

Creating Hebraism, Confronting Hellenism: The *Menorah Journal* and its Struggle for the Jewish Imagination

Lewis Fried

In February 1923, the *Menorah Journal* published Maurice Samuel's translation of Saul Tchernichowsky's Hebrew poem "Before the Statue of Apollo." In this extraordinary poem, the narrator begins with praise for Apollo as the inspiration of poets and describes the Greek god as the divinity of "joyousness and fresh delight." Shifting quickly, the narrator reminds Apollo, and the reader, that the poet is a "Jew" and that "Between us there is enmity forever!" Yet the poet enthuses that his spirit has "burst its chains" and that he has come "before thy pedestal" to kneel. Kneeling to all "passionate desires," the poet celebrates life, which the "bloodless ones/The sick, have stifled in the living God,/The God of wonders of the wilderness,/The God of gods, Who took Canaan with storm/Before they bound Him in phylacteries."¹

Paying homage to the reputed character of Hellenism, yet confronting it in the Hebrew language, so that aesthetic closeness becomes cultural tension, the poet reminded his audience of the enduring metaphor of Hellenistic and Jewish culture in perpetual opposition. In fact, these figures of speech, in reality code words of historical and theological polemics, were appropriate to the pages of the *Menorah Journal*. With its grandly suggestive title, reminding its audience of young college students that the Maccabean heritage was formed by the collision between Hellenism and Hebraism, the *Menorah Journal* was eager to explore the meaning and implication of this conflict. An understanding of the Jewish past, and its rhetoric, could clarify the American context for a generation of American-Jewish students eager to define their commitments and faith.

II

From its inception in 1915 and throughout its early years, the *Menorah Journal* analyzed the Jewish imagination and its place in America. The magazine proclaimed that Jewish existence was the result of a creative presence within American, and indeed world,

culture. Whether one of religion, peoplehood, or national continuity, a Jewish sensibility was equally at ease with its sacred texts and commentaries as with the literature of other nations.

The *Menorah Journal* often posed the legacy and nature of Jewish life as leading to an innovative, American Hebraism—an American Jewish culture that reflected its pasts—within a Hellenism of nations. As did its parent organization the Intercollegiate Menorah Association, the *Menorah Journal* pointed out that the Jewish legacy was as worthy of study as the Greco-Roman heritage, since all possessed and promoted cosmopolitan minds. The implications were arresting, just as America was seen as a nation of nations, so its pasts of Israel, Greece, and Rome constituted a metaphorical antiquity of nations within a nation. Hebraism, one part of this legacy (and a term variously debated and defined by the *Menorah Journal*), could also be helpfully understood by its apposite and opposite term: Hellenism. The debate over the meaning of these terms ran deeper than mere intellectual speculation, as it involved a discussion of the nature and shape of the American Jewish community.

The *Menorah Journal's* litany of Diaspora—Babylonia, Spain, Poland, and now America—became a homage to the richness of Jewish commentary and cultural renaissance as facts of “disenlandisement.” Places of exile were landmarks of creative resistance to assimilation. The *Menorah Journal* recast Tertullian’s famous question “What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?” to read, “What has Judaism to do with America?” Would Jewish life in the United States comport with or resist this new encounter with a modern Hellenism?²

In interpreting the cultural situation of American Jews the *Menorah Journal* engaged in the act of utopian recollection: paradoxically, suggesting the construction of a desirable future that had interpretive histories. Yet what was the Jewish past, much less the Jewish spirit? Could they be defined without an enviroing world, without the seductiveness of what the rabbis had argued was the danger of Hellenism? The world of the modern Diaspora, with its seductions of faith, turning the intellect and imagination to cultural and political idolatry, was the perilous water which lapped at Jewish existence. Given the separation of a people from its land, the Diaspora allowed Jews to see themselves as bearers of a covenanted theology, irrespective of time and place: Judaism was embodied in a peculiar

people that were adrift in a sea of nations. Yet given the rise of Zionism and historical philology, Jews could be seen as returning to and reinvigorating an ancient Hebraic civilization.

This division easily attracted the *Menorah Journal's* contributors. Would they have a stake in building a Diaspora culture in a land that seemed to abolish exile, or should they commit themselves to Zionism? Whereas the *Journal's* public history was its great refusal to see Jewish existence other than as an evolving body of critical and self-critical experiences regarding theology, peoplehood, and nation-making, it also defined a Jewish life that could not be separated from its location and future becoming. The historical continuity of the Jewish people was dynamic, in a constant process of readjustment that absorbed its own past and ideas and practices from other cultures.

Judaism and Zionism were terms that demanded examination, if not re-appropriation by American Jews, if their existence was to be made rational. By giving a content, an explanation, a past, and also a future to these terms, the *Journal* could offer an audience a remarkable synthesis, if not thoughtful speculations about Jewish existence. The *Menorah Journal's* understanding of these polemical words are found in its meditations on the Jewish imagination, indicating the notability of such self-reflection and its place in world history and American culture. The appearance of a journal devoted to these problems indicated that the value of Jewish letters was practical and pedagogical. The *Menorah Journal* became a forum in which a politics of the American-Jewish imagination emerged.

III

If we turn to the origins of the *Menorah Journal* we can understand its desire to confront the heritage of a wide, pressing past. *The Menorah Movement*, a 1914 volume edited by Henry Hurwitz (the lifelong editor of the *Menorah Journal*) and I. Leo Sharfman, discussed the history, purpose, and activities of the young Menorah movement. It was founded in 1906 partially as a response to the Harvard Zionist Club and Semitic studies. Semitics departments in universities were invariably philologically centered. Harvard's own program, benefitting from Jacob Schiff's funding of the Semitic Museum, would give the Menorah students the opportunity to tie their Jewish identity to acceptable university pursuits. The Menorah movement could



Henry Hurwitz
(courtesy American Jewish Archives)

complement the strength of the Semitics department by showing how relevant Jewish culture and thought were to both the past and the present.

The would-be Menorah students dedicated themselves to meeting every two weeks to discuss their specialties and to building “The Harvard Menorah Society, a Society for Hebraic Culture and Ideals.” Hurwitz and Sharfman wrote, “to promote Jewish knowledge and idealism among academic men—that, in fine, was the Menorah Idea.”³ The phrase “Jewish knowledge” echoes not only the ideas of wisdom in biblical and rabbinical literature, but also the concerns of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, the “scientific” study of Jewish civilization.

The group planned to discuss Jewish culture and civilization. The authors of *The Menorah Movement* claimed that Ernest Renan’s argument of what constituted the Jewish past was pivotal to their discussions. There were but three major ancient literatures “of interest to the philosophic mind”—Greek, Roman, and Hebrew. Why was this last not explored in a university? This question prompted the discussion of what an enduring Western civilization had to conserve.

