



“We are not only
English Jews—
we are Jewish
Englishmen”

.....
The Making of an Anglo-Jewish Identity,
1840–1880

SARA ABOSCH-JACOBSON




.....
“We are not only
English Jews—
we are Jewish
Englishmen”
.....

The Making of an Anglo-Jewish Identity,
————— 1840–1880 —————

The Lands and Ages of the Jewish People

Series Editor:

Ira Robinson (Concordia University, Montreal)



“We are not only
English Jews—
we are Jewish
Englishmen”

.....
The Making of an Anglo-Jewish Identity,
1840–1880

SARA ABOSCH-JACOBSON

BOSTON
2019



An electronic version of this book is freely available, thanks to the support of libraries working with Knowledge Unlatched. KU is a collaborative initiative designed to make high quality books Open Access for the public good. The Open Access ISBN for this book is 9781644690864. More information about the initiative and links to the Open Access version can be found at www.knowledgeunlatched.org.



This book is subject to a CC-BY-NC 4.0 license. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>. Other than as provided by these licenses, no part of this book may be reproduced, transmitted, or displayed by any electronic or mechanical means without permission from the publisher or as permitted by law.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data: the bibliographic data on this title is available from the Library of Congress.

Copyright © 2019 Academic Studies Press
All rights reserved.

ISBN 9781644690857 (hardback)
ISBN 9781644690864 (electronic)

Book design by Lapiz Digital Services.
Cover design by Ivan Grave.

Published by Academic Studies Press.

1577 Beacon Street,
Brookline, MA 02446, USA
press@academicstudiespress.com
www.academicstudiespress.com

For Eldad

דור הולך ודור בא והארץ לעולם עומדת

Contents

List of Tables	ix
List of Abbreviations	x
Glossary of Terms	xi
Acknowledgements	xiii
Introduction	xv
Note on Sources	xviii
Chapter One. Jewish Life in England after Readmission	1
Chapter Two. Dissent and Decorum: Establishing Community and its Limits (Anglo-Jewish Community and its Discontents)	20
Chapter Three. London Jews and the Giving of <i>Zedakah</i> and Charity: Creating Anglo-Judaic Practice	56
Chapter Four. Anglo-Jewry on the Move: Demographic, Political, Social, and Economic Change	91
Chapter Five. London Jews and Education: On Becoming English and Remaining Jewish— By Class and Design	127
Conclusion. The Making of an Anglo-Jewish Identity, 1840–1880	165
Appendix 1. Sampling of Charities and Charitable Institutions Advertising or Soliciting Subscribers in the <i>Jewish Chronicle</i> , 1841–1859	168
Appendix 2. Sampling of Charitable Institutions, Friendly Societies, and So Forth, 1874	170
Bibliography	178
Index	198

Tables

Table 4.1	Summary of Occupations for Likely Jewish Surnames—extracted from W. Kelley’s <i>The Post Office London Directory, 1841</i>	122
Table 4.1a	Sample of Jewish Surnames in W. Kelley’s <i>The Post Office London Directory, 1841</i> , Commercial Directory Section	123
Table 4.2	Dispersion of London Jewry—as Indicated by Formation of Congregations beyond the City and East End	124–6

Abbreviations Used in Citations

AJA	Anglo Jewish Archives, Southampton
BD	Board of Deputies of British Jews
BG	Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor
CR	Office of the Chief Rabbi
<i>JC</i>	<i>Jewish Chronicle</i>
<i>JE</i>	<i>Jewish Encyclopedia</i> (1906)
JFS	Jews' Free School
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives
<i>TJHSE</i>	<i>Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England</i>
<i>VJ</i>	<i>Voice of Jacob</i>
WLSBJ	West London Synagogue of British Jews

Glossary of Terms

- Ascamah** (pl. Ascamot) • bylaw, regulation of a Sephardi (q.v.) synagogue.
- Ashkenazi** (pl. Ashkenazim) • German Polish religious rite or custom, also Jews of central and eastern European origin who follow this rite.
- Ba'al Bayit** (pl. Ba'ale Batim) • “householder” (lit.), full member of an Ashkenazi synagogue.
- Goy** (pl. Goyim) • gentile, frequently used in a derogatory manner.
- Ḥakham** • rabbi and head of the Sephardi (q.v.) congregations in England.
- Halakhah** • “the path” (lit.), the corpus of Jewish law, also a particular area of Jewish law.
- Haskalah** • the European Jewish Enlightenment.
- Ḥeder** (pl. Ḥadarim) • “room” (lit.), traditional Jewish elementary school.
- Ḥerem** • religious ban or excommunication.
- Kashrut** • dietary laws governing which foods are fit for Jewish consumption, and how to prepare such foods.
- Kehilah** (pl. Kehilot) • “community” or “assembly” (lit.), traditional European Jewish community, also generic term for any Jewish community or congregation.

- Mahamad** • governing body/executive committee of Bevis Marks, Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue of London.
- Maskil** (pl. maskilim) • proponent of the *Haskalah* (q.v.).
- Sephardi** (pl. Sephardim) • Spanish and Portuguese Jewish rite or custom, also Jews from Iberia (and subsequently North Africa and areas of the Middle East) who follow this rite.
- Sheḥitah** • kosher slaughter, i.e., slaughter conducted according to the laws of *kashrut* (q.v.).
- Shoḥet** (pl. Shoḥetim) • a kosher slaughterer, one who observes the rules of *sheḥitah* (q.v.).
- Takanah** (pl. Takanot) • bylaw, regulation of an Ashkenazi (q.v.) synagogue or *kehilah* (q.v.).
- Toshavim** • “residents” (lit.), seat holders in an Ashkenazi (q.v.) synagogue.
- Yeshivah** (pl. Yeshivot) • “sitting” (lit.), traditional Jewish school of higher learning. Exclusively male.
- Zedakah** • “righteousness” (lit.), Jewish charity, and the laws governing the giving of alms.

Acknowledgements

This volume originated several years ago when I was casting about for a dissertation topic. My advisor, Dr. John Naylor, knowing (although somewhat puzzled by) my enjoyment of social history readily acceded to my desire to explore topics that combined my twin interests in British and Jewish history. Thus, my first acknowledgement must be to him for his patience, guidance, understanding, and gentle prodding.

My committee members, Professors Naylor, Georg Iggers (z"l), and Norman (Norrie) Baker gave generously of their time, advice, and insight. I am genuinely grateful for their collective support and assistance. Georg listened patiently as I outlined the original project and worked through my ideas. He and his wife, Wilma, served as my sounding boards and shared their ideas as this work took shape. They enthusiastically discussed their own multicultural and cross-national identities, sharing their perspectives as Jews, immigrants, and citizens of the world. They continued to be staunch supporters as I began my career as an historian. Norrie Baker shared his views on Anglo-American relations, history, culture, and genealogy. On rare occasions, he even inserted a comment or two about sport and sport history.

I would also like to thank Dr. Michael Berkowitz of University College London who willingly gave of his time to a stranger, providing advice, guidance, and support for this project when it was most needed.

My research in England was made possible by a Plesur grant from the Department of History at the University at Buffalo. The department also generously provided an ABD grant for my initial topic exploration. While in England, I received assistance from the librarians and archivists at the Tower Hamlets Local History Archive, the London Metropolitan Archives, and the Anglo-Jewish Archives at the University of Southampton, as well as from Dalia Tracz of the Jewish Studies Library at University College London. I would especially like to thank Ezra Kahn, librarian at the London

College of Jewish Studies, for sharing his knowledge of Anglo-Jewish sources and his suggestions regarding material, and Charles Tucker, archivist of the chief rabbi's office, for his insights and anecdotes relating to the extensive material under his purview.

My time in England was tremendously enriched by the warmth and kindness of Ralph and Muriel (z"l) Emanuel, who were my surrogate family while I was in London. My friends Archie Kalyana, Rajiv Guha, Kay Ullmann, and Alvaro Nascimento also really brightened my days there.

In the United States, my fellow graduate students were warm, supportive, funny, cynical, argumentative, and, on rare occasions, impressively profane in their observations. In particular, I appreciate the laughter, encouragement, and friendship of Fred Dotolo and Jeannette Jones-Vazansky. I am also grateful to Dr. Elisa Narin van Court of Colby College who shared her passion for Anglo-Jewish history and her quirky sense of humor over the course of a year spent as visiting faculty. Elisa may be a poet and English scholar by training, but in her heart, I know her to be an inventive and committed historian.

In Dallas, Mary Pat Higgins and Steve Waldman of the Dallas Holocaust Museum/Center for Education and Tolerance, soon to be the Dallas Holocaust and Human Rights Museum, supported and encouraged me while I prepared this manuscript for publication.

Appreciation is also due to the two anonymous outside readers whose close, meticulous reading of this work, as well as suggestions and thoughtful comments, helped me to clarify sections of the manuscript and to strengthen my arguments.

My parents have been part of this project from its beginning. I thank them for their love, encouragement, and patience over the years. I also thank my sister Tova for her many suggestions, keen editorial eye, and willingness to discuss Anglo-Jewry, and modern Jewish history more generally, though I know these are far from her favorite historical topics.

Finally, I thank my husband, Eldad, for his love, warmth, good humor, willingness to hear me out, and unwavering support as he has shared me with a very rewarding and demanding job and nevertheless encouraged me to find the time to complete this book. It is to him that this book is dedicated.

Introduction

English Jews confronted the same dilemma faced by all Jews who moved away from strictly traditional Judaism and community—how to reconcile modern individualism with the requirements of a tradition and community based religion. More specifically, English Jews had to decide how to blend aspects of their religion, culture, and ethnicity with elements from the surrounding society into a workable modern Jewish identity. That is, Jews had to make communal and individual choices regarding what to keep, what to discard, and what to add to create a sustainable, functional, and adaptable (when necessary) nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish identity. How did one become English without ceasing to be Jewish? Such a process defined the meaning of the former and redefined their understanding of the latter.

This work focuses on 1840–1880, a period marked at its beginning by two events, both of which involved the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the public, quasi-official face of the established London Jewish community. In 1840, a small but significant, and ultimately public, rift occurred in the London Anglo-Jewish establishment that led to the founding of the West London Synagogue of British Jews, England's first Reform synagogue. The Board of Deputies subsequently refused to recognize the new synagogue, founded by dissenting members of the London Jewish establishment, blocking the West London Synagogue's members from full participation in the Anglo-Jewish community. That same year, the Board of Deputies, in its first public national and international involvement, pursued relief efforts in support of non-British Jews. In this instance, the board acted on behalf of the Jews of Damascus. Actions included a meeting between Sir Moses Montefiore, president of the board, and Foreign Secretary Palmerston, as well as mass public meetings in London and elsewhere. Ultimately, the board supported Montefiore as he undertook a mission to Damascus to work for the liberation of that community's falsely accused and imprisoned

Jews.¹ In the former instance, a public challenge was made to the authority of the Board of Deputies and the chief rabbi's office, and in the latter, the Anglo-Jewish community made an open appeal to the British government and to the English public. Both events demonstrated an evolving, albeit not universal, level of Jewish communal comfort regarding their status as Anglo-Jews—that is, as Englishmen who happened to be of the Jewish religious persuasion. As shall be discussed throughout this volume, their evolving identity was not always straightforward and uncomplicated, involving a meshing of elements of Englishness and Jewishness.

The period under consideration here ends at the close of 1880, immediately before the start of the mass influx of eastern European Jews fleeing worsening Russian oppression in the wake of the assassination of Tsar Alexander II and deteriorating economic conditions in Russia and Austria-Hungary. This influx increased the number of Jews in England more than fourfold between 1881 and 1914, changed the composition of Anglo-Jewry from primarily native- to foreign-born, swelled the ranks of the poor, upset the English tone of the religious and institutional infrastructure that Anglo-Jewry had developed between 1840 and 1880, and unsettled the Anglo-Jewish sensibilities many in the community had developed and adopted.

Over the course of these forty years, 1840–1880, a mature, increasingly comfortable, native-born Jewish community emerged and developed in London. The multifaceted growth and change in communal institutional and religious structures and habits, as well as the community's increasing familiarity and comfort with the larger English society, contributed to the formation of an Anglo-Jewish communal identity. The various developments that occurred during these years and the concomitant emergence of an Anglo-Jewish communal identity comprise the subjects of the sections that follow.

Discussion begins in chapter one with a general historical summary of events and developments that led to the emergence of the post-readmission

1 The "Damascus Affair" involved a charge of blood libel. The Jews of Damascus were accused of murdering an Italian monk, one Father Tomas, allegedly to use his blood for Passover rituals. Under torture, some of the incarcerated Damascene Jews "confessed" their involvement to the Muslim authorities. The affair attracted considerable European attention. Several continental governments (most notably that of France) and newspapers supported the Muslim authorities and local Christians in their charges and "investigations." Montefiore's mission was successful as he won the release of those imprisoned Jews still alive by the time of his arrival. For details see Jonathan Frankel, *The Damascus Affair: "Ritual Murder," Politics, and the Jews in 1840* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997). See also Ronald Florence, *Blood Libel: The Damascus Affair of 1840* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004).

Jewish community in England. I also provide a critical review and discussion of the existing literature on nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish history, noting areas that remain to be studied, and explaining where the present work fits in the field.

Chapter two explores difficulties surrounding the central and eastern European Jewish encounters with modernity, as well as the varieties of Jewish responses to these encounters. This is followed by a discussion of the particular communal elements in England that consolidated their authority over the Jewish community between 1840 and 1880; some of the challenges mounted to these authorities; and the relation between these institutions, events, and the emergence of a mid-century Anglo-Jewish communal identity.

This new identity was manifest in the development of an Anglo-Jewish charitable hybrid that combined aspects of traditional Jewish *zedakah* with English charitable and philanthropic practice. Chapter three traces these developments and examines whether there was a connection between Anglo-Jewish charitable giving, organizational change, and social control.

Demographic changes in the composition of Anglo-Jewry, as well as the significance of political, social, and occupational developments, are the focus of chapter four. Selections from the debates surrounding the question of Jewish acceptance in the English political nation are discussed in this section as part of the larger process of communal identity formation.

The final chapter discusses the development of class-specific Anglo-Jewish educational institutions and instructional arrangements for both children and adults. Communal decisions regarding the appropriate amount of religious education at each class level are discussed as well. Anglo-Jews are shown, through their educational choices, to have largely adopted the general society's emphasis on practicality rather than intellectual achievement, considering a university education neither necessary nor even particularly useful in achieving financial and social advancement in England.

Note on Sources

In the latter two-thirds of this work I make extensive use of advertising material culled from the Anglo-Jewish press. This usage is significant, as this material has previously been considered only in passing by historians of nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewry. These advertisements provide considerable insight into communal and individual aspirations by affording a window into the period and by allowing the historian to trace the effects the encounter with English life had on resident Jews over time, including changes in Jewish education, developments in charitable giving, and the evolution of social expectations. Where it appears, I retain Hebrew wording in the ads so the reader may observe its continued use and importance for the Jews of England as a symbol of connectedness to Jewish community, tradition, religion, and culture.

