted. (See Yeomans, *Abbott Lawrence Lowell*, pp. 209–217, quotation from p. 212.)

15. James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, ed. L. M. Hacker, vol. 2 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959), p. 461.

16. "Development and Influence of Jewish Jurisprudence," *Jewish Exponent*, January 19, 1906.

17. See "Locating a Rabbinical Institute," *ibid.*, January 5, 1906.

18. And worse, some used the movement's findings as weapons against Judaism and European Jewry. See Ismar Schorsch, *Jewish Reactions to German Anti-Semitism, 1870-1914* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), *passim*.

19. Elliot Cohen, undated memorandum, attached to Henry Hurwitz to Nathan Isaacs, May 26, 1926, Menorah Collection, American Jewish Archives, microfilm 2083. Cohen partially blamed the Reform rabbinate for the field's truncation even in those Semitics departments that transcended philology. "Judaism considered—thanks to these reform rabbis—as a religion entirely and to be studied only for its religious implication."

20. In comparing American Jewry to Spanish Jewry a millennium before, he noted a characteristic in the latter which he termed a desideratum for the former, "its close and intimate association with the general culture of the age on the one hand, and on the other, its ability to preserve and develop its distinct Jewish character and to sink deeply into the hearts and minds of the Jewish people."

21. Israel Friedlaender, "The Function of Jewish Learning in America," *Jewish Theological Seminary Association of America Student's Annual*, 1914 (New York: Isaac Goldmann Co., 1914), pp. 124-137, quotation from pp. 137, 128.

22. Abraham I. Katsh, "The Teaching of Hebrew in American Universities," *Modern Language Journal* 30 (December 1946): 586. See also *idem*, *Hebrew in American Higher Education* (New York: New York University Bookstore, 1941); *idem*, "Modern Hebrew in American Colleges and Universities," *Modern Language Journal* 35 (January 1951): 3-6; and *idem*, "Hebrew Studies in American Higher Education: An Evaluation of Current Trends," *Jewish Social Studies* 21 (January 1959): 15-21.

23. Cecil Roth, "Jewish History for Our Own Needs," *Menorah Journal* 14 (May 1928): 419, 434.

24. See Harold S. Wechsler and Paul Ritterband, "Jewish Learning in American Universities: The Literature of a Field," *Modern Judaism* 3 (October 1983): 253-289.

Harold S. Wechsler is Associate Professor of Education at the School of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University. Among his many publications is *The Qualified Student: A History of Selective College Admission in America* (1977).