It is interesting that the students chose Ernest Renan, the Orientalist, as the central figure to address. Renan’s argument was one to be countered because it was timely, popular, and did not see the Jew as an historical metaphor or symbolic figure. In his *History of the People of Israel* (published in America from 1888-96), Renan read Judaism Christologically. According to Renan and his disciples, Judaism was impoverished. Its narrow-mindedness, its dedication to “abstract discussions” and “casuistry” were symptomatic of “mental disease.” The Talmud was a “most exasperating book” which Judaism should forget. In the past Judaism had attempted to isolate itself from Greek influences. “Walled up in her own Hebrew, she [Judea] knew nothing of the beautiful form, the sound logic, and all the other appliances of the human mind, for which Greece had given the rule and set the model.” Nonetheless, Judaism prepared the way for an acceptable ethic: the synagogue had become the church for all. What else had Judaism to say for itself? After giving “birth” to Christianity,

Judaism was an historical deposit devoid of vitality. As Renan saw it, "Judaism still continues to exist, but as a withered trunk beside one fertile branch. Henceforth the life is gone from it." Nonetheless, Renan argued, Judaism would remain the spirit that indicted complacent social relations that were unjust. Judaism's force was an invective defying "the world as it is."⁴

For the *Menorah Journal's* future editors, Judaism was not anachronistic. Indeed, the editors proclaimed that "the Jews were not destroyed with the destruction of their polity, nor have they ceased to develop their religion and their literature down to the present day."⁵ Consequently, the study of the history of Jewish life and thought emphasized the continuity of Jewish life and demonstrated the vitality of modern Jewish inquiry.

The task of giving Jewishness a characteristic shape became part of an exciting project. On October 27, 1913, Horace Kallen, then a rising educator and philosopher at the University of Wisconsin, wrote to Hurwitz that he would accept a role as a "member of the Menorah College of Lecturers," offering to talk about "The Meaning of Hebraism." His exposition would deal with "1. Racial and Physical Basis of Hebraic Literature. 2. Social Forces in the Molding of the Hebraic View of Life. 3. The Prophets and Monotheism. 4. God and Nature in Job. 5. Hellenism and Hebraism."



*Horace M. Kallen
(courtesy American Jewish
Archives)*

Kallen's views on these topics, at least in his 1910 essay "Judaism, Hebraism and Zionism," depict Hebraism as the large, organic, developing context of the life of the Jews, with Judaism as a theology within it. In Kallen's eyes, Hebraism is a counter to Hellenism. With its belief in a static universe, in "the immutable structure of things," Hellenism is a conceptually anachronistic world view. On the contrary, we have Hebraism, with its stress on a reality in process, its high moral valuation of the individual, and its version of what Kallen calls naturalism and evolutionary moral life ("positive, social and active"). These are criteria, as Kallen propounded, for nationhood. In a polemically rich sentence, Kallen claimed that "Jewish religion is a function and an expression of nationality and

depends on nationality for life.”⁶

At a conference held at Columbia University in 1912, the idea of “the Hebrew” contribution to Western culture was approached in a different way. The National Menorah Organization would study “*Jewish history, culture, and problems, and the advancement of Jewish ideals.*” These phrases are ambivalent enough: whether they are narrow or large, whether they admit “Jewish” as a theologically organizing concept or as a phenomenological marker is debatable. In a way, they were. On October 2, 1914, Cyrus Adler wrote to Hurwitz about “the Jewish people” having “a long and honorable record of literary activity. Our Holy Scriptures, our Rabbinical Literature, our contributions to philosophy, to ethics, to law, our poetry, sacred and secular, our share in the world’s history, all become part of the programme which you have laid out for yourselves as a means of cultivation.”⁷

The very title, the *Menorah Journal*, proclaimed that its aim would be involved with some form of Jewish nation and temple building. Given the nature of the menorah in the Hanukkah story, the title also suggested that the magazine would be an example of Jewish survival within what the rabbis saw as the culture of Hellenism. Although Hellenistic culture was variously received and debated by the Jewish community, the *Menorah Journal* saw Hellenism metaphorically—as both a context within and an opportunity by which Jewish life had been and would be measured.

It is hard to read the *Menorah Journal’s* early issues without remembering its audience: young college men and women who, like its lifelong editor, Henry Hurwitz, were first-generation Americans attracted to classical German Reform Judaism. In many respects their counterparts existed at a host of progressive magazines, primarily in New York: witness Randolph Bourne, Van Wyck Brooks, Lewis Mumford—all “young Turks” intent on reexamining American history so as to nourish American creativity. In a sense, these progressive Americans found themselves to be intellectual immigrants on an American strand, hoping to preserve as well as adapt an American heritage they could be part of and contribute to. In similar fashion, the Menorah students, often children of immigrants, wanted to understand the American moment. But the Jewish heritage had to be reinterpreted before they could make their allegiances clear and felt.

Yet Hurwitz and others would also be members of the “Parushim,”

a name bespeaking the desire to arrive at an inspiring Zionism confronting the “otherness” of nations. Horace Kallen, one of the *Menorah Journal*'s early pro-Zionist advocates and essayists and a central figure in the “Parushim,” reminds us, no doubt with an eye toward his contemporary setting, of the force of this conflict when he quotes the early lines of *1 Maccabees*, in his *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy* (1918), a work whose thesis would be debated in the *Menorah Journal*. “In those days there came forth out of Israel transgressors of the law and persuaded many...[sic] And they built a place of exercise in Jerusalem according to the laws of the Gentiles; and they made themselves uncircumcised and forsook the holy covenant, and joined themselves to the Gentiles and sold themselves to evil.” One year later Norman Bentwich, an English scholar and Zionist, wrote about the parallels between his own day and that of the Hellenistic period. The efforts to preserve Judaism against a Hellenistic modern culture, he argued, had their “closest parallel” in the Palestine of some two thousand years ago.⁸



Norman Bentwich
(courtesy American Jewish Archives)

With its first editorial statement, the *Menorah Journal* of January 1915 announced itself as part of yet another Young America. The magazine proclaimed the advent of a unique generation, one of Jewish college-educated men and women who felt that their lives could be enhanced through American Jewish *belles-lettres*. As the literary arm of the Menorah movement, the *Menorah Journal* hoped to foster the Jewish humanities and to further “their influence as a spur to human service.” The editors wanted to “develop a ‘new school’ of writers on Jewish topics that shall be distinguished by the thoroughness and clarity of the university-trained mind...” Pointing to a provocative conceptual division, the editors wrote that the publication would be “devoted first and last to bringing out that value of Jewish culture and ideals, of Hebraism and of Judaism, and striving for their advancement...” The editors wanted both to “deepen the consciousness of *noblesse oblige*” and to advance the Jewish liberal arts, thus striving...to be sane and level-headed.”⁹

The term “Jewish humanities” suggests how far these students had come from believing that Judaism was a singular culture: “humanities” suggesting the liberal and liberalizing branches of secular studies most often traced to Greco-Roman culture. Jewish humanities would not consist solely of religious literature, but of cultural works intertwined with those of other times and places.