Much of the existing Anglo-Jewish archival material is institutional in nature. It encompasses material from the chief rabbi's office and court, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor (Jewish Board of Guardians). Also covered are various synagogal records that include membership and contributions, as well as registers of births, circumcisions, marriages, and deaths/burials. Other institutional records cover the United Synagogue, charities, and charitable institutions including orphanages and free schools. Material can also be found in the Jewish newspapers, *Voice of Jacob*, the *Jewish Chronicle*, and the *Jewish Record*, and in London-based Victorian newspapers and journals, such as *The Times* and the *Illustrated London News*. Archival holdings of the correspondence and papers of communal grandees such as Moses Montefiore, Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, various members of the Rothschild family, and others are also available. Some nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish prayer books, religious commentary, and synagogal addresses still exist. Also available to the researcher are the novels of Victorian Jewish

authors, principally, although not exclusively, written by women.¹ Some demographic material is available, much of it collected by the Office of the Chief Rabbi, and by the Board of Deputies of British Jews. The English census of 1851, the only one to pose questions relating to religious attendance, contains information on both church and synagogue attendance. Additional information relating to Jewish occupations, business locations, and the growth of London's Jewish population, can be gleaned from tracing Jewish surnames (not a completely scientific approach) in postal and commercial directories issued between 1840 and 1880.

Unfortunately, middle-class and working-class memoirs, correspondence, and the thousand and one other tangible items from the lives of members of the Victorian Jewish community for the period 1840–1880, do not appear to exist any longer, certainly not in any form accessible to the historian. This complicates the task of social historians of Anglo-Jewry as it forces them to rely upon existing institutional and print records, from which they must attempt to retrieve aspects of the lives of the people about whom they wish to write.

1 These include Grace Aguilar, Amy Levy, and the Moss sisters, Celia and Marion. The Moss sisters also ran private schools in London for many years (see below, chapter five, London Jews and Education, section on private education). For more general information on these and other Victorian Jewish woman authors, see Nadia Valman, "Writers in Victorian England," *The Jewish Women's Archive*, <https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/writers-in-victorian-england>.

Chapter One

Jewish Life in England after Readmission

Historiographical Review: Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish History

Before providing a brief overview of Jewish history in England prior to roughly the middle third of the nineteenth century, and before commencing a discussion of the emergence and development of a distinct hybrid Anglo-Jewish communal identity between 1840 and 1880, it is appropriate to review the existing literature on nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewry.

Several excellent surveys of Anglo-Jewish political history in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries have been written, including those by Geoffrey Alderman, Eugene Black, and David Feldman.¹ These are of interest for their reflections on changes taking place in Jewish internal communal politics, voting habits, emancipation, and interactions with the British political system. Those authors who range beyond 1880 also bring a discussion of immigration and changing demographics into the mix. Regardless of particular focus, these historians are practitioners of the newer non-Whiggish approach to the writing of Anglo-Jewish history, pursuing their craft, as Geoffrey Alderman has put it in *Controversy and Crisis*, by telling the story “warts and all.”²

1 Geoffrey Alderman, *Modern British Jewry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Geoffrey Alderman, *London Jewry and London Politics, 1889–1986* (London: Routledge, 1989); Geoffrey Alderman, *The Jewish Community in British Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983); Eugene C. Black, *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988); David Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture, 1840–1914* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).

2 Geoffrey Alderman, *Controversy and Crisis: Studies in the History of the Jews in Modern Britain* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2008), 54.

Of this group, David Feldman’s *Englishmen and Jews* is of particular interest, as he deals with the development of British national identity and the effect that the Jewish presence in England had on the emerging popular and elite sense of nationhood. Feldman believes that the debates surrounding the legal and political status of Jews in England (that is, the debates surrounding Jewish integration into the British nation) both “revealed and, in part, shaped conceptions of the nation.” He further notes that the debate over Jewish emancipation was “about the nature of English national identity.”³ While Feldman explores Jewish collective identity, as does my own work, his focus, unlike mine, is directed primarily outward to politics and to the community’s interactions with the state.

Some scholars have turned their attentions, more narrowly, to the communal and external political and social contexts of Anglo-Jewish political emancipation, as well as its success or failure in meeting with Jewish expectations of social and political acceptance into the wider English society. For historians, Abraham Gilam’s *The Emancipation of the Jews in England* is probably the more useful of the two monograph-length treatments that exist on the topic.⁴ The degree to which historians have devoted themselves to the study of political emancipation might seem somewhat curious, as it was not important to much of the community at the time, and its passage directly affected only the uppermost echelons of Anglo-Jewry. However, its importance looms larger when considered in light of contemporary parliamentary debates over the putative “Christian nature” of the English constitution.⁵ Thus, emancipation should be interpreted as one measure of elite English acceptance of Jews as part of the English body-politic—that is, as a temporary or partial answer to the “Jewish question.”

3 Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews*, 13, 47.

4 Abraham Gilam, *The Emancipation of the Jews in England, 1830–1860* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1982); M. C. N. Salbstein, *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: The Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828–1860* (London: Associated University Presses, 1982). See also Israel Finestein, “Jewish Emancipationists in Victorian England: Self-Imposed Limits to Assimilation,” in *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); H. R. Q. Henriques, “The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *Past and Present*, no. 40 (July 1968); V. D. Lipman, “The Age of Emancipation, 1815–1880,” in *Three Centuries of Anglo-Jewish History: A Volume of Essays*, ed. V. D. Lipman (Cambridge: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1961); Israel Finestein, “Anglo-Jewish Opinion during the Struggle for Emancipation, 1828–1858,” *TJHSE* 20 (1959–61).

5 See chapter four below for more on the substance of these debates.

Literary analysis has also been used to address the “Jewish question” in England; changes in the meaning and uses of the stereotyping of Jews; and English perceptions of the Jew as a racial, religious, and later, ethnic “other,” particularly in *Figures of Conversion* by Michael Ragussis and in the work of Bryan Cheyette.⁶ In a slightly different vein, Linda Gertner Zatlín, in *The Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish Novel*, has done an interesting analysis of various nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish novelists and their responses to challenges affecting Victorian Jewry, including antisemitism, Christian conversionary efforts, and retention of Jewish identity in the face of assimilationist pressure.⁷

Historians have looked for English equivalents to the European Jewish Enlightenment. In *Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key*, David Ruderman indicates he believes that a small distinctly English *Haskalah* movement existed, developing separately from the Enlightenment purveyed by Mendelssohn and Continental thought. The difficulty with Ruderman’s position is that he does not demonstrate that the work of the men he discusses (including David Levi, Samuel Falk, Abraham Van Oven, Abraham ben Naphtali Tang, and a few others) had any significant impact on Jewish religious and intellectual developments in England. Without such proof, these men do not rise beyond the level of believing and highly knowledgeable Jews who engaged with English Christian intellectuals on various subjects of interest. Cecil Roth, in his essay “The Haskalah in England,” writes mostly of the same men as Ruderman and he, too, fails to prove that they had any general effect on English Jewry. Interestingly, in *The Origin of the Modern Jewish Woman Writer*, Michael Galchinsky claims to have located a female Anglo-Jewish enlightenment in the “polemics . . . prefaces . . . and especially . . . romances set in the Jewish home” of a handful of Victorian Jewish novelists. He dubs Grace Aguilar, Marion Hartog (née Moss), Celia Moss, and others, “the unacknowledged Mendelssohns of England.” Certainly, these authors added the flavor of Jewish ethnicity to the light sentimental Victorian romances of the era. However, Galchinsky, like the

6 Michael Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion: “The Jewish Question” and English National Identity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995); Bryan Cheyette, “Neither Black nor White: The Figure of ‘The Jew’ in Imperial British Literature,” in *The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity*, ed. Linda Nochlin and Tamar Garb (London: Thames and Hudson, 1995); Bryan Cheyette, *Constructions of “The Jew” in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Olivier Cohen-Steiner, “Jews and Jewesses in Victorian Fiction: From Religious Stereotype to Ethnic Hazard,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 21, no. 2 (1987): 25–34.

7 Linda Gertner Zatlín, *The Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish Novel*, no. 295 of *Twayne’s English Authors Series* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981).

others, fails to prove these women had a specific impact on the views or activities of their coreligionists.⁸

Efforts to find an English *Haskalah* are of significance as they tie into a larger debate among European Jewish historians (I include Anglo-Jewish historians in this category) over the centrality and importance of German and eastern European Jewish responses to modernity. The clearest exposition of the Germanocentric view that these experiences form the archetype for Jewish responses to modernity appears in the works of the late Jacob Katz, such as *Toward Modernity*, *Out of the Ghetto*, and *Tradition and Crisis*.⁹ Katz contends that consciously intellectual and ideological responses to modernity such as those posited by Moses Mendelssohn, among others, were significant because they could be exported, adapted, and applied to all areas in which European Jews resided. In other words, the portability and effect of certain ideas were crucial to the formation of modern Jewish identity. By stressing the importance of the *Haskalah*, Katz necessarily de-emphasizes the significance of the development of Anglo-Jewry, which neither experienced its own *Haskalah* nor was much affected by that which originated in Germany and spread eastward. Katz believes that the Anglo-Jewish approach to modernity, driven in large part by circumstances and unconscious responses, is much less important to achieving an understanding of European Jewish responses to modernity. He writes that “[f]actual, nonreflective accommodation, as exemplified by the English experience, is by nature locale-bound.”¹⁰ As such, it does not add much to our understanding of the Jewish modernization experience on the Continent.

The views of Todd Endelman (and others such as W. D. Rubinstein) are markedly different from those of Katz. In “The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England,” Endelman implicitly argues for Anglo-Jewish

8 David B. Ruderman, *Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key: Anglo-Jewry's Construction of Modern Jewish Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); quotation from Michael Galchinsky, *The Origin of the Modern Jewish Woman Writer: Romance and Reform in Victorian England* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996), 132–33; Cecil Roth, “The Haskalah in England,” in *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. H. J. Zimmels, J. Rabbinowitz, and I. Finestein (London: Soncino Press, 1967).

9 See Jacob Katz, introduction to *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model*, ed. Jacob Katz (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1987). See also more generally Jacob Katz, *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770–1870* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1998); Jacob Katz, “Leaving the Ghetto,” *Commentary* 101, no. 2 (February 1996); Jacob Katz, *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages*, trans. Bernard Dov Cooperman (New York: NYU Press, 1993).

10 Katz, introduction to *Toward Modernity*, 3.

exceptionalism, although, interestingly, he does not seem to argue for English exceptionalism.¹¹ Endelman believes the Anglo-Jewish path to modernity can be attributed to a number of factors, including the following: English religious diversity; the absence of Jews in England from 1290 to 1656; muted upper class hostility to commerce and banking (two of the principal professions of the Jewish upper and upper-middle classes); a philosemitic strain within English Protestantism; a growing empire marked by the conquest of external “others” (meaning that before 1881, Anglo-Jews, while not Anglo-Saxon Protestants, were also not really thought of as foreigners); a measure of social acceptance that preceded political emancipation; and a political arena that, once opened, did not require alteration of Jewish worship practices.¹² All these factors certainly ensured that Jewish life in England after readmission was consistently more comfortable than Jewish life on the Continent. Nevertheless, Jews in England still faced dilemmas regarding individual and communal Jewish identity brought on by modernity. The fact that a society is generally more accepting does not negate the need to arrive at an understanding of one’s communal or individual place and role within that place. Additionally, the fundamentally Christian, and, more generally, religious nature of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century England forced the Jews who settled there to wrestle with the nature of their own Jewishness and connection to religion and community, if only to decide whether to remain as Jews or to convert and disappear into the surrounding society.¹³

Endelman seems to imply that the exceptionalism he perceives should in turn lessen the intense focus and emphasis many scholars place on German/central European Jewry, their histories, and responses to modernity. The work of Jacob Katz is illustrative of this Germanocentric approach. Katz is correct in his contention that elements of German Jewry in the

11 See particularly Todd M. Endelman, “The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England,” in *Toward Modernity*, 225–46; and Todd M. Endelman, “Writing English Jewish History,” *Albion* 27, no. 3 (Autumn 1995): 633–36. See also W. D. Rubinstein, “English-Speaking Jewry as a Field of Study in Modern Jewish History,” in *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain* (London: Macmillan Press, 1996), 1–35. Rubinstein expounds “a view of modern Jewish history which regards the movement of the Jewish people to the English-speaking countries as one of the most central events of Jewish history in modern times” (1).

12 See Endelman, “The Englishness of Jewish Modernity,” 225–46.

13 On Anglo-Jewish conversion see Todd M. Endelman, *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990). On European and American Jewish conversion and radical assimilation in the modern era, more generally, see Todd M. Endelman, *Leaving the Jewish Fold: Conversion and Radical Assimilation in Modern Jewish History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were ideologically driven and as such “created” ideas that were exportable and adaptable throughout European Jewry. The fact that these ideas had little resonance with Anglo-Jewry in no way negates their importance—particularly in light of their effect in both eastern Europe and America.¹⁴ It strikes me that neither Endelman’s nor Katz’s approach is entirely satisfactory. Rather, a middle ground must be found that accommodates both conscious and unconscious Jewish responses to modernity. I argue vigorously for studying Anglo-Jewish history and identity formation as part of a wider program of understanding Jewry and its responses to modern conditions, in all its forms. Insofar as Jews in England (who eventually constitute Anglo-Jewry) had Continental origins, an understanding of post-medieval Continental developments, as outlined by Katz, is needed. Although ultimately the community, as it develops in nineteenth-century England, does so without direct reference to its European roots, they are still in evidence in the early religious and cultural practices the Jews bring with them to England after readmission. To approach the subject in any other fashion is to act as if Anglo-Jewry developed in a vacuum with no antecedents.

Not surprisingly, in light of the large number of eastern European Jews who arrived after 1880, historians such as Susan Tananbaum in *Jewish Immigrants in London* and Lloyd Gartner in *The Jewish Immigrant in England* have written on the immigrant influx.¹⁵ Eugene Black, in *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry*, and David Feldman, in *Englishmen and Jews*, have explored growing tensions between communal elites and the new arrivals.¹⁶ Aubrey Newman and William J. Fishman have studied the emergence of Jewish labor consciousness and East End radicalism,¹⁷

14 Certainly, for my period it appears that German and central and eastern European Jewry were considerably more “productive” culturally, religiously, and ideologically than was Anglo-Jewry. But this does not mean that Anglo-Jewry’s approach to modernity and identity formation is not worthy of study in its own right.

15 On Jewish immigration to England, see Susan Tananbaum, *Jewish Immigrants in London, 1880–1939*, Perspectives in Economic and Social History (New York: Routledge, 2016). See also Lloyd P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870–1914* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960); and Todd M. Endelman, “Native Jews and Foreign Jews in London, 1870–1914,” in *The Legacy of Jewish Migration: 1881 and Its Impact*, ed. David Berger (New York: Brooklyn College Press, 1983).

16 See Black, *Social Politics*; Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews*.

17 Aubrey Newman, ed., *The Jewish East End, 1840–1939* (London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1981); William J. Fishman, *East End 1888: A Year in a London Borough among the Labouring Poor* (London: Duckworth, 1988); William J. Fishman, *East End Jewish Radicals, 1875–1914* (London: Duckworth, 1975); Peter Elman, “The Beginnings of the Jewish Trade Union Movement in England,” *TJHSE* 17 (1951–52).

and others have written on the communal responses to the Aliens Bill of 1905.¹⁸ In fact, a small but measurable eastern European Jewish immigration began earlier in the century than has frequently been credited. As Bill Williams notes in *The Making of Manchester Jewry*, already in the 1840s Jews fleeing the increasing economic restrictiveness of “Russian Poland” started arriving in Liverpool, while smaller numbers settled in Manchester.¹⁹ This movement gathered momentum in the 1860s and 1870s and became the post-1880 influx. The smaller Victorian-era German Jewish immigration to England has also been dealt with. These arrivals were generally skilled, frequently with means and some education. Unlike most other Jewish immigrants in the pre-1880 period, they assimilated quickly, sometimes vanishing from Judaism within their own lifetimes, or encouraging their children to leave the fold.²⁰ Obviously, not all German Jews were assimilationist, as the Chief Rabbis Adler (father and son) demonstrate, but many were.

Strangely, particularly in view of commonly held contemporary stereotypes regarding the acquisitive nature of Jews, little has been written on the general economic history of English Jews since readmission beyond Harold Pollins’s volume, *Economic History of the Jews in England*.²¹ Also, not much has been written on the Anglo-Jewish poor before 1880 beyond Todd Endelman’s *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830*, in which he explores the work and culture of the Jewish working class and poor in England, including some of their criminal elements.²² The extent and nature of Anglo-Jewish philanthropy as well as the various motivations, religious and secular, attached to charitable giving have also received scant treatment. Certainly—as noted

18 See footnote 1 above.

19 Bill Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry: 1740–1875* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1976), 143–47; see also A. R. Rollin, “Russo-Jewish Immigrants in England before 1881,” *TJHSE* 21 (1968).

20 Todd M. Endelman, “German Jews in Victorian England: A Study in Drift and Defection,” in *Assimilation and Community*; Todd M. Endelman, “German-Jewish Settlement in Victorian England,” in *Second Chance: Two Centuries on German-Speaking Jews in the United Kingdom*, ed. Werner E. Mosse et al. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991); Aubrey Newman, “German Jews in Britain. A Prologue,” in *Second Chance*; Todd M. Endelman, “German Immigrants in the Victorian Age,” in *Radical Assimilation*; C. C. Aronsfeld, “German Jews in Victorian England,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 7 (1962).

21 Harold Pollins, *Economic History of the Jews in England*, Littman Library of Jewish Civilization (East Brunswick, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1982).

22 Todd M. Endelman in his volume *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979).

later—the uneasy transition from traditional religiously mandated *zedakah* to the more mundane Victorian notions of relief for the “deserving poor” merits discussion. In this context, V. D. Lipman produced a comprehensive but rather hagiographic history of the Jewish Board of Guardians, *A Century of Jewish Social Service*, while Mordechai Rozin, in *The Rich and the Poor*, has advanced a theory regarding Jewish charitable giving as a mechanism for social (that is, class) control. Additionally, in “Middle-Class Anglo Jewish Lady Philanthropists and Eastern European Jewish Women,” Rickie Burman has suggested a “lady bountiful” motivation for the philanthropic activities of middle-class Jewish women. Rozin’s monograph is discussed at greater length in chapter three below.²³

More attention has been paid to certain issues and controversies relating to Anglo-Jewish religious institutional authority, including the development of the chief rabbinate, the lack of a nineteenth-century English rabbinate, and the staying power of anglicized Orthodoxy.²⁴ The communal discord stemming from and surrounding the founding of the West London Synagogue of British Jews (the first Reform synagogue in London) has received coverage.²⁵ Historians have also explored elements of Victorian

23 V. D. Lipman, *A Century of Social Service, 1859–1959: The Jewish Board of Guardians* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959); Mordechai Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor: Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London* (Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press, 1999). See also Rickie Burman, “Middle-Class Anglo Jewish Lady Philanthropists and Eastern European Jewish Women: The First National Conference of Jewish Women, 1902,” in *Women, Migrations and Empire*, ed. Joan Grant (London: Trentham Books, 1996).

24 Hugh McLeod, “Why Did Orthodoxy Remain Dominant in Britain? A Comment on Michael Meyer,” in *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective*, ed. Michael Brenner, Rainer Liedtke, and David Rechter (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Eugene C. Black, “The Anglicization of Orthodoxy: The Adlers, Father and Son,” in *Profiles in Diversity: Jews in a Changing Europe, 1750–1870*, ed. Frances Malino and David Sorkin (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998); Geoffrey Alderman, “Power, Authority and Status in British Jewry: The Chief Rabbinate and Shechita,” in *Outsiders and Outcasts: Essays in Honour of William Fishman*, ed. Geoffrey Alderman and Colin Holmes (London: Duckworth, 1993); Geoffrey Alderman, “The British Chief Rabbinate: A Most Peculiar Practice,” *European Judaism* 23, no. 2 (Autumn 1990); Michael Goulston, “The Status of the Anglo-Jewish Rabbinate, 1840–1914,” *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 10, no. 1 (June 1968); Bernard Homa, *Orthodoxy in Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1940* (1954; repr., London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1969).

25 See Michael A. Meyer, “Jewish Religious Reform in Britain and Germany,” in *Two Nations*; Anne Kershen and Jonathan A. Romain, *Tradition and Change: A History of Reform Judaism in Britain, 1840–1995* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1995); Stephen Sharot, “Reform and Liberal Judaism in London: 1840–1940,” *Jewish Social Studies* 41, nos. 3–4 (Summer–Fall 1979); Robert Liberles, “The Origins of the Jewish Reform Movement in England,” *AJS Review* 1 (1976).

Jewish religious practice and its connection to anglicization efforts on the part of various communal elites.²⁶ Chapter two below relates the development of the chief rabbinate, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the West London Synagogue as part of a larger discussion on the emergence of an Anglo-Jewish communal identity.

Research has been conducted on Victorian and Edwardian Jewish education, again, mostly as it relates to certain communal elite efforts to anglicize the Jewish poor and immigrant populations (two groups that were certainly not mutually exclusive).²⁷ Although brief reference is made in some of the literature to private schools for middle- and upper-class Jews, with the exception of Albert Hyamson's *Jews' College*, no in-depth exploration of their educational arrangements has been written.²⁸ This book's final section seeks to correct this oversight.

Numerous works have been written on Zionism, its early twentieth-century political history, and the British gentile and Anglo-Jewish connection to it, from early meetings in London with Theodor Herzl, to the crafting of the Balfour Declaration, the creation of the British Mandate for Palestine, and the efforts of Chaim Weizmann, Moses Gaster, and others. Stuart Cohen's volume, *English Zionist and British Jews*, which is on communal politics as played between the established Jewish community and the English Zionists (many of whom were younger or newer members of the community), seems most appropriate to mention here. Cohen details the process by which the Zionists ultimately succeed in co-opting communal institutions and winning communal support.²⁹

26 See David Englander, "Anglicized Not Anglican: Jews and Judaism in Victorian Britain," in *Religion in Victorian Britain*, ed. Gerald Parsons, vol. 1, *Traditions* (1988; repr., Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997). Page citations refer to 1997 edition. See also Steven Singer, "Jewish Religious Thought in Early Victorian London," *AJS Review* 9, no. 1 (Spring 1984); Stephen Sharot, "Native Jewry and the Religious Anglicization of Immigrants in London: 1870–1905," *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 16, no. 1 (June 1974).

27 See Suzanne Kirsch Greenberg, "Anglicization and the Education of Jewish Immigrant Children in the East End of London," in *Jewish History: Essays in Honour of Chimen Abramsky*, ed. Ada Rapoport-Albert and Steven J. Zipperstein (London: Peter Halben, 1988); Steven Singer, "Jewish Education in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: A Study of the Early Victorian London Community," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 77, nos. 2–3 (October 1986–January 1987); Rev. Arthur Barnett, "Sussex Hall—the First Anglo-Jewish Venture in Popular Education," *TJHSE* 19 (1960).

28 See Albert M. Hyamson, *Jews' College, London, 1855–1955* (London: Jews' College, 1955), which also presents an account of the Jews' College School.

29 Stuart Cohen, *English Zionists and British Jews: The Communal Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1895–1920* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

Sharman Kadish, in *Bolsheviks and British Jews*, has written on the supposedly strong Anglo-Jewish connections to the Russian revolution of 1917 and to Bolshevism. Kadish believes that the British and Anglo-Jewish establishments misinterpreted both Russian Jewish interests in these developments and the strength of "world Jewry" to influence events and opinions. They were encouraged to do so by British Zionists, who enhanced their own position by promoting just such misinterpretations.³⁰

Historians Tony Kushner and Colin Holmes have written on British antisemitism and British fascism, both of which increased in importance in light of the wartime devastation wrought on the Jewish communities of Europe by the believers in racial "scientific" antisemitism and the followers of the various incarnations of fascist ideology.³¹ This is not to say that anti-Jewish intellectual and social prejudice did not exist in England, or that members of the Anglo-Jewish community felt safe from the emergence of such sentiment. However, in the nineteenth century, at least, its effect on the lives of most English Jews was fairly limited. Certainly, the creation of the Jewish Board of Guardians in 1859 can be viewed as a communal effort to stave off potential resentment directed at the Jewish poor, and presumably at English Jews more generally. The section on *zedakah* deals with these concerns as they related to Jewish charitable activity and the formation of the Jewish Board of Guardians.

The London Jewish community has occupied the attention of most historians of Anglo-Jewish history. This is warranted since for much of the nineteenth century London Jewry comprised between three-fifths and

30 Sharman Kadish, *Bolsheviks and British Jews: The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain and the Russian Revolution* (London: Routledge, 1992). The single-mindedness of various Zionists in focusing on Jewish statehood to the exclusion (frequently) of all other matters effecting the lives of diaspora Jewry, was, at times, quite amazing.

31 Tony Kushner, "British Anti-Semitism, 1918–1945," in *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, ed. David Cesarani (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990); Tony Kushner, *The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society during the Second World War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989); Bill Williams, "The Anti-Semitism of Tolerance: Middle-Class Manchester and the Jews, 1870–1900," in *City, Class, and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester*, ed. Alan J. Kidd and K. W. Roberts (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985); Colin Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876–1939* (London: Edward Arnold, 1979); Gisela C. Lebzelter, *Political Antisemitism in England, 1918–1939* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978). For a magisterial survey and assessment of the history of antisemitism in England, see Antony Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 262–328. Julius covers mid-nineteenth-century World War II British antisemitism in this work.

two-thirds of England's Jewish population. Although the primary focus has been the London Jews, work has been done on some of the provincial Jewish communities. The Birmingham Jewish History Research Group has produced studies of Birmingham Jewry, and Bill Williams has written from a Marxist perspective, appropriately enough, on the genesis and development of the Manchester Jewish community. Also, the Jewish Historical Society of England has published at least one study on provincial Jewry.³²

As previously noted, no comprehensive work has been written on the emergence of Anglo-Jewry and/or Anglo-Jewish identity during roughly the middle third of the nineteenth century, although particular aspects of the social and demographic history of the period have certainly been well covered by historians, including Israel Finestein in *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times* and V. D. Lipman in *A History of the Jews in Britain*.³³ This period, 1840–1881, is of particular interest as it was the first time since readmission that the majority of the Anglo-Jewish population, despite a continued inflow of migration from Europe, was native born. To date, nothing has been specifically written on the development of Anglo-Jewish identity (that is, a hybrid of distinct English and Jewish identities fusing somewhat uneasily) during this important period. As noted earlier, historian Todd Endelman has covered the beginnings of identity formation in

32 Zoë Josephs and I. A. Shapiro, eds., *Birmingham Jewry: More Aspects, 1740–1930*, vol. 2 (Birmingham: Birmingham Jewish History Research Group, 1984); Zoë Josephs, ed., *Birmingham Jewry, 1749–1914* (West Midlands, UK: Birmingham Jewish History Research Group, 1980); Bill Williams, “East and West: Class and Community in Manchester Jewry, 1850–1914,” in *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*; Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry*; Aubrey Newman, *Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain* (papers for a conference at University College London, July 6, 1975).

33 See Israel Finestein, *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times: Studies in Diversity, 1840–1914* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1999); Israel Finestein, *Jewish Society in Victorian England: Collected Essays* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1993); V. D. Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1990); V. D. Lipman, “The Anglo-Jewish Community in Victorian Society,” in *Studies in the Cultural Life of the Jews in England*, vol. 5 of *Folklore Research Center Studies*, ed. Dov Noy and Issachar Ben-Ami (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975); V. D. Lipman, “The Development of London Jewry,” in *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life: Lectures to Commemorate the Centenary of the United Synagogue*, ed. Salmond S. Levin (London: United Synagogue, 1970); V. D. Lipman, “The Structure of London Jewry in the Mid-Nineteenth Century,” in *Essays Presented*; V. D. Lipman, “The Rise of Jewish Suburbia,” *TJHSE* 21 (1962–67); V. D. Lipman, “Trends in Anglo-Jewish Occupations,” *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 2, no. 2 (November 1960); V. D. Lipman, “Synagogal Organization in Anglo-Jewry,” *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (1959); V. D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850–1950* (London: Watts, 1954); V. D. Lipman, “A Survey of Anglo-Jewry in 1852,” *TJHSE* 17 (1951–52).

the Georgian period, and others have covered identity formation as well as changing Anglo-Jewish identity beginning with the immigrant influx of the 1880s, but the period 1840–80 has been neglected. This monograph will correct this oversight.

In concluding this overview, it should be noted that at least one historian of considerable repute, David Cannadine, has questioned the significance and merit of studying and writing Anglo-Jewish history. The presumption is that Anglo-Jews were a small minority, for the most part economically and politically successful, and, as such, there really is not much to be said about the community or the individuals who comprised it. Cannadine has written that "[i]n the context of international Jewry, the history of British Jewry is neither very interesting nor very exciting. In the context of British history, it is just not that important."³⁴ Tony Kushner, rightly concerned about such abrupt dismissal of the history of a minority group, or any group, for that matter, has responded that "[i]n a straightforward numbers game, minorities will always lose out."³⁵

Cannadine also noted, in a book review of Chaim Bermant's *The Cousinhood* in the *London Review of Books*, July 27, 1989, that "[a] 'successful minority'—assimilated, free from persecution, materially comfortable—British Jews and their past efforts offer little to stimulate the imagination." To this rather snide comment Todd Endelman responded that "[t]wo inferences can be made from Cannadine's comments. The first is that Jews merit attention only when they appear as victims, as objects of persecution. The second is that historians should concern themselves with explaining failure, not success. The first strikes me as condescending, the second as ludicrous."³⁶

Cannadine's comments regarding Anglo-Jewry's successful assimilation should be taken with a rather large grain of salt. Firstly, he should have used the term "acculturated," as nineteenth-century Anglo-Jews sought to join the English nation, to become Jewish Englishmen rather than seeking to assimilate—that is, to become English with no continued connection to Jewry. If they had sought to assimilate, the historical record of nineteenth-century Jewry in England would be rife with instances of Jews converting to some form of Anglo-Christianity and it most certainly is not. Second, if Jewish acculturation had been as successful as Cannadine believes

34 Cannadine and Kushner's remarks first appeared in Tony Kushner, ed., *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness* (London: Frank Cass, 1992), 3; and were quoted in Endelman, "Writing English Jewish History," 624.