The separation of the totality of Jewish experience into “Jewish culture” and the “ideals of Hebraism” revealed an uneasiness with how to describe the Judaic heritage, especially in America, and indicated a split that ran throughout the *Menorah Journal’s* early years. On the one hand, Hebraism was no longer relevant to those who believed that Jewish culture—with its ethical and social ideals such as solidarity, cooperation, and fraternity—could be abstracted from a theological framework. On the other hand, Judaism was not a precise enough term for those who felt that an existence between the poles of *galut* (exile) and *geula* (redemption) was at all relevant for the modern comprehension of Jewish history. Reflecting in 1961 on the 1906 Menorah Society’s problems with terminology, Horace Kallen wrote:

the first statement of the new Society’s objective... was ‘the study and promotion of Hebraic culture and ideals.’ Why ‘Hebraic’ and not ‘Jewish’?...The reason lay rather in the English tradition of comparing and contrasting Hebraism with Hellenism. Further, there was a certain anxiety lest ‘Jewish’ or ‘Judaic’ should imply a disproportionate concern with Judaist [*sic*] creeds and codes, instead of a concern with a comprehensive humanism which would take in every aspect of the Jewish heritage, not the religious alone.¹⁰

Hebraism had been a culturally sweeping term, both in English and European letters. Whereas Kallen mentioned in passing about “‘the Hebrew humanities,’ and comparisons...made with the *Cercle Francais*, [and] the *Deutsches Verein*,” Hebraism’s meaning for an American audience such as the early *Menorah Journal* circle owed a great deal to Ahad Ha’am, to Leon Simon—who contributed a piece on Ahad Ha’am to the *Menorah Journal*—and to Matthew Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy* (1869). Whereas Ha’am’s essays would have been part of an interested Jewish student’s self-pedagogy or Zionist interest, Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy* was part of a large cultural

discussion. Norman Bentwich, in his *Hellenism*, could easily speak of Arnold's idea of Hellenism as "laid down, with an insistence which almost repels question..."¹¹

Simon's introduction to Ha'am's essays reveals a writer less given to variousness and, I think, urgency than he actually was. In anthologizing Ha'am's work, Simon emphasized the movement from "Hebraism," as Simon defined it, to Judaism, and the invigoration that a return to Hebraism could provide Jewish life. For Ha'am, the concept of Hebraism pointed to a transforming culture with a future. Hebraism, which expressed a people connected to a land, became sublated as Judaism, a culture binding together a people in exile. Living in Diaspora, Jewish existence could not attain normalcy; Palestine would be both a theory and a remedy. It would restore Jews to a normal and nationally healthy life; it would be, by implication, a programmatic goal that had a concrete past rooted in Jewish historical life and consciousness.

Nonetheless, in these essays Ha'am did not see Hebraism as a metaphor, as an historical yet cultural resistance to a definable Hellenism that could be applied to any people or culture. (Like Arnold before him, though, he did identify what he thought were some of the dynamics between self and culture—the interplay between a creative, modernizing Jewish life and a rigid bookish one, invalidating variable individual experience and judgment). In fact, if we trust Simon's translation, Ha'am did well use the idea Hebraism. Because, he spoke to a Jewish people needing a Hebraic revival in the land of their ancestors. Hellenism, for Ha'am, was more easily conceived as a given historical period in which the Jewish spirit translated Greek knowledge into Judaic interest. The fragmentation of the Jewish people and its consciousness, Ha'am argued, was to be guarded against. A commanding center, Palestine would have the allegiance of Jewish Diaspora communities; it would nourish the development of their individuality as well as connect disparate habitations. As a



Leon Simon
(courtesy American Jewish Archives)

cultural nucleus, it would concentrate as well as disseminate the means of an ongoing Jewish identity.

Simon's presentation of Ha'am's Hebraism provided a background for the *Menorah Journal* writers, most specifically in their debate about whether Judaism or Hebraism was a desirable theory, a practical program, or a misreading of American-Jewish existence. Could a Jewish culture flourish without physical occupation of a territorial unit? Could Zionist politics subsist without a cultural dimension? Moreover, Simon's distinction of "Hebraism" sharpened Ha'am's essays and gave them wider intellectual command, if only because the very terms of Hebraism and Hellenism had become indexes of a continuous Western heritage and sensibility.

Simon's utilization of "Hebraism" reinforced a long, almost conceptually luxurious debate about culture and self as secular or sacred, as defined by criteria that historical experience expressed or those by which transcendent judgment had mandated. Ha'am himself worked in Arnold's tradition, as we shall see, calling objective culture "the concrete expression of the best minds of the nation in every period of its existence." Ha'am, as Arnold and those before him, appealed to Hellenism as an instance of an aesthetic education of the spirit. Contemporary life, Ha'am wrote, still enjoyed the "benefit of Greek culture...the wisdom of Greek philosophers...the poetry and the art which that great nation has left us..."¹²

Ha'am's critical ruminations were designed to break an impasse in Jewish historiography and self-reflection: could a nationalist Zionism be the basis of the modern Jewish response to its own existence? Born of the emergencies of forgetting, assimilating, and dreaming, Ha'am's work confronted what he considered was the failure both of renewal as well as reassessment. Although his thoughts were initially addressed to the Jewish community that he knew, they could easily have suggested to the *Menorah Journal's* audience the tasks ahead for them: the creation of an American Jewish culture that could be connected to and nourish both world civilization and the life of other Jewish communities.

Arnold, trying to tie a perfection of self to a perfection of culture in an industrializing, intellectually disabling society, believed that civilization had been marked by the contributions of Hebraism and Hellenism. For Arnold, they were dramatic metaphors for a response to authority and experience. Both were part of human nature and had

perfection or salvation as their goal. "The uppermost idea with Hellenism," Arnold wrote "is to see things as they really are; the uppermost idea with Hebraism is conduct and obedience." In one of the most memorable lines in *Culture and Anarchy*, Arnold declared that "The governing idea of Hellenism is *spontaneity of consciousness*; that of Hebraism, *strictness of conscience*."¹³

For Arnold, Hebraism is to be read Christologically. Its Jewish narrowness, as he conceived it, is rescued by a Christian universalism, which accounted for Christianity's appeal. First, separation of the self from the political and social values of Western civilization is minimized. Here, Arnold anticipates a more modern yet affirmative appraisal of the advantages of estrangement for cultural criticism, a critical alienation often affirmed by American Jewish *belles-lettres* during the 1940s and 1950s. As Arnold contended, "it would still have been better for a man, during the last eighteen hundred years, to have been a Christian and a member of one of the great Christian communions, than to have been a Jew or a Socinian; because the being in contact with the main stream of human life is of more moment for a man's total spiritual growth, and for his bringing to perfection the gifts committed to him...than any speculative opinion which he may hold or thinks he holds."¹⁴

Second, Christianity supersedes Judaism, partaking of both Jewish and Hellenistic life. This had saved Christianity from being a provincial cult. Arnold claims that the "planters of Christianity," given the strength of their inspiration, "carried men off the old basis of life and culture, whether Jewish or Greek..." "This is a crucial point, for Arnold combines character and confession: "The worth of what a man thinks about God and the objects of religion depends on what the man is; and what the man *is*, depends upon his having more or less reached the measure of a perfect and total man."¹⁵

Moreover, the customs of biblical culture, derided by Arnold as Orientalism, had nothing to offer Victorian England. They were signs of backwardness. The belief that the customs of an inferior civilization could be utilized to deform a higher one attracted Arnold's interest. His example was a legal one: could a man marry his deceased wife's sister. This was a tactically chosen example; it reminded his audience of the Sadducees questioning Christ's authority in the canonical Gospels:

And, immense as is our debt to the Hebrew race and its genius, incomparable as is its authority on certain profoundly important sides of our human nature...who, that is not manacled and hoodwinked by his Hebraism, can believe that, as to love and marriage, our reason and the necessities of our humanity have their true, sufficient, and divine law expressed for them by the voice of any Oriental and polygamous nation like the Hebrews? ¹⁶

“That race like the Hebrews” could only have conjured up the primitivism and the subversiveness that Jews represented in the English literary mind. Ha’am’s Hebraism was compatible to a degree with Arnold’s. Both saw it bespeaking a national trait as well as one that had an existence within world history. Both saw it addressed to world cultural life—for Ha’am, the vitality of a renewed people, for Arnold, part of the balance that culture expressed. Finally, it was broad enough to provide writers with a term that could be helpful in exploring self, society, culture, and nation.

Central to Arnold’s thesis about Hebraism and Hellenism was the diminished nature of Judaism and the minatory Hebraic imagination. The Jew, both in English and American letters, was often depicted as someone lacking an ongoing, creative presence in modern life. Hebraism was either defined as theologically or culturally incomplete against the majesty of Christianity or the achievements of Greek and Roman civilizations. A popular Anglo-American antisemitism depicted the Jew, as Jacob Riis argued in his well-known *How the Other Half Lives*, “stubbornly refusing to see the light” of Christianity or as DuMaurier caricatured him in *Trilby*, manipulative and devoid of sympathy for a larger humanity that defensively barred his race from normal fellowship.

The opposition between Hebraism and Hellenism—whether from Arnold in its most accessible form or from Ha’am’s sense of the creativity of the Hebraic spirit vis-à-vis Greek thought—formed part of the *Menorah Journal*’s early discussions about Judaism. No less importantly these oppositions were seen as shaping the framework of modern civilization. In his June 1919 *Menorah Journal* piece titled “Whither,” Adolph S. Oko, one of Henry Hurwitz’s intellectual mentors and the librarian at Hebrew Union College, speculated that

“every man born into this world is, intellectually and spiritually, either a ‘Greek’ or a ‘Jew’...” Judaism was the process and sum of Jewish inquiry toward its truth, albeit a relative one; its socially attractive value was its commitment to iconoclasm. America could provide a habitation for Judaism to flourish and yet create another phase of its thought. Or, as Hartley Alexander put it, speaking under Menorah auspices in the “First Annual Zunz Memorial Lecture,” published in the 1920 issue of the *Menorah Journal*, “It is a commonplace of the history of our culture that the roots of what are highest in it are two, an Hebraic and an Hellenic.”¹⁷

IV

Hebraism had a vigorous life in literature. Whether the *Menorah Journal* editors were aware of the depth of this tradition is less important than the weight this critical heritage gave to the editors’ claims. In fact, the *Journal* pushed aside Arnold’s reading to insist that Hebraism was not merely a method of conduct or an essential temper, but an ongoing process of critical reflection and evaluation that allowed Judaism to survive. Unlike Hellenism, Hebraism was literally the phenomenology of ongoing Jewish reflection in habitations of Diaspora. An American Hebraism was an indisputable and celebratory fact.

The *Journal* disputed the charge that the Jewish contribution to civilization was over, or simply imitative, or at worst, exploitive. Worth looking at is the weight the editors attached to literature itself as a means of educating their Jewish audience as well as Christian readers. From the very beginning, the *Journal* insisted that the Jewish cultural imagination was part of the classical tradition of the West. In fact, Hebraism could lay claim to being the progenitor of myths about the West. Sir Henry Maine argued that “Except [for] the blind forces of Nature nothing moves in this world that is not Greek in origin.” Adolph Oko differed, asserting that the influence of Hellenism had long been diminished. Reflections on myths of historical origins were indebted to the Jewish imagination. In his tripartite sketch of Leopold Zunz for the *Menorah Journal*, Oko retorted that “Hellenic superstition” had to be confronted. “Ancient Hebrew legends—not Greek speculation—supplied Christian Europe the imaginary background of the earliest history of the human race.”¹⁸

Hebraism was part of the triple heritage of Western civilization itself. The Menorah circle insisted that Jewish letters had to be restored to their cultural originality and dignity. The strength of their scholarly claims can be read both strategically and intellectually. As a group, Jewish intellectuals were aware of their marginality and newness in America. As such, claims of both an original contribution to democratic life and an indisputable presence in the Western imagination could dispel the popular charges of actually being strangers in a strange land. As Jews attracted to the spirit of classical German Reform, they were interested in understanding the development and interpretive strengths of their religion.

Nonetheless, Hebraism and Judaism were not resolved issues for the *Menorah Journal's* editor, Henry Hurwitz; they were textured, if not problematic. In 1915 Hurwitz read that Cyrus Adler delivered an address at the Jewish Theological Seminary in which, as Hurwitz wrote to Adler, "you are made to oppose 'Hebraic culture' to 'Jewish knowledge and Judaism'.... Since the matter of Hebraic culture and Jewish knowledge and Judaism (which I had not suspected to be contradictory) touches us closely in the Menorah Societies, won't you utilize The Menorah Journal to give your thoughts on the matter to our students?" Adler reminded his youthful admirer that "the Menorah Society itself has recognized that there is a difference between Hebraic culture and Jewish knowledge or Jewish culture. In the first number of the Journal you published an article by Professor Margolis entitled 'The Twilight of Hebraic Culture' in which he set forth from the historical point of view the difference between Hebraism or Hebraic culture and Judaism." Moreover, Adler encouraged Hurwitz to read Horace Kallen's essays championing Hebraic culture.¹⁹

Throughout this formative period, Hebraism became refracted into pragmatic terms. Its definitions, certainly for the *Menorah Journal*, connected a people's experience to patterns of cultural change shared by other groups. Whereas this patterned history revealed a Jewish essentialism, a core identity or people's spirit not shared by other nations, it was a concept that generated discussion. It could be defined by what it was not, what it resisted, and how it repelled other definitions. Each of these broad and often overly simplified responses had implications for varieties of a Jewish future, encompassing everything from the role of teaching to its very nature, from the

function of the liturgy to its forms, from the idea of the synagogue to its modern uses, and, above all, from an understanding of the Covenant and Halachah which encompassed their historical environments and modern values.