35 Ibid.

36 Ibid., 624n2. This author heartily agrees with Endelman.

it was, Anglo-Jews would not have remained as socially distinct from their Christian compatriots as many of them were. Some would argue this social distinctness holds true even today, particularly for those who are open about their Jewishness. This is not to imply that Jews faced insurmountable political, legal, or economic barriers to their advancement within English society—but rather that an unwritten “contract of social acceptance” existed (and continues to exist), at least socially. That is, in exchange for complete social integration within British society, Anglo-Jews were expected to drop their Jewish particularism, as many Jews *qua* Jews were believed to be socially and culturally, albeit not politically, unassimilable.

There is a group of historians of Anglo-Jewry (including, among others, Bill Williams, Bryan Cheyette, David Cesarani, and Tony Kushner) that believes a political, rather than a social, contract existed in England. Meaning, in exchange for political emancipation Anglo-Jews were expected to conform to societal norms—to be no different from their neighbors in anything other than their choice of place of worship. Unlike the aforementioned “social acceptance contract,” a “political contract,” even if unofficial, would be connected to formal parliamentary passage of Jewish political emancipation and therefore should appear, in some form, in the nearly thirty years of sporadic public discussions surrounding emancipation. However, evidence of such discussion does not exist. The fact that there was no truly national “Jewish” political figure between Disraeli and Michael Howard (excepting, possibly, Sir Herbert Samuel) does not prove the existence of such a “contract,” particularly when it is considered that there has never been a Catholic prime minister, or one from any “ethnic” group other than the Welsh, either.³⁷ Rather than a “political contract,” this likely represents lingering discomfort with any national political figure who is not Protestant and the fact that they were traditionally supposed to advise on the selection/election of the archbishops of the Church of England.

W. D. Rubinstein in his book *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World* sharply disagrees with the views, espoused by what he has termed the “Southampton school,” that a political contract existed in England. Rather, he believes that the Jewish experience in British society, and English-speaking societies more generally, was truly exceptional. He argues that nineteenth-century Britain was open to Jews and that relatively few limitations to their integration existed. Rubinstein also minimizes the extent and effect of antisemitism in Britain, something the “Southampton

37 “Jewish” is placed in quotation marks as Disraeli was a duly baptized practicing member of the Church of England from his childhood on, and Michael Howard’s Jewishness has encompassed marriage to a Christian and allowing his son to be raised in that faith.

school" has written on at considerable length. He believes English antisemitism was virtually always relegated to the outer limits of society and that studying it without proper context, including counterbalancing its existence against the strong strain of English philosemitism, as the "Southampton school" does, is rather disingenuous.³⁸ Finally, Rubinstein also questions what he terms the "deliberately adversarial tone and intention" of many of the newer works (and historians) in Anglo-Jewish history, wondering about the benefit of such a stance to the field.³⁹

In ending this historiographical overview, it should be noted that an account of the emergence and development of an increasingly acculturated Victorian Anglo-Jewish communal identity, shaped in part by the communal sense that a "social contract" did exist, has yet to be written. This work will do so for the period 1840 to 1881.

Overview of Pre-Victorian Developments⁴⁰

Although not officially recognized or welcomed, by 1656 a Jewish community comprised of resident *converso* families and new Jewish arrivals from Amsterdam emerged in London, signaling readmission.⁴¹ Starting in December they met for worship in a rented house on Creechurch Lane and in February 1657 they leased a plot of land in Mile End as a cemetery.⁴² These Spanish and Portuguese *conversos* and new Dutch arrivals formed the genesis of England's modern Jewish community.

Despite its uncertain status, the Jewish community was not stagnant in the decades following readmission. While the earliest resettlement community was Sephardi, it was soon joined by Ashkenazi Jews from the German

38 Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews*, 11, 32–35.

39 *Ibid.*, 33. *Pace* Rubinstein, who is an apologist for the British, and the newer Anglo-Jewish historians, who err in the opposite direction, the field is best served by a perspective that is neither overly laudatory nor overly condemnatory of British society.

40 For a brief survey of the history of English Jewry from the Norman Conquest to the mid-eighteenth century, see "The Jewish Experience," in Bernard Glassman, *Protean Prejudice: Anti-Semitism in England's Age of Reason* (Atlanta: Scholars' Press, 1998).

41 *Conversos* were crypto-Jews or secret Jews. They were forcibly converted to Catholicism in Spain prior to the expulsion of 1492 but continued to practice Judaism in secret. Many reemerged as Jews when they settled in Protestant countries.

42 The building in which the Creechurch congregation met (at 5 Creechurch Lane) was razed in the nineteenth century long after the congregation had relocated. The Sephardi *Velho* (Old) Cemetery, much reduced in size, still exists behind a building on Mile End Road just off the campus of Queen Mary and Westfield College in London's East End. It was open for burials from 1657–1742.

principalities, and from Holland and Poland. Initially the Ashkenazi arrivals could not support a synagogue or burial ground. Between 1660 and 1690 they relied upon the largesse of the Sephardim; they attended the Creechurch Lane Synagogue and were buried in the Sephardic *Velho* (Old) Cemetery. Their numbers increased so over this thirty-year period that by 1690 they established their own congregation, which became the Great Synagogue, at Duke's Place.⁴³ This was followed by the establishment of the Hambro' Synagogue (1707) and the New Synagogue (1761), both of which originated as offshoots of the Duke's Place congregation. In 1696/7, the Ashkenazim acquired their own burial ground which came to be known as the Alderney Road Cemetery.⁴⁴

As the eighteenth century progressed, Ashkenazi Jews began to look to the rabbi of the Great Synagogue to answer religious questions and solve disputes. It is from this early informal situation that the British chief rabbinate emerged. Scholars argue over precisely when the rabbi of Duke's Place came to be considered the chief rabbi of England's (and Britain's) Ashkenazi community, as well as the importance of this designation and the authority of the office, but most agree that by the latter part of Solomon Hirschell's tenure as rabbi (1802–1842) the institution existed.⁴⁵

43 The terms Great Synagogue and Duke's Place are used interchangeably. For the history of this synagogue see Cecil Roth, *The Great Synagogue, London, 1690–1940* (London: Edward Goldston, 1950).

44 The Alderney Road Cemetery was closed to burials in 1853 but is maintained by the United Synagogue, walled, with a guard dog and caretaker. Among the notables buried here is Hayim Samuel Jacob Falk (1708–82), also known as the “Baal Shem of London,” a *wunder-rebbe* in the Hasidic tradition (also an alchemist, Sabbatian, and possibly a charlatan). See Bernard Susser, ed., *Alderney Road Jewish Cemetery, London E1, 1697–1853: Anglo-Jewry's Oldest Ashkenazi Cemetery* (London: United Synagogue Publications, 1997); Rev. Dr. H. Adler, “The Baal Shem of London,” *TJHSE* 26 (1902–5).

45 See Todd M. Endelman, *The Jews of Britain, 1656–2000* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 52; Dr. C. Duschinsky, “Rabbi Solomon Hirschell,” in *The Rabbinate of the Great Synagogue, London, from 1756–1842* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921); Roth, *The Great Synagogue, London*, 185. Endelman believes the chief rabbinate emerged only with the election of Rev. N. M. Adler in 1844. However, Duschinsky notes that Rabbi Solomon Hirschell, Adler's predecessor at the Great Synagogue (c. 1803–42), issued responsa to English provincial congregations, and to some as far away as Jamaica, supervised the Board of *Shechita*, etc., performing the functions of a chief rabbi (albeit one not chosen by congregations outside London). Roth also considers Hirschell the “first unquestioned incumbent of the office.” England's Sephardim had no comparable religious official/office. However, in the nineteenth century the Board of Deputies of British Jews treated the *hakham* (rabbi) of Bevis Marks as the principal religious authority of the Sephardic community.

In the period immediately following readmission, the Sephardi community rapidly became too large for its Creechurch Lane location. In 1701 a new synagogue, the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Synagogue, was opened just off Bevis Marks Street on the border of London's East End.⁴⁶ The congregation was generally led by a *hakham* and governed by a *Mahamad* that enforced a series of *ascamot*.⁴⁷ These laws applied to all Sephardim in London.⁴⁸ Under the first *ascamah*, Sephardim were forbidden, under threat of excommunication (*heder*), to open a synagogue or even hold religious services in London other than at Bevis Marks (an exception was granted for weddings and during mourning).⁴⁹ Once the community began to disperse to other areas of London, this rule caused problems and eventually precipitated dramatic action by a small section of the membership.

Enforcement of congregational rules and regulations was accomplished by threats, fines, denial of burial in the Sephardi cemetery, and even expulsion or excommunication (as noted above). Beyond these measures, there was no way of forcing London's Sephardim to behave in any particular manner. The Ashkenzi congregations faced the same difficulty. Jewish communal affiliation in England was purely voluntary, as the community was not officially recognized by the authorities. In this, the post-readmission Jewish experience differs significantly from the Continental situation prior to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. European Jewish communities were generally recognized in law by the secular/non-Jewish authorities, and individual Jews had no legal existence outside the confines of the law that applied to their communities.⁵⁰ As will be seen in below, the voluntary nature of the Anglo-Jewish community brought with it both opportunities and tremendous challenges. In forming their community and institutions, English Jews had to decide for themselves what constituted community; which religious, traditional, and ethnic elements were dispensable or indis-

46 The synagogue became known as "Bevis Marks" and is still in use today.

47 The word "generally" is used because there were periods (sometimes several years in length) when the congregation was without a *hakham*.

48 For an older but still worthwhile general history of the Sephardim in England, see Albert M. Hyamson, *The Sephardim of England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community, 1492–1951* (London: Methuen, 1951).

49 Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 31.

50 Germany's *Gemeinde* (Jewish Community) is one example of this type of legally recognized community. "The *Gemeinde* was a legal entity . . . [c]reated and empowered by the states . . . a compulsory community which embraced all Jews within certain territorial limits, levied taxes on members, and organized Jewish communal and ritual affairs." Marion A. Kaplan, *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family, and Identity, in Imperial Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 12.

pensable; and which elements of English life and culture they wished to adopt. That is, they had to both become and remain a community, and also function socially, politically, and economically as not quite Englishmen, but yet as more than simply Jews. In addition to constructing a hybrid Anglo-Jewish community, individual English Jews also had to create or adopt a workable Anglo-Jewish identity for themselves—that is, an identity that allowed them to function comfortably as both Englishmen and Jews.

While conditions for Jews in England were indisputably better than they were in Europe, they were not ideal. Various minor legal, economic, and political restrictions existed. By the later eighteenth century, however, most were not indicative of any particular anti-Jewish animus, but rather were indicators of the non-Anglican (that is, dissenter) status of the Jews. *De facto* tolerance was generally practiced, although religious toleration did not exist in law until 1846.⁵¹ Restrictions were placed upon certain Jewish economic activity such as operating retail businesses within London City limits, a prohibition that remained in place until 1832.⁵² Also, from 1697, Jewish brokers on the Royal Exchange were limited to twelve, out of a total of 124. These and other legal restrictions remained in place until they were repealed in the first half of the nineteenth century.⁵³ These restrictions (there were more than those listed here) indicate that there were some barriers to Jewish economic activity at all levels, from the poor individual who wished to operate a stall in the City of London, to the wealthier individual who sought to operate on the Royal Exchange. Yet, in contrast to conditions faced by Jews on much of the Continent, these restrictions, while irritating, were relatively innocuous.

51 Section 2 of the *Religious Opinion Relief Act of 1846*, 9 & 10 Victoria, cap. 59, states “Jews are to be subject to the same laws as Protestant dissenters with regard to their schools, places of religious worship, education, and charitable purposes. . . .” Quoted from *JE* (1906), s.v. “Acts of Parliament relating to the Jews of England,” Joseph Jacobs, accessed November 9, 2017, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com>.

52 Endelman notes that this restriction did not significantly limit Jewish economic activity. The point here is that this restriction, unlike others, was actively enforced until its repeal in 1832, deliberately to deny Jewish access to certain commercial activity in the City of London. (Endelman’s view expressed in comments sent to the author, August 2003.) Note that the terms “City” or “City of London” refer only to the territory contained within the borough known as the City, while the terms “city,” “city of London,” and “London” refer more generally to the London metropolitan area, which includes the various boroughs that comprise greater London.

53 On the Jews and the Royal Exchange see section “The Return” of *JE* (1906), s.v. “London,” by Joseph Jacobs, accessed November 9, 2017, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com>. For a discussion of the various legal limits faced by English Jews from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, see Gilam, *Emancipation of the Jews*, 8–16.

Two additional areas of restriction should be mentioned, both of which existed until well into the nineteenth century. Jewish political emancipation was not granted until 1858 although even English Catholics were emancipated by 1829. Educational restrictions also remained in place in the country's public schools as well as at Oxford and Cambridge. This last set of restrictions prompted the founding of private Jewish schools to cater to the children of the Jewish community's middle and upper classes. Jewish upper-middle- and upper-class views and actions relating to emancipation will be discussed below in sections of chapters two and four, while responses to educational restrictions are dealt with at length in chapter three.

Both the Sephardi and Ashkenazi communities gained in size throughout the eighteenth century, but the Ashkenazi community grew at a much more rapid pace. By 1720, its population already surpassed that of the Sephardim, which never grew much above two thousand people. During the Georgian period the Anglo-Jewish population increased by several thousand individuals, partly through natural increase, but primarily through immigration.⁵⁴ By 1815 the Jewish population of England had grown to roughly 20,000–25,000 individuals, most of whom were Ashkenazi in origin.⁵⁵ The new arrivals were mostly poor, excepting a small number of Jews who arrived from Germany in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The poverty of this increased population was of concern to many of those who were already established. They worried about the effect these new immigrants might have on their still uncertain status in English society. They also worried about how, and how much, to provide in assistance for their coreligionists.