In one influential aspect, Hebraism inspired American life. It also nourished a fundamental heritage. As Hartley Alexander, professor of philosophy at the University of Nebraska and former president of the American Philosophical Association, rhetorically asked in the "First Annual Zunz Lecture" in 1919, "Is it not evident...that the characteristic color in all of these ideas—fundamental to Greek, fundamental to Hebrew, fundamental to Americans of today—is given to their Hebraic form by that very concern for what is significant in history, for what is dramatic and moving in human life, which has seemed to us the core of the Hebrew genius? And is it not evident again that these conceptions, of Law and Justice and Wisdom and Providence...get their moving, their activist as distinct from their contemplative values, from the Hebraic root?" There was no issue to which the United States was "more deeply indebted," for this Hebraic spirit opposed the dangers of a "weak Hellenism" of the "educated classes" with their "laissez-faire in the moral and political life, evading responsibility, abjuring faith in any essential righteousness."²⁰

Yet Hebraism would be employed—following Ha'am's theses—to suggest the limitations of Judaism, a theological phenomenon, being the basis alone for a nationalism and renewed nationality with its superstructure of law, ethics, belief, and art. This was a metamorphosis with legal suppositions and theses: Jews were a people reclaiming a land. As Max Roseman suggested in his 1916 Wisconsin Menorah Prize essay, "The Hebraic Renaissance in Palestine," Hebraism expresses itself in a "Kultur," found in the "beginnings of a new art, a new literature" and realizing "the social and economic justice" explained in the Prophets. The Jewish National Fund and cooperative settlements would fortify the "Mosaic injunction against perpetual private ownership of land...." Roseman saw Hebraism and Zionism perpetuating an earlier Jewish life. Zionism, for Roseman, made the Palestinian project Hebraic. Although Judaism and Hebraism had different connotations, the "former has a theological implication; the latter is an expression of all that is peculiar to the Hebrew; the first is merely the religious manifestation of the second..." For Hebraism was a world view, rooted in the Prophets. On the contrary, Samuel

Schulman, former president of Reform Judaism's Central Conference of American Rabbis, contended that this thesis justified the mission theory. Israel was not only destined to its Diaspora, it ought to be in Diaspora. "Despite the sneers at the 'mission of the Jews', it is the only sound idea which justifies Jewish existence."²¹

Nonetheless, Hebraism would lose its strength if it renounced its humanistic tenor. Paying but scant attention to the importance of Judaism as a theology shaping the lives of Jews, Samuel Spring claimed that although there is a renaissance of the "Hebrew tongue" in Palestine, Hebraism would "perish" if it forgot "that it is but a group identity representing a different view of things human, guided by an ideal that has a more piercing appeal to those of Jewish blood."²²

Was Jewish blood an index of something called a Jewish perspective? Ha'am expressed an accepted position in the most general of terms. Speaking of Jews who were creative in Diaspora, he contended that they could not conceal their "Jewish characteristics," for "the spirit of Judaism comes to the surface in all that they attempt, and gives their work a special and distinctive character, which is not found in the work of non-Jewish laborers in the same field." There were *Menorah Journal* writers sympathetic to a putative Jewish temperament who discussed the unceasing intellectual energy of the Jewish people within the world of nations. So, for example, in writing about Heine, who seems to be one of the two figures (the other being Kafka) twentieth-century critics would choose to identify as representing an irreducible Jewish character, Louis Untermeyer, writer and anthologist, suggested that this poet presented us with commanding Jewish traits in his "voluptuous love of the color and flavor of things, his feverish imagination (a source of sharpest pain as much as of intense delight), his confident egoism...." Commenting on Untermeyer's observation, Burton Rascoe, in his *Menorah Journal* piece of August 1923, "The Judaic Strain in Modern Letters," identified this Jewish presence—in contradistinction to the Hellenic disposition of "measure in all things"—as "intellectual curiosity, egocentricity, feverish anxiety about life, cynical wit, sarcastic irony, social discontent, arrogance, extreme cleverness, pungent and often redundant words, sexual frankness on the one side and sexual mysticism on the other...."

Addressing both these readings of the Jewish aesthetic imagination, John Cowper Powys claimed that "What we are fully

prepared to admit is that ‘the Judaic strain’ implies a certain passionate intensity in all intellectual pursuits; an intensity that springs from that superabundant vital energy which is the eternal justification for the expression ‘the chosen people.’” It is also worth looking at the work of Israel Abrahams, who succeeded Solomon Schechter in Cambridge University’s chair of Talmudic and Rabbinic Literature. In a *Menorah Journal* essay on poetry and religion, he asked the reader to consider whether Israel’s mastery of music and the Psalms bequeathed its legacy to Heine, “an inheritance from ancient Israel that made [him]...—the greatest modern poet of the Hebrew race—author of a *Book of Songs*...”²³



Israel Abrahams
(courtesy American Jewish Archives)

One attractive and politically usable aspect of Hebraism was its nineteenth-century romantic aura that guaranteed an autochthonic literature marking a people’s distinctiveness, giving a form and language to a unique spirit. The evolution of Hebrew literature itself validated the normalcy of Jewish existence and its donations to humanity. Hebraism, then, could be used as a measure of a future that was not yet past or brought into fruition. Indeed, the *Menorah Journal* circle might have known Zunz’s words in his *Die judische Literatur*:

Inasmuch as [Jewish literature] shares the intellectual aspirations of past and present, their conflicts and reverses, it is supplementary to general literature. Its peculiar features, themselves falling under universal laws, are in turn helpful in the interpretation of general characteristics....Jewish literature, like other literatures, and like literature in general, reveals to the student the noble ideals the soul of man has cherished, and striven to realize, and discloses the varied achievements of the mind of man.²⁴

For the *Menorah Journal*, this manifestation of singularity and community was presented in discussions not only about the capaciousness of Zionism’s cultural tasks, but also about the folk

origin of Jewish literature. Biblical literary production could be endowed with a folkloric dimension. So, for example, Morris Jastrow, professor of Semitics at the University of Pennsylvania, claimed that "the Song of Songs" had nothing in particular designating its treatment of its subject as "Hebraic or Jewish." He contended that "the national Deity of the Hebrews is nowhere introduced" and Hebrew history, save for allusions to Solomon, is absent. Yet just as other agricultural peoples had seasonal songs celebrating harvest, so did the ancient Hebrews. Similarly, as other people had their love songs and ballads, "the Song of Songs" testified to the presence of this genre among early Hebrew tribes. The "unimaginative Rabbis of the Talmudic Age," Jastrow argued, "were no longer able to appreciate the folk spirit which produced the Song of Songs...."²⁵

In "The Twilight of Hebraic Culture," Max Margolis, professor of biblical theology at Dropsie College, wrote about a historic Hebraic culture as a compromise, a "midway station between the indigenous Canaanite civilization...Mosaism in its beginnings and Judaism in its consummation." Hebraic culture was "not to be severed from the soil in which it was rooted." Hebraic culture was rich in imagination, Margolis teaches, fashioning its expression through "cosmogonies and ballads and collections of proverbs." It was "joyous," not yet being transformed by the "somber seriousness of latter-day Judaism" which was "bookish," and hence bespeaking a truncated existence. Hebraic culture was "the sum total of all that goes to make up the concern of a nation living on its own soil." Yet Hebraism, tempered by Judaism, could be revived, and Margolis's picture of its activities suggests how its existence would be as normal as other nations in terms of self-reflection, cultural mediation, and world presence.²⁶

Hebraism measured the discriminating transactions Hebrew culture had with Hellenism. It would have been all too obvious for Felix Perles's audience to take the next step and consider the interpenetrations of American and Jewish culture as a variant of a Hebraic-Hellenic history and a literal and metaphorical program for the present. For Perles, in his "Culture and History," real culture nourished international civilization. He pointed out that such a valid culture "makes fruitful the best in one's own spiritual treasure while at the same time it assimilates all that is good outside. By a synthesis of the native and the foreign, it continually creates something new."²⁷ This was not a new claim but a gathering of ideas about local culture

and cosmopolitanism that had its immediate belletristic origins in the works of Ahad Ha'am, American pragmatists such as John Dewey, the multiculturalism of Randolph Bourne, and the vibrant proposals of the eminent Scots regionalist, Patrick Geddes. What was important was its application. For Perles the Alexandrian conquest of Palestine in 332 B.C.E. produced a cultural explosion muffled by military opposition. Alexander the Great had demolished the cultural insularity of the Jews, creating for many a transaction in which "the valuable elements of both Jewish and Greek life" were involved. The combination of Jewish Torah (religious-ethical education as Perles described it) and Greek *Hokmah* (for Perles, intellectual wisdom) could have created a "type of the highest culture" if Antiochus Epiphanes had not threatened Jewish resistance and fomented rebellion.

Yet the engagement of Hebraism and Hellenism was looked at in a manner not unusual for a journal trying to achieve a distinctive, self-reflective American-Jewish voice. There were suggestions that the Jewish imagination itself—a world view, not a set of racial sensibilities such as love of sarcasm or high seriousness—found its own traditional forms of expression either inadequate or un compelling in a Hellenic world. This argument is interesting for its own sake but also intriguing because it reflects a search for then-modern literary experiments that would do justice to a Jewish life that had not decided yet if its physical and theological alienation had ended. At what point would a search, if not *the* search for form, become a historical pattern that marked all Jewish expression?



Horace Kallen
(courtesy American Jewish Archives)

The *Menorah Journal* presented this as the problem of Job's authorship. In 1918 Horace Kallen's *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy* was published. Kallen proposed that *Job* was a late composition, written somewhere around the end of the fifth century B.C.E., and that it was the product of the confluence of Greco-Jewish thought. More concretely, it was written by a Jew who had seen a performance

of Euripides. In fact, *Job* was a "Hebraized form of the Greek tragedy" which gave it a characteristic strength, a universalism of perception and recognition. Kallen argued that both the message of Hebraism and the form of Hellenism felicitously nourished each other in *Job's* revelation. The ethical and religious goals of Greek and Jewish culture—for the Greeks, the yearning for the good, for the Jews, the fear of God—became the triumphant yet self-humbling dramatic utterance of *Job's* struggle. "I know that he will slay me," says *Job*. "I have no hope. Yet will I maintain mine integrity before him."²⁸

For Kallen, who wrote unabashedly about a people's "long racial experience," Hellenic culture provided the writer of *Job* with the form of a drama, the Euripidean drama, which Hebraic literature had not cultivated. Kallen proposes that "In the traditional forms of [the author's] own literature...there were no traditional forms which gave voice to doubt, to accusation, to defiance. The different mood demanded a different form, and the dramatic form was ready to hand and welcome."²⁹

Kallen's interpretation of *Job* takes the work as a meditation that is more than the cultural mediations that gave it birth. *Job* is the voice of a durable, inspiring Hebraic humanism, one that refuses to see the world as necessarily answering to or even malleable by human wish. Man's life is made naked, without creative optimism but hardened by a consciously shaped endurance. As Kallen describes the situation, man's "soul" becomes his "citadel" in his confrontation with the world and God. This fortress is strengthened by humanity's integrity. Whereas Hellenism had "conquered the Jewish mind itself," Hebraism maintains and strengthens itself with science as a means of knowing, for "science," Kallen proposed, yields power where and as it disillusions. It is a conquest of nature through knowledge. Yet the Hebraic mind had attained this perspective without the domination of nature. "Disillusion" had been attained at the cost of "mastery of self." This, Kallen propounded, was an excellence that was not "a common virtue of mankind."

Kallen's analysis was consistent with the rest of his work, reflecting his presentations of a Jewish state as a legitimate one among the community of nations. His sense of cultural borrowing in *Job* is at one with his later readings of the Jewish experience and also strikingly of the American experience with its balancing of diversity and commonality, producing a shared culture of inquiry.

The *Menorah Journal* found Kallen's article sufficiently provocative to publish a review and a rebuttal. The problems raised were cast either into historical or culturally programmatic theses. The underlying question in these essays was not only the riddle of *Job's* authorship, but also what kind of imagination is now brought within the scope of inquiry. In his meditation "Job as a Greek Tragedy," which responded to Kallen's book and was introduced in the *Menorah Journal* in April 1919, Gilbert Murray saw Kallen's thesis as "an ingenious hypothesis, but helpful and fruitful also." Murray pointed out that Kallen offers nothing but a working conjecture, although parts of *Job* now seem to fall into place. More to the point made by Murray, we have an example of an imagination that could well have profited by Jewish and Greek perspectives, although *Job* may give us no answers, it probably reflects the religious and philosophic convictions of these two cultures, although the writer of *Job* "stayed half-way, at an easy and intelligible halting place, which was presumably acceptable to an Oriental mind although it would have repelled and revolted a Greek." The Greek would have continued his inquiry "in spite of the thunder."³⁰

Max Radin, instructor of postbiblical history at Columbia University, took a less charitable view of Kallen's reading. In his "A Mistaken Hypothesis" Radin indicated that Kallen's line of inquiry was plausible but weakly so. It bound together multiple "improbabilities" that made it far from acceptable. These involved questions of dating, problems of textual authority, transmission, dramatic form, and a Jew with little or no comprehension of Greek understanding of a performance of Euripides. In fact, Kallen's hypothesis was intellectually uneconomical. The Jewish literary imagination, Radin intimated, was part of a spectrum of world literary experimentation. "The dramatic form," Radin expounded,

arose quite independently in Greece, in India, perhaps in China, and in Etruria and other parts of Italy and Sicily.... Hebrew narrative, especially, as the whole Bible shows, has a strong tendency to a dramatic vividness of of quotation that is not found in other ancient prose. A first-rate poet needed nothing more than the suggestions furnished by his own literature to give *Job* the dramatic framework that it possesses.³¹

The question of form and means of expression played a role in the definition of Hebraism and its imagination. There is an important history going back to Robert Lowth's *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (1741) in which Hebrew poetry, by nature of its sublimity, divine inspiration, and prophetic dimension in the Prophets was superior to the efforts of Greeks and Romans. For the English-speaking world, Lowth raised the questions of poetic form and convention, admitting that meter was, at best, problematic for discussion. His work established many of the questions that would be raised, but most important, his lectures demanded that Hebrew literature not only be considered part of a world heritage, but also the key to understanding the continuity of the classical tradition. Understanding what is perfect and what is defective in art, Lowth suggested, is the path to the mind's attainments. How could Hebrew poetry, with its developments in matter and figure, not play an important role in one's education?