The eighteenth century was not without political and economic setbacks for the Jews. A brief but ugly flare up of antisemitism occurred when a small but wealthy segment of the Jewish community sought to have restrictions on its trading abilities eased. These merchants (mostly Sephardim) were born abroad and thus were alien residents. "As aliens . . . they suffered from extensive commercial discrimination: they could not purchase land; they could not own, or share in the ownership of a British vessel; they were barred from the colonial trade; and they were subject to various alien

54 The seminal work on the Jews in this period is Endelman's *Jews of Georgian England*.

55 Lipman, "The Age of Emancipation," 70, 96n2. Lipman extrapolates his figure of 25,000 from estimates made by Patrick Colquhoun in 1800 and by Francis Goldsmid in 1830. See also Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 41–42. Endelman puts the Jewish population at 12,000–15,000 for the early decades of the nineteenth century. Of this number, he estimates that approximately 2,000 were Sephardim. Endelman thinks Colquhoun's figure (20–26,000 English Jews in 1800) was high, which, in turn, presumably means Lipman's figure for 1815 was also on the high side.

duties, some twice as high as those native merchants paid.”⁵⁶ These restrictions did not apply to native-born Jews, who were English citizens by birth, or foreigners who became naturalized through private act of Parliament (a very expensive proposition). However, naturalization was not an option for practicing Jews, as prior to the introduction of all private naturalization bills, applicants were required to take communion. In 1753, the Jewish Naturalization Bill was introduced by the Pelham Ministry and passed.⁵⁷ It allowed those few Jews who could afford to pay for the process of passing a private act of Parliament to forego taking communion when applying to Parliament for private naturalization. Passage was followed by public outcry against the act. Much of the protest took the form of antisemitic pamphlets, petitions, and sermons. While the antisemitic vitriol (including rumors of blood libel) surrounding the act’s passage was real, it was not spontaneous. Rather, the merchants and financial interests of the City of London, seeking to prevent any Jewish competition in the City, deliberately orchestrated it.⁵⁸ In response to the agitation the act was repealed in 1754 and the furor quickly abated.

In spite of the overt anti-Jewish hostility that periodically arose following readmission, and a sub-rosa anti-Jewish sentiment prevalent within certain social circles, the fact remains that as a general rule “disabilities suffered by Jews in England were almost always the result of their having fallen foul of limitations designed to exclude Roman Catholics and Nonconformists, and to ensure the Anglican character of civic and social life.”⁵⁹ Having said this, the reader must still be careful not to view post-readmission history in general, and nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish history in particular, as merely a long series of inevitable triumphs and progressions.

56 Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 74.

57 The bill (26 George II, cap. 26) was generally referred to as the “Jew Bill.”

58 See Endelman, *Jews of Georgian England*, 25–26. The Tory opposition to the Pelham (a.k.a. Newcastle) Ministry and to conservative elements in the Church of England can be added to the list of those involved in stirring up antisemitism around the “Jew Bill.” See also Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews*, 55–56. See Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain*, 4–5, for a brief discussion of the Jew Bill and other obstacles encountered by English Jews prior to emancipation.

59 David Katz, *The Jews in the History of England, 1485–1850* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), vii.

Chapter Two

Dissent and Decorum: Establishing Community and its Limits

(Anglo-Jewish Community and its Discontents)

Modernity and Communal Change: The Birth of Modern Jewish Identity

In this section, we will trace the permutations of growth and interaction in the religious and political institutions that composed the mid-nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish community. It also highlights the activities of a selection of individuals involved in building and shaping the community. Significantly, in the process, the rise of Anglo-Jewish communal identity becomes clearly visible.

Before discussing these developments, some thought should be given to the external influences that affected, directly or indirectly, the general development of modern Jewish communities and communal identities. More specifically, the genesis of the modern question of Jewish identity, both from the Jewish and gentile perspective, needs to be considered.

Prior to the advent of modernity, Jewish interaction with the gentile world generally did not extend much beyond the realm of economics. Most Jews remained apart from the non-Jewish world—socially, culturally, and

politically. They were able to do so because they frequently lived in separate communities recognized as such by the external authorities. Since Jews as individuals had no legal existence outside their communities, the traditional religious community was the central focus of Jewish life. Legal concerns aside, the practice of traditional Judaism was based on the daily interaction of Jews in group prayer and, when feasible, in the study of religious texts. Thus, Jewish communal and individual identity did not become problematic until Jewish entry into the modern Western world, accompanied as it was by the penetration of Enlightenment ideas, emancipation, and the breaking down of traditional barriers to Jewish-gentile interaction.¹

The emergence of the modern nation-state, a major component of the constellation of developments encompassed by modernity, heralded the arrival of a new relationship between the state and its inhabitants. Group or communal recognition, such as that previously extended to many European Jews, was withdrawn in favor of state recognition of the individual (and with emancipation, the citizen). Thus the external legal justification for a separate Jewish communal existence ceased. Further, as Jacob Katz has noted, the “[t]he modern state . . . [now] defined the Jews solely in terms of . . . religion; indeed, no other category lay at its disposal . . . [However, the fact remains that in addition to religion] there were family ties, economic interests, and perhaps above all sentiments and habits of mind which could not be eradicated,”² and which Jews needed to address if they were to achieve an accommodation with modernity that could replace their previous religio-cultural identity.

To some traditional Jewish religious leaders, communal entry into the modern world—despite the economic, social, and political opportunities offered—was a Faustian bargain they were unwilling to make. The following anecdote nicely illustrates this point. During the Napoleonic era when it looked as if Napoleon might succeed in conquering Russia, bringing civic equality in his wake, one of Russia’s most prominent rabbis prayed for the “welfare of the Russian empire and for the victory of Czar Alexander I.” As the rabbi later explained, he considered tsarist oppression preferable to “*liberte, egalite et fraternite*” since tsarist mistreatment of the Jews guaranteed their continued adherence to Judaism and Jewish communal existence. The

1 Michael A. Meyer, “Tradition and Modernity Reconsidered,” in *The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era*, ed. Jack Wertheimer (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992), 466; Michael A. Meyer, *Jewish Identity in the Modern World*, The Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1990), 16–17.

2 Katz, “Leaving the Ghetto,” 32–33.

material and political improvements that would likely accompany a victorious French campaign would, he believed, cause (tempt?) Jews to distance themselves from their God, religion, and community.³

For many Jews, modernity heralded the ending of an all encompassing religious worldview. Others, while continuing to live religiously traditional lives, were compelled *to choose to do so*, since for the first time an alternative existence was possible that did not necessarily require conversion and the severing of Jewish ties. Those who moved away from the traditional Jewish worldview denied the previous totalizing authority of the *kehilah* and *halakhah*, while the more intellectually inclined among them began to subject Jewish history and religious texts to critical review from a vantage point outside the previously accepted religious one.

While this period ushered in a new era of possibilities, it also brought with it tremendous doubts and insecurities regarding belonging—meaning, the place of the individual Jew, and of the Jewish community, in the world. For the first time, Jewish identity (that is, what it meant to be a Jew beyond the holistic religious view accepted within traditional Jewish communities) was opened to serious debate. For many, strictly traditional Judaism and Jewish communal living lost their luster when compared to the possibilities of achieving increased social and economic status within the larger society. But the questions of how to attain this status, and what parts (if any) Judaism and Jewish community would play, remained to be answered.

States also sought to clarify the nature of Jewish identity and, in so doing, questioned the loyalties of native-born Jews whose Jewish connections represented more than private religious affiliations. Nation-states expected social and cultural adherence to Jewish norms to end with emancipation. For an example of such a “political contract,” in which conformity with societal norms of behavior, dress, interactions, and so on was expected in exchange for emancipation, we may look to France.

Under both the revolutionary and Napoleonic regimes societal conformity was posited as a condition of Jewish political emancipation. In 1789, while debating the merits of Jewish emancipation in the French National Assembly, Count Clermont-Tonnerre famously described the “contract” that granted Jews new political status (that is, citizenship) in exchange for dropping their particularism: “We must refuse everything to the Jews as a nation and accord everything to Jews as individuals. We must withdraw

3 Aviezer Ravitsky, *Messianism, Zionism, and Jewish Religious Radicalism*, trans. Michael Swirsky and Jonathan Chipman (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 181. The rabbi was Rabbi Shneur Zalman of Lyady, the founder of the *Chabad* movement in *Hasidic* Judaism.

recognition from their judges. . . . We must refuse legal protection to the maintenance of so-called laws of their Judaic organization. . . . They must be citizens individually. . . . If they do not want to be citizens . . . we should banish them.”⁴ This did not signal a new relationship between all individuals and the state as later events demonstrate, but rather the beginnings of a circumscribed Jewish identity in the name of citizenship. This identity was one in which any hint of Jewish activity (including religious activity) marked the individual Jew as different from his countrymen, made him suspect, and raised the question of his worthiness to exercise political rights.⁵

As subsequent events demonstrated, being Jewish, even if solely by birth, was apparently enough to trigger forces that considered such a connection grounds for nullification of the “political contract.” The absence of such a new relationship (and just such a nullification) was dramatically demonstrated by the anti-Jewish furor that surrounded the Dreyfus affair at the end of the nineteenth century, as well as by the renewed antisemitism that greeted the reopening of his case after the turn of the century, once it was clear to all but the most virulently anti-Jewish that Dreyfus had in fact been convicted of a crime he had not committed.

By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with the racialization of Jewish identity, the mere fact of Jewish birth or heritage was believed both by antisemites and by some Jews (generally those with an uneasy or problematic connection to their religious and cultural roots—that is, those with an uncertainty over their Jewish identity) to unmistakably mark the Jew as different from his gentile countrymen. These supposed “markers” of Jewishness included the following: hyper-sexuality, a hooked nose, weak feet, speech patterns and pronunciation different from those in the surrounding society, hyper-intellectualism, cheapness and other money-related

4 Clermont-Tonnerre, “Speech on Religious Minorities and Questionable Professions” (December 23, 1789). Originally appeared in *The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History*, trans. and ed. Lynn Hunt (Boston: Bedford, 1996), 86–88. Can be found online at <http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/284/>.

5 David Feldman, “Was Modernity Good for the Jews?” in *Modernity, Culture and “The Jew,”* ed. Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 177, 184. Feldman thinks Clermont-Tonnerre was simply expounding on the new relationship between citizens and the state. Furthermore, Feldman believes “the Jews’ difficulties [in the modern era] were caused not by the assemblage of the phenomena labeled ‘modernity’ but by the democratization of representative government . . . [and] the mass franchise in particular. . . .” This explanation fails to address the problems of Jewish existence and identity in tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union, nor does it explain the unique difficulties experienced by Jews in the United States. The end of traditional Jewish religio-communal life and the entry into modernity directly led to the problems of Jewish identity discussed here. The mass franchise was not to blame.

fixations, the carrying of sexual disease, physical "otherness" (beginning with circumcision) that marked an abnormal soul, and general physical and social unwellness.⁶ Thus the promises held out by emancipation, equality, and choice were once more denied, only this time even conversion to Christianity could not normalize Jewish existence.

This is not meant to imply that modernity ushered in an unending series of horrors for modern Jews, but rather to demonstrate that its "gifts" of opportunity and possibility were not without costs. Modernity required the development of modern Jewish individual and communal identities, as traditional Jews were exposed to the larger world. The modern world appeared accepting but frequently would not tolerate Jewish difference.

In addition to individual Jewish responses, there were various organized efforts to combine aspects of Judaism, Jewish culture, history, and tradition with modern scholarly practices and/or newer sensibilities regarding the needs of Jews beyond the older all-encompassing religio-cultural outlook, to create useable modern Jewish identities. The *Haskalah* was one such effort.

Proponents of the *Haskalah* responded to the challenges of modernity by seeking to fuse secular rationalism to selected elements of Jewish practice and belief, thus crafting a place for Jews in the non-Jewish world. They sought to create a modern cultured Judaism in tune with the world around it. In general, *maskilim* were unfavorably disposed toward traditional Jewish religious practice and communities; instead, they emphasized the primacy of secular education and achievement, the use of Hebrew as a living language rather than as a sacred tongue reserved for prayer, and the need to master the languages of the areas in which Jews lived. Despite intentions to the contrary, the *Haskalah's* emphasis on secular rationalism undermined the foundations of Jewish belief for many of its proponents, effectively raising more questions for which satisfactory answers could not be provided.

Advocates of the Reform movement desired to modernize Jewish religious practice and shed the notions of Jewish ethnicity and difference, to "normalize" (to use an anachronism) Jewish existence in the countries in which they resided. Others sought to modernize minor aspects of Jewish religious worship in the hope of both maintaining traditionally based Judaic practice and accommodating elements of the surrounding culture. This Neo-Orthodox (or in current parlance, Modern Orthodox) approach was the route chosen by the majority of those who shaped the Anglo-Jewish community between 1840 and 1880. The Reform approach was also

6 See Sander Gilman, *The Jew's Body* (New York: Routledge, 1991); Sander Gilman, "Proust's Nose," *Social Research* 67, no. 1 (Spring 2000).

pursued by a small segment of the communal elite, albeit with less successful results. Both approaches will be discussed in the sections that follow.

Yet another approach to reconciling the Jewish heritage and religion with the exigencies of the modern world was attempted by those affiliated with the *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. These scholars sought to rationalize and modernize the study of Judaism and Jewish history, removing it from the realm of belief to that of scientific enquiry. In doing so, they hoped to create a useable Jewish past that would bolster workable modern Jewish identities.

Historians note that as Jewish belief waned, a new Jewish historical consciousness appeared.⁷ Traditional Judaism has a built-in historical prism through which all life is viewed. Jewish practice, including the yearly cycle of reading the Torah through to its end, re-rolling the scroll and beginning again, are part of a never-ending process of reaffirming the sacred history of the Jewish people and the abiding Jewish mission. Once Jews are separated from the traditional totality of their religious belief, with its notions of divine will and Jewish exceptionalism, they must seek meaning through the positive act of developing a modern historical consciousness—moving from an all-encompassing belief in the sacred to the rewriting of their past as simply one secular history among others.⁸

None of the approaches discussed here were mutually exclusive. All espoused, to a greater or lesser extent, a desire for change in the practice of traditional Judaism or sought to shape the criteria for a modern Jewish identity, as part of an effort to come to some accommodation with the modern gentile world. The approaches ran the gamut from radical, as in the case of German Reform, to conservative, as in the case of Neo-Orthodoxy, but all acknowledged, through actions if not always through direct reference, the need to create a workable modern Jewish communal and/or individual identity.

Interestingly, even though London's resident Jewish community in the early nineteenth century was comprised of people whose roots lay mostly in the *kehilot* of the Netherlands, Germany, and Poland, neither the Reform movement nor the *Haskalah* had a significant ideological or intellectual impact on Anglo-Jewry. This is not to imply that these movements were unknown in England. Certainly, Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler (who served 1845–1890) was well aware of their effects on the Jewish communities of Europe. He came from Germany (Hanover), the cradle of both the *Haskalah* and the Reform movement in Judaism. He spoke fluent Yiddish

7 Michael A. Meyer, "The Emergence of Jewish Historiography: Motives and Motifs," *History and Theory* 27, no. 4 (December 1988): 160.

8 See Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (1982; repr., New York: Schocken Books, 1989).

(or "Jargon" as his similarly fluent son, Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler—who served 1891–1911—called it), which meant he also had contact with communities in eastern Europe through which the *Haskalah* would subsequently spread.⁹

Although London's Jewish community never fit the mold of the traditional *anah*, some efforts were made to recreate elements of this form. Despite the uncertainties of communal (and individual) Jewish status associated with the unofficial readmission of 1656, the Anglo-Jewish community never suffered most of the externally imposed strictures under which many of Europe's traditional Jewish communities labored. The post-readmission governments, already on their way to modern nation-statehood, expressed no interest in creating or encouraging a separate autonomous Jewish group. Absent such pressure, the community that developed was never as tightly knit as those in Europe or as fearsome in its ability to impose penalties on dissenting Jews. Isaac D'Israeli's 1813 dispute with Bevis Marks is probably the most famous example of the failure to bring a community member to heel. An inactive member of the synagogue, he was elected an officer and refused to serve. Fined forty pounds, customary practice when an office was declined, D'Israeli refused to pay and ultimately withdrew from the congregation, baptizing his children (among whom was the future prime minister) in 1817.¹⁰ A further difference was that assimilation into English society was neither culturally distasteful, as it was for the Jews in much of eastern Europe, nor was social acceptance generally necessary as it was in Germany throughout most of the nineteenth century.¹¹ Membership in the Jewish community, continued religious observance, and identification with Judaism and the community were *voluntary* in nineteenth-century England, as there were no externally imposed ghettos and relatively few exclusionary laws.¹²

9 See the historiographical essay in chapter one, above, for a discussion of those scholars who argue there was a distinctly English *Haskalah*, although it exerted no genuine influence on Anglo-Jewry.

10 The letter in which Isaac D'Israeli gave his reasons for resigning from Bevis Marks is found in Cecil Roth, *Anglo-Jewish Letters, 1158–1917* (London: Soncino Press, 1938), 237–39.

11 See Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, for the standard account of Jewish assimilation in England. See also Endelman, "German Jews in Victorian England"; and Endelman, "German-Jewish Settlement."

12 See Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858*, 5–9, 28–31; Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 74–75. English exclusionary laws usually concluded with the words "on the true faith of a Christian," or required the taking of the sacrament in the Church of England. Although mostly aimed at Dissenters and/or Catholics, they effectively prevented Jews from the following activities: taking office as sheriff of London before

Later Georgian and Victorian society, although at times genteelly antisemitic, was never virulently so. Much of the antisemitism that did exist took literary or journalistic form, with occasional forays (as in the parliamentary debates over political emancipation) into the political realm. There were also occasional oblique antisemitic references, such as this one from “Notes on Noses” of the *Illustrated London News*, which stated, “The last class of noses to which we shall advert are hook-noses. . . . The men who have the misfortune to have hook noses on their faces are frequently ‘no better than they should be’; they are in general sly, insinuating rogues, who by cunning and much craftiness try to circumvent and cajole the simple ones of the earth. No good can ever be expected to come of a man having a hook nose. . . . We cannot explain why there should be so much wickedness in hook-nosed men, but such is the case. . . .” Less obliquely, English caricaturists were certainly not kind to the Jews, singling out lower class Jews and Jewish “types,” such as the “old clothes man,” street hawkers, and petty thieves, for editorial mockery in their published etchings as well as in the pages of *Punch*. Jewish elites, also, were targeted for mockery at times. At the same time, as one historian of Anglo-Jewry has noted,

however unsettling Victorian prejudices were to the Anglo-Jewish elite, they did not prevent their integration into state and society. The offensive portraits [of popular literature, newspapers and journals] and social slights lacked political resonance. . . . The upper-class English were hardly free of prejudices, but they did not feel strongly enough about them to translate them into a systemat-ic program of defamation and discrimination.

For the most part, however, the Jewish community remained relatively free from this type of harassment.¹³

1835, serving as aldermen in London before 1845, sitting in the House of Commons before 1858, taking degrees at Cambridge and Oxford before 1871. See also Alfred Rubens, “The Jews of the Parish of St. James, Duke’s Place, in the City of London,” in *Remember the Days: Essays on Anglo-Jewish History Presented to Cecil Roth by Members of the Council of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, ed. John M. Shaftesley (London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1966), 183. Rubens notes that the restrictive oaths were not always administered, as Jews were actively involved in the running of the Parish of St. James as early as 1748 when, on June 23, at a meeting of the Vestry, one “Enoch Solomons was appointed one of the two Overseers of the Poor.”

13 *Illustrated London News* 3, no. 36 (May 28, 1842). For a sampling of negative caricatures done of English Jews, see Alfred Rubens, “Anglo-Jewry in Caricature, 1780–1850,” *TJHSE* 23 (1969–70). See also the famous (infamous?) characterization of Fagin in Charles Dickens’s *Oliver Twist* (1837–39). Quote is from Todd M. Endelman,

Anglo-Jewry: Developments and Disputes

The foregoing discussion raises the following questions regarding the Jewish community that developed in England between 1840 and 1880: as there was no external governmental or societal pressure to become or remain a community, why did the Jews of London organize themselves into one? That is, organizationally, why did they go beyond the basic dictates of their faith which required, in no particular order, access to kosher meat; a *mohel* (ritual circumciser); a cemetery and burial arrangements; some form of group prayer; and a religious authority for adjudicating disputes, performing marriages, and so on?¹⁴ Why did most Jews adhere to the community, religiously and culturally, if not compelled to do so? Also, what forms/organizational structures did this community adopt, and why? Did the community adopt these structures out of atavism or group memories of negative outsider status, or were there new considerations at work? What was the community's position or role in English society (if any)? How did the community maintain itself once formed? Was the community, as it grew and developed between 1840 and 1880, distinctly Jewish, English, or did it combine elements of both—that is, what identity did the community develop for itself?

Already by the reign of George IV, London's Jewish community had begun to develop distinct religious and political institutions with rules and regulations governing the behavior of those who chose to affiliate themselves with the community. The community initially formed around the congregations and synagogues founded by those who arrived in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including the Spanish and Portuguese (1701), the Great (1690), the Hambro' (1707), and the New (1761) Synagogues. This was a logical and natural development, as the synagogue had been the center of Jewish communal life and the location of its activities, including group worship, for more than a millennium. Laws governing categories of synagogal membership, religious observance, behavior of members, and so on were duly passed; burial land acquired; and edifices built. Interestingly, several of the terms used to designate the levels of Ashkenazi synagogue membership were borrowed from the language of the European *kehilot*. For example, full members were designated "*Ba'ale Batim* or those enjoying *Hezkath HaKehilla* or privileged

"Communal Solidarity among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London," *Victorian Studies* 28, no. 3 (Spring 1985): 518.

14 A trained *shohet* was needed to provide kosher meat. Group prayer was to take place in a *minyan* (quorum), that is, in a group of at least ten men who were *bnei mitzvah* (aged thirteen years and one day).

members[hip]. . . .” Privileged members governed the synagogue, served as its officers (*Parnasim*, *Gaba'im*, and so on), “enjoyed priority or monopoly in the award of synagogal honours . . . and . . . a special portion of the . . . burial ground was reserved for them.” Members who rented seats on a yearly basis were known as *toshavim*, not strangers to the synagogue, but not full members either. *Orahim* or “strangers” (literally, visitors or guests) were those who came for prayer but had no status within the synagogue, usually the poor of the community.¹⁵ Frequently they were kept separate from the other members of the congregation, permitted to stand or sit only at the side or back of the synagogue. This hierarchy influenced communal organization beyond the synagogues, particularly in the case of the Board of Deputies.

The London Committee of Deputies of British Jews, later the Board of Deputies of British Jews (generally known as the Board of Deputies), which derived from an even older Sephardic organization known as the *Deputados*, was established in 1760. It was fairly moribund, meeting irregularly and very occasionally between 1760 and 1835. It “gr[ew] out of a system for private periodic consultation between the Jewish grandees of London [and] retained its highly personal character” well into the nineteenth century.¹⁶ In 1835, efforts were made to place the board on a more regular footing. At that time, the deputies adopted a constitution and elected Moses Montefiore their president, a position he held until 1874, except for periodic trips abroad on behalf of foreign Jewry. The board’s purpose, according to the new constitution, “was to represent the Jews of Britain ‘in all matters touching their political welfare’ . . . and ‘to adopt such measures as [the members] may deem proper’ to ‘protect and promote the welfare of the Jews.’”¹⁷ Deputies were elected to the board from among the full members of the four main London synagogues:

-
- 15 Lipman, “Synagogal Organization,” 80–81; and Lipman, *Social History of the Jews*, 41–44. At Bevis Marks the three categories of membership were, in order, *Yehidim*, *Congregantes*, and *Orahim*. Note that other than for the founders and their children, privileged membership was generally by invitation only, thus candidates had to possess status and money (both of which would bring them to the attention of the *Ba'ale Batim*).
- 16 Israel Finestein, “The Anglo-Jewish Revolt of 1853,” *The Jewish Quarterly* 26, nos. 3–4 (1978–79): 106. For general information on the board, see Aubrey Newman, *The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–1985: A Brief Survey* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1987); Charles H. L. Emanuel, *A Century and a Half of Jewish History: Extracted from the Minute Books of the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews* (London: George Routledge, 1910).
- 17 David C. Itzkowitz, “Cultural Pluralism and the Board of Deputies of British Jews,” in *Religion and Irreligion in Victorian Society: Essays in Honour of R. K. Webb*, ed. R. W. Davis and R. J. Helmstadter (London: Routledge, 1992), 87. Board meetings frequently addressed the “civil disabilities of the Jews,” although not much action was taken regarding this issue. See, for example, BD, minute book, 1838–40, ACC 3121/A/005/3, LMA.

Bevis Marks, the Great, the Hambro', and the New. As full membership in the London synagogues was an expensive and status-related proposition, the deputies were chosen from, and elected by, the wealthier elements of London Jewry. Although the board claimed to speak for all British Jews, touting itself as "the sole medium of communication with the Government," no provincial congregations were represented until 1838.¹⁸

In 1836, Parliament enacted legislation that greatly enhanced the power of the board within the Jewish community and granted the board governmental recognition. The marriage and registration acts established civil marriage in England and Wales, required the formal recording of births deaths and marriages by designated registrars, and provided for central collection of the recorded information. Their passage also permanently altered the status of the Board of Deputies. The registration act stated that "the president of the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews is to certify to the registrar-general the appointment of secretaries of synagogues to act as marriage registrars."¹⁹ This meant that the board's president, Montefiore, religiously Orthodox and temperamentally conservative, had exclusive governmental authority to legitimize one of the most important synagogue functions, the solemnization of marriage. If he chose not to recognize a synagogue's designated marriage registrar, under the terms of the act, the state could not recognize marriages performed in that congregation. This effectively gave the board and its president, in conjunction with the chief rabbi and the *hakham*, veto power over the recognition of synagogues. This legislation also led indirectly to the strengthening of the offices of the chief rabbi and the *hakham*, a fact which became clear during the controversy surrounding the founding and status of London's first Reform congregation, the West London Synagogue of British Jews.²⁰

In addition to its activities and/or discussions relating to the political welfare of the Anglo-Jewish community, the board acted on requests for

18 Roth, *The Great Synagogue*, 240.

19 6 & 7 William IV, cap. 86, *An Act for Registering Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England*. The quotation is taken from §30 of the act. The Marriage Act 6 & 7 William IV, cap. 85, §2 allowed that "Jews may contract marriage according to Jewish usages provided . . . that the registrar's certificate has been obtained." The relevant sections of both acts can be found at <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/752-acts-of-parliament-relating-to-the-jews-of-england>.

20 The board's constitution obliged it "to accept the guidance of its ecclesiastical authorities" in all matters of religion, which effectively gave the chief rabbi and the *hakham* veto power over certain board action. Finestein, "Anglo-Jewish Revolt," 110. The chief rabbi was more frequently consulted as the office of the *hakham* was empty for long periods of time.

political or monetary assistance to alleviate physical suffering (in the form of famine, earthquake, or torture for blood libel) received from the Jews of Syria, Turkey, Persia, Morocco, Rome, Egypt, Russia, the German state of Posen, and elsewhere over the years.²¹ The board also conveyed the sentiments of Anglo-Jewry to foreign governments and served as the contact point for foreign Jewish organizations.²² The board convened to discuss the varied requests it received, and it responded, as it was able, with political or monetary help or appeals to various English congregations on behalf of the supplicants. It also contacted other European-Jewish bodies on behalf of the sufferers. As but one example of its actions on behalf of foreign Jews, in response to an appeal from the Jews of Damascus, the board purchased ads in thirty-one newspapers in metropolitan London and the provinces, solicited funds from Jewish congregations, met with Foreign Secretary Palmerston to request the assistance of the Foreign Office,²³ and deputized

21 On the Damascus libel, see BD, minute books, 1838–40, ACC 3121/A/005/3, LMA; and BD, minute books, 1840–41, ACC 3121/A/005/4, LMA. See BD, minute books, 1855–58, ACC 3121/A/005/8, LMA on the Carmona Affair (the murder and confiscation of the property of Carmona, a wealthy Jewish resident of Constantinople, by Turkish authorities); and BD, minute books, 1859–64, ACC 3121/A/005/9, LMA on petitions for assistance from the Jews of Damascus (1860), Rome, Galicia (for help in rebuilding a *Beth Hamidrash*), Wallachia, Bengazi, Tripolie, Belgrade, Rhodes. BD, minute books, 1871–78, ACC 3121/A/005/11, LMA contains information and resolutions on the board's actions regarding the Persian Famine Relief Fund (for Jews in Shiraz), the Odessa Relief Fund (for the survivors of the Easter 1871 Pogrom), relief for Jewish sufferers in the Baghdad drought. BD, minute books, 1878–89, ACC 3121/A/005/12, LMA contains requests from the Jewish communities of Persia, Palestine, Syria, Turkey, and Russia, for political and financial assistance.

22 BD, minute books, 1864–71, ACC 3121/A/005/10, LMA contains condolences sent by the board to the United States government (via the American minister in London) over the death of President Abraham Lincoln; notice of receipt of a testimonial volume from the United States government (authorized by Congress) and a letter of thanks from William Seward, secretary of state, received December 10, 1867; also notice from the Board of Delegates of American Jews sent July 10, 1865, of a reorganization after the end of the Civil War.