The *Menorah Journal* would not, from its founding theses about the triple pillars of Western culture, ignore this claim. In October and December 1920 the *Journal* published Israel Abrahams' "Poetry and Religion," part of the Arthur Davis Lectures given in England. Abrahams had no patience with Kallen's work on *Job* and found claims like it to be examples of bad reasoning, a confusion of ends and origins which he called "totemitis." More important, Abrahams was willing to see the historical distinctness of "Poetry and Religion." As he understood it, contemporary poetry had become "formless"; modern religion had become "stiff and still." At the heart of the problem was the recreation of a communal worship, a strategic reconciliation or, as Abrahams put it, of honesty. Contemporary poetry and religion could comport if one recovered the honesty and the "other, the music of the Psalms....," for the psalmist makes his material out of his experience of religion. The feat of the Hebrew lyric accompanied the success of Israel's cultivation of music. This pointed to a past and a future. Poetry would achieve its devotional heights in the lyric in which self-expression was "the most genuine ally to Religion." Although art is not the handmaiden of religion or its conventions, what Abrahams called "the Great Lyric"—the majestic Psalm—is also "great religion." As a result, the split between poetry and religion, between beauty and truth, could reunite, renewing a

stolid religion and correcting a too-experimental poetry. Yet there was a past as well to be considered. In his literary "Art," the Hebrew had become unique. "The Hellene," Abrahams writes, redeploing Arnold's notion about the great artist being able to see life steadily and whole, "saw more, expressed more variously; but what the Hebrew saw, he saw clearly and whole; and what he saw he expressed with an art, limited in scope, but within that scope perfect beyond perfection's dream."³²

We ought to pause to consider the implications of this interpretation. In a literary age that some identify as modern, Abrahams suggested that a critical poetry take account of religion and that a critical religion would do well to question the social uses of poetry and its forms. Literature would not be religion, but its great challenge would be to keep alive man's relation to God by suggesting the poet consider his craft as an expression of the ground of all reality, the context of all ordered life.

Hebraism involved what *belles-lettres* stood for as American in an immediate, political sense. Arnold had defined culture as the best of the human imagination. Yet "culture," as seen by Arnold, was also deployed to suggest the strength of Diaspora culture, and "Kultur" thereby authorizing an easeful Jewish life in America. Samuel Schulman, in his "The Searching of the Jewish Heart," well summarized this position by writing about the difference between the two words and their consequences. Invoking Arnold's dictum that culture is a knowledge of the best efforts of the human imagination, Schulman pointed out that culture becomes "an intellectual and spiritual power." Contemporary Jews, employing the term "culture," were anglicizing the term "Kultur," which was "the totality of the productions of a people." Jews speaking of "Jewish culture" actually mean the past culture of Israel which was given its characteristic energies by religion and ethics. For Jewish culture and life to be Jewish, they "must be permeated...shaped, if you will, by the Jewish religious consciousness."³³

For the contributors to the *Menorah Journal* in these early years, culture had to be wrested from Kultur. American Jewry had to institute a program of learning that could turn an inquisitive, reverential, or theological Hebraism into a defense of democracy. In an anonymous article titled "The Maccabaeian [*sic*] Summons," the writer declaimed "twenty centuries ago a Wilhelm Hohenzollern,

whose Greek name was Antiochus Epiphanes attempted to dominate the world and to impose his *kultur* over all peoples." Analogies were quickly made: throughout the next two thousand years the menorah illuminated the Western world, for during the period of Maccabean resurgence the Hebrew spirit was given a permanent form in the Bible, which in turn inspired the Puritans and American republican institutions. Hebraism had come full circle in its war against Hellenism. According to an anonymous author, the First World War brought closure "To the lineal descendants of the Maccabees...this War is in truth a call to our ancestral heroisms, sanctities, and ideals."³⁴

V

The uses to which the *Menorah Journal* thinkers put Hebraism and Hellenism reveal a great deal about their own creation of history and historical writing. Such uses reveal the capacity of the American-Jewish literary imagination to make the past comport with a venturesome future. After all, what did these students think of their Jewish identity having passed from immigrant European Jew to Harvard graduate in one generation? They were the ones who could best appreciate the dedicated cynicism of Henry Adams's musings on his own situation. "Had he been born in Jerusalem under the shadow of the Temple and circumcised in the Synagogue by his uncle the high priest, under the name of Israel Cohen, he would scarcely have been more distinctly branded, and not much more heavily handicapped in the races of the coming century..."³⁵

With irony, American-Jewish thinkers could point to the Hebraic foundation of American Puritan life, but watch as Jewish life would be transformed by Christian writers into a metaphor for willful apostasy and blindness. The Jew would be in America not as a progenitor, but as a stranger to a culture that others had adopted, transformed, and made into a barrier. New Israelites, who would see themselves as a chosen people, scorned Israelites who were a peculiar treasure. Hebraism would be Puritan Hebraicism. Of greater irony for the Jewish students who made the *Menorah Journal* part of their lives, the appeal to another history—one too usable for any occasion and one too given to being made a figure of speech—indicated how desperately they wanted to view themselves as Jews in yet another land with an ambivalent present and future.

They had the opportunity to invoke Hellenism and to define and transform Hebraism. They could make their journal a program of cultural durability, and in fact, of resistance to Orthodoxy, nationalist Zionism, and the very languages of the European-Jewish migrations to America. Eschewing Hebrew and Yiddish as suitable languages for articles, the *Menorah Journal* editor and contributors could see themselves as Jews sure enough of the nature of their heritage to discuss it in English without feeling that this language diminished their past or narrowed their future. English would become the new Hebrew that “new” rabbis might approve. It would be the form in which a modern Judaism could be expressed and a language that might make Judaism as accessible to its American public as Hebrew was to Zionists.

VI

As the *Menorah Journal* matured it became uninterested in Hebraism and Hellenism as components of a once viable historical model functioning as a polemical issue. American Judaism could be understood in terms of its own interpretive strengths and cultural autonomy. The publication committed itself to the development of an American Judaism free of political Zionism which it argued was untrue to the needs of American-Jewish life. America would be *Yavneh*—the place of yet another extraordinary Jewish renewal.

The *Menorah Journal* would publicize a “free man’s Judaism” (as Henry Hurwitz called his hoped-for, projected book). Yet this too could be (and was) seen as a Hellenism, or worse—certainly by opponents of progressive Judaism. Nonetheless, the ideas of Hellenism and Hebraism helped create, through exhaustion of meaning, a new model for historical awareness. The magazine aided American-Jewish culture in liberating itself from a world view based merely on the invocation of Judaism as a companion to the Greek and Roman legacies. The *Menorah Journal* swept free American-Jewish history of such a formula and made it again open to a new and rich interpretation.

Lewis Fried is Professor of American Literature at Kent State University. Research for this project was made possible by a grant from The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives. The author would like to thank Liisa Hake, Lawrence Starzyk, Sanford Marovitz, and Steven Esposito for their

suggestions and ready advice.

NOTES:

1. Saul Tchernichowsky, "Before the Statue of Apollo," trans. Maurice Samuel, *Menorah Journal* 9, no. 1 (February 1923): 21, 22, 23.