23 The meeting between Lord Palmerston and a delegation from the board took place on April 30, 1840. Palmerston “expressed his willingness to aid the object sought by the deputation . . . [by] immediately forward[ing] instructions of Lord Ponsonby, the English Ambassador at Constantinople, and also to Colonel Hodges, the English representative at Alexandria, directing them to use every remonstrance in their power to prevent the continuance of atrocities so disgraceful to the present era.” *Times*, 2 May 1840, 5. See BD, minute books, 1838–40; and BD, minute books, 1840–41. See also *Times*, 23 June 1840, 3; and *Times*, 4 July 1840, 6–7. Parliament sympathetically discussed the plight of the Damascene Jews, and a large meeting was held on their behalf at the Egyptian Hall, Mansion House, at which resolutions of sympathy were

Moses Montefiore²⁴ as the board's representative to undertake a relief mission to the East.²⁵

The Board of Deputies was also careful to observe the formalities of English organizational life. Thus, letters of congratulations were sent to Queen Victoria on her marriage to Prince Albert, and to the Duchess of Kent (the Queen's mother) on the same occasion. The board resolved to publish the responses it received to these missives in the *London Chronicle* and the *Times of London*, presumably with an eye to informing its own constituency and the greater London public.²⁶

As can be imagined, the increased power of the board, and its claim to be the exclusive voice of the Jewish community on issues of political concern, was not universally heralded. Interestingly, despite the fact that membership on the board was limited to those chosen from among (and by) the full members of the London synagogues, the first challenge to the board's authority came from within this group. A long letter (eleven pages) dated September 26, 1838, was received from Isaac Lyon Goldsmid by way of the wardens of the Great Synagogue (of which he was a member), which took issue with the newly reconstituted "Deputies of the British Jews."²⁷ Among Goldsmid's points: "I am unable to see why there is any necessary connexion between the circumstance of a man being a *Ba'al Bayit* and his fitness for the office of a Deputy, or why if he be con-

adopted. The meeting drew a "who's who" of London merchants, bankers, officials, MPs, etc.

- 24 Montefiore was knighted by Queen Victoria (November 7, 1837) on her visit to the Lord Mayor's Day at the London Guildhall. At the time, he served as one of the two sheriffs of London. This marked her first visit to the Guildhall as queen. An original admission ticket to the event, in the name of Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, Esq., still exists. The invitation, no. 228, is bordered by raised coats of arms and other decorations, and topped by an embossed crown. The lower left-hand corner contains the red wax seal of the "Royal Entertainment Committee, 1837." Mocatta, letters of Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, MSS 22(2), University College London.
- 25 For a first-hand account of Montefiore's mission to Damascus, see Dr. Louis Loewe, *The Damascus Affair: Diary of Dr. Louis Loewe, July–November 1840* (Ramsgate, UK: Montefiore Theological College, 1940).
- 26 The letter to the queen was dated February 17, 1840. It was resolved to publish the responses on March 4, 1840. See BD, minute book, 1838–40.
- 27 Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid (1778–1859), the first Jewish baronet (1841), was a successful financier and an early and steadfast proponent of Jewish political emancipation. He was also a strong supporter of the West London Synagogue of British Jews (Reform) and a founder of University College London. An engraved certificate for ten shares in the University of London, dated March 1826, in Goldsmid's name is at Mocatta, letters of Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, MSS 22(2). See also <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/6765-goldsmid> for more general information.

sidered by the majority of rate payers as one of the persons best able to advance their interests in the latter capacity they should nevertheless be prevented from choosing him because he does not fill the former.”²⁸ He noted that the board had become too large to convene in a timely matter or to accomplish much in an efficient fashion, and took issue with the board’s claim “to be the only official medium of communication with the Government . . . [on] all matters affecting the Political interests of the British Jews. . . .” He further asked, “What right have those who reside in London to affirm that none but they shall officially communicate with the Government?” Regarding full members of the London synagogues, he also noted that they were bound by their synagogue’s rules to adhere to the board’s decisions. He thought the board presumptuous in claiming the exclusive right to speak for the Jews in England. Further, it denied individuals their right to choose political representation. He also wrote that, historically, the board had been ineffectual and that he, and others he named, were considerably more successful in winning political rights/concessions. “For myself the object of my efforts on behalf of the Jews has been to benefit them and not to obtain their applause . . . I cannot possibly consent to entrust my political interests to the charge of the Deputies.”²⁹

Goldsmid concluded by stating that if the current state of things was not remedied (that is, the fact that membership in the synagogue bound him to the decisions of the Board of Deputies; required him to accept the board as the sole political spokesman for British Jewry; and precluded him from exerting himself politically, solely, or in concert with others, on behalf of British Jews) he, and he thought others, too, would be driven from synagogue membership “in order that they may remain politically free agents.” He stated that this would cause him tremendous distress as “[t]o be forced to separate from a Body with which my Father and family have been connected for very many years and with which . . . I desire still to remain in connection would cause me the deepest concern.”³⁰

This was quite a blast, coming as it did from an active, moneyed, and respected member of the community. The Board of Deputies responded by inviting Goldsmid and his son Francis Henry Goldsmid to attend a meeting

28 This is likely a reference to middle- or upper-middle-class Jews, a small but growing part of the London Jewish community, who were prevented from sitting on the board as they were not yet full members of any of the London synagogues. They remained silent (at least publicly) on the issue until the 1850s. For Goldsmid’s letter and the board’s response see BD, minute books, 1838–40.

29 BD, minute books, 1838–40.

30 Ibid.

to discuss his letter. At that meeting (December 4, 1838) it was resolved "[t]hat it is the opinion of this Board that no persons by being Members of the synagogues or Board of Deputies are precluded from exerting their individual influence with the Government of the Country, for the promotion of their civil rights and privileges. . . ."³¹ And this, at least for a few years, is where the matter was left.

Religious Reform—Anglo-Jewish Style

As mentioned above, the board's constitution required that it consult the chief rabbi and the *hakham* on political issues of religious import. Thus, the board neither would nor could recognize the marriage registrar of any synagogue engaged in religious practices unacceptable to either the chief rabbi or the *hakham*. This constitutional requirement, along with the intransigence of Montefiore, as board president, provoked a crisis in the Jewish community that occupied the board and the chief rabbinate intermittently for several decades, and likely encouraged the chief rabbi (in 1847) to make certain reforms in the rules and regulations governing Britain's Ashkenazi congregations.

In 1840, eighteen members of Bevis Marks left the synagogue. They were frustrated that their proposals for substantive reform had twice been rejected by the *Mahamad*, as had their request to open a branch synagogue closer to their residences in West London. Together with six well-to-do Ashkenazim, also residents of West London, they founded London's first Reform synagogue, the West London Synagogue of British Jews. The founders were all from respectable London Jewish families. Those from Bevis Marks included several members of the Mocatta family, as well as Horatio Montefiore (brother of Sir Moses); the six Ashkenazi founders included three members of the Goldsmid family.³²

31 Much of Goldsmid's dissatisfaction was precipitated by the board's lack of effort in the cause of Anglo-Jewish political emancipation, an issue of importance almost exclusively for the upper echelons of Anglo-Jewry (and then, certainly, not for all of them, as Montefiore's lukewarm support of the issue proves).

32 Roth, *The Great Synagogue*, 254. The Goldsmid founders, all members of the Great Synagogue, were "Aaron Asher Goldsmid, Francis H. Goldsmid, and Frederick D. Goldsmid; the others were Albert Cohen, Montague Levyssohn, and Solomon Lazarus. . . . [T]hey were followed by Benjamin Elkin, who played a prominent part in the literary defence of the Reform movement; when he died in 1848, the [Great] Synagogue imposed such stringent conditions before consenting to bury him at his wife's side that the ex-warden, Sir Isaac Lyon Goldsmid . . . also resigned and

Those who withdrew from Bevis Marks sent a lengthy letter to the Synagogue's elders enumerating their reasons for having done so.³³ They wrote, more in sorrow than in anger, that

[i]n order to preserve proper decorum during the performance of Divine Worship, it is essential that the whole congregation should assemble before the commencement of prayer, and remain until its conclusion. To secure the observance of this regulation and at the same time to obtain a full attendance of members . . . we have determined that the service shall commence at a more convenient hour, viz., on Sabbaths and Holidays, at half-past nine, in summer, and at ten in winter; also the service shall be limited to a moderate length. . . .

The entire service, except on the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur), was not to exceed two and a half hours. To achieve this desired reform "it became necessary to abridge the existing forms of prayer." Further, the tenor of the service was to be raised by the addition of a choir, and sermons in English. The traditional practice of adding a second day to many holidays was to be dropped, as it "is not the intention of the body, of which we form part, to recognize as sacred, days which are evidently not ordained as such in scripture. . . ." They noted that they would adopt Sephardic pronunciation and designate themselves British Jews, styling themselves "neither Portuguese nor Germans, but natives. . . ." Finally, they stated they had instituted the aforementioned "improvements" "to inspire a deeper interest, and a stronger feeling towards our holy religion," and to keep the youth within the faith. Clearly, these men had made a decision regarding what they believed to be the appropriate identity for the Anglo-Jewish community, and they were willing to force the issue by striking out on their own.

At least one prominent scholar of the Reform movement in Judaism, Michael Meyer, believes that, despite their desire for reform, the founders of the new synagogue would have remained within the fold, at least for a time, if Bevis Marks or the Great Synagogue had acceded to their desire to open West London branches of the parent synagogue.³⁴ However,

transferred to the new congregation the legacy of £3,000 that he had intended for his ancestral place of worship."

33 For full text of the letter dated August 24, 1841, see Roth, *Anglo-Jewish Letters*, 281–86.

34 Michael A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 173. Albert Hyamson, too, believes the split was mostly over location and not over a desire for religious reform. Hyamson, *The Sephardim of England*. More generally, see Meyer, *Response*

there is no evidence to support Meyer's belief, and the fact remains that this split was also over the seceders' wish to shorten worship services, abolish the required second day observance of certain holidays, raise the level of decorum in the synagogue, and so forth.

Both Bevis Marks and the Great Synagogue had rules (*Ascamah No. 1* and various *takanot*, respectively) forbidding the opening of new synagogues in London. Historically, the Ashkenazi synagogues had been less effective in preventing this from happening, as the Ashkenazi population in London continued to grow at a fairly rapid pace. Even two of the establishment synagogues, the Hambro' and New Synagogues, began as breakaway congregations from the Great Synagogue. The restrictions against opening new synagogues were originally established to ensure communal unity. However, by the nineteenth century they were generally used to prevent moneyed members from transferring their loyalties and funds to newer (and more suburban) synagogues, leaving the older congregations to foot the bill for the Jewish poor. To this end, the three main Ashkenazi synagogues implemented "no poaching" treaties, preventing full members of one synagogue from being accepted as members in another.³⁵

Although the founding of the West London Synagogue of British Jews is frequently painted as a split within Bevis Marks (that is, the Sephardi community), it should be remembered that there was an active Ashkenazi component in the push for reform. Robert Liberles argues that the split was not really over internal politics at Bevis Marks, but rather over lukewarm efforts by the Board of Deputies to push for political emancipation, coupled with resentment over the board's claim to speak for London Jewry. Certainly, this would have figured into the decision of the Goldsmids to join the new congregation. Liberles further believes that the desire for reform in religious practice was driven by the hope that these changes would make the Jewish community more acceptable to the English public, and, as such, more attractive as candidates for political emancipation. Thus, in deliberately merging the Sephardi and Ashkenazi communities in a single synagogue, Liberles thinks the hope of those seceding was that the new synagogue would "serve as a rival institution, not to Bevis Marks or the Great Synagogue, but rather to the Board of Deputies."³⁶ Certainly, some of the new synagogue's founders were dismayed with the board's rather desultory efforts to forward the cause of Jewish political emancipation. However,

to *Modernity*, 171–80; Kershen and Romain, *Tradition and Change*; and Liberles, "Jewish Reform Movement," 121–50.

35 Roth, *The Great Synagogue*, 253.

36 Liberles, "Jewish Reform Movement," 145.

there is no evidence to prove that this issue, in particular, caused the split in Bevis Marks. Nor is it clear that the reformers were hoping to impress the English public with their worthiness for emancipation. It is far more likely that they genuinely sought the convenience of a closer synagogue and the religious decorum that, as Englishmen of the Jewish persuasion, they had come to desire. It should be stressed that the liturgical and practical changes they adopted (see below), coupled with continued Hebrew services, separate seating for men and women, the wearing of *kippot* (traditional men's head coverings), and so on, were also well within the bounds of this identification. The very conservatism of their reforms, when contrasted with the more drastic changes found in Continental Reform, can be attributed to the generally conservative tone of the English upper-middle and upper classes, of which they were increasingly a part and with whom they identified as Englishmen of the Jewish persuasion.³⁷ It can certainly be argued that the movement for Reform in London was a way for a segment of the Anglo-Jewish communal elite to challenge the communal authorities' interpretation of Anglo-Jewish identity (that is, to challenge what the authorities allowed was the acceptable balance between Judaic religious practice and English behavior).

Before opening their new synagogue, the founders secured the services of native-born David W. Marks to serve as their minister. Marks was young, religiously knowledgeable (but not an ordained rabbi), and willing to enact the desired reforms. He crafted a new prayer book, the *Forms of Prayer* (which abridged the "forms of prayer"—that is, liturgy—mentioned in the seceders' letter above): a five-volume Hebrew set, with English translations, for use in the new synagogue.³⁸ His introductory remarks to the *Forms of Prayer* made clear the rationale for the liturgical changes that followed. Marks indicated that he intended to return scripture to its rightful place in the practice of the Jewish religion, and thus his prayer book sought to remove many of the rabbinic accretions that had accumulated over the centuries. The Bible, he wrote, is a "monument to . . . the once lauded greatness of Zion . . . is the sacred volume of our Scriptures. . . . Thus it is that the

37 Unlike the WLSBJ, the two provincial Reform synagogues founded in the nineteenth century (Manchester, 1856; and Bradford, 1873) were more directly affected by the German Reform movement. The Reform movement did not grow beyond these three synagogues until the twentieth century.

38 Rev. D. W. Marks and Rev. A. Löwy, eds. *Seder Ha'tefilot Forms of Prayer used in the West London Synagogue of British Jews*, 2nd ed. (1841; repr. London: Wertheimer, 1856).

Scriptures became the immediate and fit source of the Hebrew Prayers."³⁹ Further, "[t]he history of the [Jewish] ritual till lately lay buried beneath a mass of critical difficulties; to remove which has only within the last generation become the task of several of our eminent continental coreligionists, such as [Leopold] Zunz, [Salomon Judah] Rapaport, and others. . . ."⁴⁰ He also noted, in fine Victorian form, that

time has exerted its influence on these prayers, it is but meet that the exigencies of the time should again be consulted, when we have arrived at the conviction that the house of prayer does not exercise that salutary influence over the minds and hearts of the congregants which it is intended and capable to exert . . . and it must be universally admitted that the present mode of worship fails to call forth the devotion, so essential to the religious improvement of the people. . . . We have removed those parts of the service which are deficient in devotional tendency; and have expunged the few expressions which are known to be the offspring of feelings produced by oppression, and are universally admitted to be foreign to the heart of every true Israelite of our day.⁴¹

Again, with an eye to elevating the tone of the prayer book, Marks translated the various Aramaic prayers that are found in traditional Jewish prayer books into Hebrew so as "to render the prayers at once more dignified and more generally intelligible . . . [for Hebrew is] the language of the law . . . knowledge of which we trust it will be the pride, as it is the bounden duty, of every Israelite to attain."⁴² This approach differed from that of Continental Reformers who produced prayer books in which Hebrew and Aramaic prayers were removed and those in German were added.