2. Among contemporary books that raise this question are Arnold Eisen, *The Chosen People in America: A Study in Jewish Religious Identity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983); Seth Koreslitz, "The Menorah Idea: From Religion to Culture, from Race to Ethnicity," *American Jewish History* 85, no. 1 (March 1997): 75–100 is an important essay also examining the divisions between Hebraism and Jewishness. Well worth looking at is Lauren Strauss, "Staying Afloat in the Melting Pot: Constructing an American Jewish Identity in the Menorah Journal of the 1920s," *American Jewish History* 84, no. 4 (December 1996): 317–31.

3. Henry Hurwitz and I. Leo Sharfman, *The Menorah Movement* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Intercollegiate Menorah Association, 1914), 4. For a detailed discussion of the rise of Hebrew studies in American universities, see Paul Ritterband and Harold S. Wechsler, *Jewish Learning in American Universities: The First Century* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994). For an exploration of Jewish academics during the same period in secular departments, see Susanne Klingenstein, *Jews in the American Academy, 1900–1940* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991) and her *Enlarging America: The Cultural Work of Jewish Literary Scholars, 1930–1990* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1998).

4. Ernest Renan, *History of the People of Israel*, 5 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1905–7), 5: 272, 355, 361.

5. Hurwitz and Sharfman, *The Menorah Movement*, 3.

6. Horace Kallen, "Judaism, Hebraism, and Zionism," (1910), in *Judaism at Bay* (New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1932), 41.

7. Hurwitz and Sharfman, *The Menorah Movement*, 145. "Letter," Cyrus Adler to Henry Hurwitz, October 2, 1914, Henry Hurwitz Collection, Box 1, Folder 1, The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, Ohio (hereafter, AJA).

8. Horace Kallen, quoting what he called "the pious historian of I Maccabees," in *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy* (New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1918), 14–15. What is more intriguing is what Kallen excluded with his ellipses. Perhaps these omitted words would have indicated to many of his audience their own plight and the seductiveness of an American secular culture. "Come, let us make a covenant with the gentiles around us, because ever since we have kept ourselves separated from them we have suffered many evils," found in Jonathan Goldstein, ed., trans. *I Maccabees* (New York: Doubleday, Anchor Bible, 1976), 199; Norman Bentwich, *Hellenism* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1919).

9. Anon, "An Editorial Statement," *Menorah Journal*, 1, no. 1 (January 1915): 1–2. For a history of the menorah movement, see Jenna Weissman Joselit's "Without Ghettoism: A History of the Intercollegiate Menorah Association, 1906–1930," *American Jewish Archives* 30, no. 2 (November 1978): 133–54.

10. Horace Kallen, "The Promise of the Menorah Idea," *Menorah Journal*, 49, nos. 1 & 2 (Autumn-Winter 1962): 9–16, 13.

11. Bentwich, *Hellenism*, 51. For intellectually rich discussions of these terms, see

David DeLaura, *Hebrew and Hellene in Victorian England* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969); Susan Handelman, *The Slayers of Moses* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982); Vassilis Lambropoulos, *The Rise of Eurocentrism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); and Yaacov Shavit, *Athens in Jerusalem* (Portland, Ore.: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1997); Simon also translated Ha'am's *Selected Essays* (1912) into English.

12. *Selected Essays, by Ahad Ha'am*, tr. from the Hebrew, by Leon Simon (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1912). Simon's introduction is from pp.11–40. Also see Steven Zipperstein, *Elusive Prophet: Ahad Ha'am and the Origins of Zionism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993). The quotation is by Ha'am in his "The Spiritual Renewal," *Selected Essays*, 259.

13. Matthew Arnold, *Culture and Anarchy*, J. Dover Wilson, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 132.

14. *Ibid.*, 30.

15. *Ibid.*, 30.

16. *Ibid.*, 183–84.

17. "S. Baruch" [pseud. of Adolph S. Oko], "Whither?" *Menorah Journal* 5, no. 3 (June 1919): 121–36; 125. Hartley Alexander, "The Hebrew Contribution to the Americanism of the Future," *Menorah Journal* 6, no. 2 (April 1920): 65–74.

18. "S. Baruch," [pseud. of Adolph S. Oko], "Leopold Zunz—Humanist," *Menorah Journal* 9, no. 3 (August 1923): 216–29; 216.

19. Letter, Hurwitz to Cyrus Adler, June 9, 1915; Letter, Adler to Hurwitz, June 17, 1915, Ms. Col. #2, Box 1, Folder 3, AJA.

20. Hartley Alexander, "The Hebrew Contribution to the Americanism of the Future," *Menorah Journal* 6, no. 2 (April 1920): 69.

21. Max Roseman, "The Hebraic Renaissance in Palestine," *Menorah Journal* 2, no.5 (December 1916): 311–12. Samuel Schulman, "The Searching of the Jewish Heart," *Menorah Journal* 4, no.2 (April 1918): 96. Also see Leon Simon, "Religion and Nationality," *Menorah Journal* 5, nos. 3 &4 (June–August 1919): 154–60; 226–31.

22. Samuel Spring, "The Opposition to Zionism," *Menorah Journal* 4, no. 5 (October 1918): 287–95, 292–93.

23. Ahad Ha'am, *ibid.*, 265. Louis Untermeyer, "Preface," *Poems of Heinrich Heine* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1923), ix quoted by Burton Rascoe in "The Judaic Strain in Modern Letters," *Menorah Journal* 9, no.3 (August 1923): 170, 175. John Cowper Powys, "Race and Literature," *Menorah Journal* 9, no. 4 (October 1923): 296. Israel Abrahams, "Poetry and Religion," *Menorah Journal* 6, no. 6 (December 1920): 333.

24. Leopold Zunz, *Die jüdische Literatur*, quoted and translated by S. Baruch [pseud. of Adolph S. Oko], in "Leopold Zunz—Humanist," *Menorah Journal* 9, no. 2 (June 1923): 133.

25. Morris Jastrow, "The Song of Songs," *Menorah Journal* 7, no. 4 (October 1921): 212.

26. Max Margolis, "The Twilight of Hebraic Culture," *Menorah Journal* 1, no. 1 (January 1915): 36–37.

27. Felix Perles, "Culture and History" *Menorah Journal* 8, no. 5 (October 1922): 318.

28. Horace Kallen, *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy* (New York: Moffat, Yard and Company, 1918), 11.

29. Ibid., 26–27.

30. Gilbert Murray, "Job as a Greek Tragedy," *Menorah Journal* 5, no. 2 (April 1919): 93–96.

31. Max Radin, "A Mistaken Hypothesis" *Menorah Journal* 5, no. 2. (April 1919): 97–103. Also see Radin, *The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1916).

32. Israel Abrahams, "Poetry and Religion," 336.

33. Samuel Schulman, *Menorah Journal* 4, no. 2 (April 1918): 86–97.

34. Anonymous, "The Maccabaeian Summons," *Menorah Journal*, 3, no. 5 (December 1917): 255–56.

35. Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (New York: Modern Library, 1931), 3.