As for specific changes, Marks's prayer book shortened many sections of the traditional liturgy, including the *Amidah* (also known as the *Shemonah Esrei*), "the main statutory prayer in Jewish public and private worship since the destruction of the Second Temple."⁴³ The *Amidah* was

39 Rev. D. W. Marks and Rev. A. Löwy, "Introduction to the First Edition (August 1841)," in *Forms of Prayer*, v–vi.

40 Marks and Löwy, "Introduction," vii.

41 Ibid., viii–ix.

42 Ibid., xi.

43 *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, ed. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), s.v. "*Amidah*." *Amidah* means "standing." The prayer is so called because the supplicant recites it in its entirety while standing. Its current weekday form of nineteen benedictions has remained basically unchanged (in traditional Judaism) since the second century AD.

removed from the weekday afternoon prayers (*Minchah*) and greatly shortened in the Sabbath Day prayers. The prayer for restoration of the temple and sacrificial offerings was retained. The various forms of *Kaddish* (sanctification), traditionally recited in Aramaic, were given in Hebrew; and the *Aleynu* (“it is incumbent upon us”), the closing prayer of morning worship, was shortened, with the phrases thanking God for having chosen the Jews as his people kept, but those giving thanks for “not having been made like other nations” removed.

The Passover *Haggadah*, containing the home service for the first night of Passover (traditionally celebrated for two nights outside of Israel), was tremendously shortened. Missing were several recitations including the traditional Aramaic *Ha Lachma Anya* (“this is the bread of affliction”), the *Ma Nishtanah* (“why is tonight different from all other nights?”), the blessings over the *Arba Kosot* (“four cups”) of wine, and other elements. In his introduction to the first volume of the West London’s *Forms of Prayer*, Marks admits to having “expunged the few expressions which are known to be the offspring of feelings produced by oppression, and are universally admitted to be foreign to the heart of every true Israelite of our day.”⁴⁴ In so writing, Marks made clear that he and his congregants viewed England as their homeland, one in which oppression no longer figured as a focus of Jewish life.

Like Marks, the founders of the West London Synagogue of British Jews stressed the primacy of the written Torah over the oral law, although both are believed by traditional Jews to be the revealed word of God. This emphasis distinguished them from the Reform Jews of Germany who were willing to dispense with much of both the Torah and the oral law to bring their religious practices into what they believed was greater harmony with the expectations of the larger society. Continental Reformers, unlike their English counterparts, rejected Torah-based elements such as adherence to the laws of *kashrut*, something West London’s members were not willing to do at this time. This is not to imply that London’s Reform synagogue ignored accepted English religious forms. In fact, “the bibliocentricity we find in the origins of Reform Judaism in London owes more to English Protestantism, mediated through upper-class Anglo-Jewry, than to any religious thoughts from abroad.”⁴⁵ The various evangelical (that is, dissent-

44 Marks and Löwy, *Forms of Prayer*, ix. This makes for odd reading, as the *Haggadah* is based on retelling the story of the Jewish exodus from Egypt and deliverance from oppression. By removing references to oppression Marks alters its essence and that of the Passover *Seder* (ritual meal).

45 Kershen and Romain, *Tradition and Change*, 22–23. They note that “we do not find . . . any hint of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. . . . There was no public airing of intellectual ideas,

ing) movements in early to mid-nineteenth-century English Protestantism also reemphasized the primacy of scripture. Thus, the liturgical reforms, and the return to the Torah as the source of religious practice—advocated by Marks and the founders—were in keeping with contemporary English practice and likely influenced by them.

In response to the founders' publication of the new prayer book, the chief rabbi, Solomon Hirschell, and the acting head of Bevis Marks, David Meldola, issued a caution in 1841 (followed the next year by a mild ban) on interacting with members of the new synagogue.⁴⁶ Neither the caution nor the ban caused much harm, as the founders of the West London Synagogue came from established Anglo-Jewish families and had interlocking business and familial connections throughout the London Jewish establishment. Many in this establishment considered the snubbing of family members and/or business partners and acquaintances unseemly, and they simply refused to do so. As but one example, the Jews' Hospital annual dinner for 1849 was chaired by F. H. Goldsmid, a founder and member of the West London Synagogue of British Jews. Attendees at the dinner included Sir Anthony Rothschild and Alderman David Salomons, members of synagogues under the aegis of Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler. Thus, it is clear that the ban did not prevent public interaction between members of the Anglo-Jewish establishment.⁴⁷

On January 24, 1842, the West London Synagogue of British Jews was consecrated, opening its doors in a former chapel on Burton Street. Moses Montefiore, in his capacity as president of the Board of Deputies, refused to certify D. W. Marks as the marriage registrar of the new synagogue. Montefiore's refusal forced congregation members to wed before a public registrar prior to their synagogue nuptials, as marriages conducted in the West London Synagogue were not recognized in British law.⁴⁸

though the European precedents were there . . ." (22). See also Meyer, *Response to Modernity*, 172–73. Meyer believes the Reform "scripturalists" were . . . responding to pervasive Gentile opinion."

46 The caution, issued October 14, 1841, had other signatories, as well. For the full text see Roth, "The Ecclesiastical Authorities to the Jewish Public: A Manifesto," in *Anglo-Jewish Letters*, 254, 286–88. Roth notes that the office of *hakham* had been vacant since 1828. Thus, Chief Rabbi Hirschell, ill and in the last year of his life, was left the "unquestioned head of the English Rabbinate, and it became his duty to face the emergency" (254), a duty he was neither temperamentally nor physically able to fulfill.

47 *Times*, 4 June 1849, 5.

48 For an interesting exploration of Montefiore as a communal figure during this period in the 1840s, see "Unity and Dissent," in Abigail Green, *Moses Montefiore: Jewish Liberator, Imperial Hero* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010), 158–73.

The Chief Rabbinate and the Board of Deputies: Building and Centralizing Anglo-Jewish Community

Less than a year after the opening of the West London Synagogue of British Jews, Chief Rabbi Hirschell, who had been in failing health for some years, passed away. His death was deemed of sufficient significance to merit notices in the London press, and as far away as America. As *The Times* noted under the heading “Death of the Chief Rabbi of the Jews,” “[h]e was 82 years of age, and ha[d] officiated as Chief Rabbi upwards of 42 years. . . . [A] solemn ceremony will be performed in the Great Synagogue” followed by a burial procession. “The commissioners of Police have consented to supply a sufficient force for the preservation of order on the occasion.”⁴⁹ The American coverage, which appeared in a Jewish monthly journal, was quite lengthy and in slightly purple prose, as this brief excerpt shows:

The whole service was most impressively performed; the clear and thrilling enunciation of the glowing words of the requiem had a powerful effect; numbers sobbed audibly, and the Rev. Mr. Asher himself was frequently obliged to pause. We thought it had been usual on such an occasion to sound the *Shofar* (cornet), but we perceived that it was not done.

On leaving the Synagogue a procession was formed, headed by the boys of the various charity schools of our community, who had previously been marshaled into order in the square in front of the Synagogue. These were preceded by two mounted inspectors, and two rows of policemen, six abreast. . . . We have previously said that every Jewish house was closed; it was also gratifying to see a similar mark of respect paid by a large number of non-Israelite tradesmen on the route. The bells of every church, which the cortege passed, were tolled—a spontaneous mark of sympathy on the part of the respective authorities.⁵⁰

The Office of the Chief Rabbi remained empty for more than two years as the Ashkenazi synagogues searched for an appropriate candidate. The split within the community, although more directly affecting Bevis Marks, clearly weighed on the minds of those tasked to choose the new official. Even many traditionalists in the Ashkenazi synagogues hoped the new chief rabbi would modernize the office and institute certain reforms with

49 *Times*, 2 November 1842, 5. The chief rabbi died on October 31, 1842.

50 *The Occident and American Jewish Advocate* 1, no. 1 (April 1843). The journal was based in Philadelphia and edited by Isaac Leeser.

an eye to elevating the tone of Jewish worship, adding decorum and dignity to Jewish practice (that is, encouraging worship in a fashion befitting Anglo-Jews). It was resolved that in addition to being an ordained rabbi, the successful candidate was to have been chief rabbi elsewhere for a minimum of six months, "well acquainted with Ancient Classical and Modern General Literature, and to have a competent knowledge of some of the Modern European Languages." He was to be "between the ages of 30 and 42 and . . . able to deliver talks in English within two years of appointment."⁵¹ He was also expected to perform "the Marriage Ceremony for the *ba'ale batim* and *toshavim* of the uniting London Congregations, their widows and children . . . at a cost of 1 guinea, within the bounds of London" and he was to superintend "affairs of *Shechita*, both in London and the Provinces." Finally, the chief rabbi was to "have the general religious direction and superintendence of each of the uniting congregations . . . and to determine all questions on religious points referred to him by any member of any such congregation."⁵²

Rigorous as these requirements were, there was no shortage of qualified applicants. As *The Times* wrote of the four chosen candidates (from a field of thirteen), "[t]he whole of these rev. gentlemen are celebrated on the continent in the Christian and Jewish circles for their piety and attainments, the three first being doctors of philosophy of eminent foreign Universities."⁵³ On December 1, 1844, the vote was finally taken and Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler of Hanover was overwhelmingly elected, as the vote count given in *The Times* shows.⁵⁴ Although his predecessor, Rabbi Hirschell, had been

51 Alderman, "Power, Authority and Status," 15. The first English sermon was given in Liverpool at the Seel Street Synagogue (known as the Liverpool Old Hebrew Congregation) in 1819. The first at Bevis Marks was delivered in 1831 at a "special service of intercession for protection against the scourge of Cholera. . . ."

52 United Synagogue, "Chief Rabbinate Synopsis of Steps taken in 1842–43 Election of Chief Rabbi," ACC/2712/15/2037, LMA. The above resolutions were adopted by the electors at meetings held at the Great Synagogue, February 19 and 21, 1843.

53 *Times*, 26 September 1844, 5.

54 *Times*, 6 December 1844, 5—reprinting a notice from the *Voice of Jacob*. Adler received 121 votes, his next closest rival received only 13. See also *Illustrated London News* 5, no. 138 (December 21, 1844): 389. The election was attended by a correspondent for the *Illustrated London News*, which printed an engraving of the event and the following description of the proceedings: "An event has just occurred of great importance to the Jewish nation. . . . A multitude was present. A strange din of sounds saluted our ear. . . . A strong eastern character was stamped on every countenance. Every man was recognised as a foreigner, and felt to be a Jew. . . ." An interesting observation considering that most of the electors were well advanced in the process of anglicization.

accorded the status of chief rabbi, he had not been elected. The new chief rabbi would assume office secure in the knowledge that he was duly elected and representative (at least of the moneyed English Ashkenazi congregations), as electors from Jewish synagogues throughout Britain had voted in the election.⁵⁵

Rabbi N. M. Adler was installed as “Chief Rabbi of the United Congregations of Great Britain” amidst much pomp and high expectations on July 9, 1845. *The Times*, devoting several paragraphs to the event, “Installation of the Jewish High Priest,” reported that

[t]he installation . . . took place . . . at the Great Synagogue . . . with unusual pomp and splendour. . . . The interior of the synagogue had been beautified for the occasion, and a spacious orchestra had been erected facing the ark for the accommodation of nearly 50 singers. . . . Before the ark was hung a rich white damask satin curtain, embroidered profusely with gold and silver; the reading desk was also covered with the same rich material. The chandeliers and branches were decorated with a profusion of flowers, of the choicest description, and lighted with upwards of 500 wax candles, which together with the galleries being filled with ladies, had a very pleasing and brilliant effect. . . . The high priest . . . delivered a sermon, which he spoke in high German, and after the . . . usual prayer for the Royal family, the ceremony was concluded. . . .⁵⁶

This was an auspicious beginning to a father and son regime that was to occupy the office of chief rabbi for the next fifty-six years. The pomp and

55 United Synagogue, “Chief Rabbinate Synopsis.” *The Occident* 2, no. 7 (October 1844) gives the estimated vote allotment as follows: “London—Great (Duke’s Place) Synagogue 50, New (St. Helen’s) 25, Hambro’ (Fenchurch St.) 20, Western (St. Alban’s) 5, Maiden Lane 3; Provincial—Liverpool (Seel St.) 8, Liverpool (Hardman St.) 2, Birmingham 4, Manchester 4, Bristol 2, Dublin 2, Edinburgh 2, Portsmouth 2, Plymouth 2, Brighton 1, Chatham 1, Falmouth 1, Glasgow (Old) 1, Glasgow (New) 1, Ipswich 1, Jersey 1, Newcastle 1, Southampton (High St.) 1, Swansea 1, Penzance 1.” These congregations could afford the fees required to be permitted to vote. Votes allotted to member congregations were determined by the amount “subscribed for the Support of the office of CHIEF RABBI” by each Congregation in £5 increments (e.g., between £5 and under £10=1 vote, between £10 and £15=2, etc. The increments change over £50).

56 *Times*, 10 July 1845, 6. *The Times*’s use of the title “high priest” was wildly anachronistic as the position had ceased to exist with the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 AD. Its use suggests a romanticization of “the Jew” and a misunderstanding of Jewish worship.

circumstance surrounding the installation, as well as the gravitas of the "high priest," met Christian expectations as well as those of anglicizing Jews.

The new chief rabbi wasted no time in establishing the authority of his office, by addressing the complaint most frequently raised during the later years of his predecessor. The tone and tenor of Anglo-Jewish worship were to be improved. Measures ensuring the dignity and decorum of worship, befitting the English adherents of one of the world's oldest religions, would henceforth be compulsory in the Ashkenazi synagogues under the chief rabbi's authority. To this end, one of Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler's earliest acts was to issue a set of "Laws and Regulations for all the synagogues in the British Empire," in which he declared,

The Israelite must prove by his conduct *before, during, and after* service, that Divine worship is to him at once a sacred and a pleasing duty, and that he delights in the benign influence of the House of Worship. He will prove this if, *previous* to the service he prepares himself both outwardly and inwardly; if he appears in the house of God *at the proper time*: if, *during service*, he devoutly strive that quiet and decorum, devotion and solemnity prevail within the holy walls, and [that] his prayers issue from the depth of the heart. . . .⁵⁷

All elements of worship and activity in the synagogue were to be monitored and controlled by the "proper" religious authorities. Included among the forty-two laws and regulations in the new proposal were the following items:

1. The proper synagogal hierarchy is, in order of those present: Chief Rabbi, Dayan [religious judge], Minister, Reader, Honorary Officers, senior contributing member present.⁵⁸

. . . .

5. The erection of a new Synagogue must have the sanction of the Chief Rabbi; and the formation of a new Congregation must

57 United Synagogue, "Chief Rabbinate, Chief Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler's Proposed Laws & Regulations, 1847, for Ashkenazi Congregations in the British Empire," ACC/2712/15/1963, LMA. The pamphlet was actually printed in 1846 and titled as noted above.

58 Note that there is no mention of any rabbi other than the chief rabbi. Under the new regime, the chief rabbi neither ordained nor, generally, recognized other rabbis in England.

have the sanction of the Chief Rabbi, besides that of the Board of Deputies.⁵⁹

6. The Exterior as well as the Interior of the Synagogue to be kept in proper and decorous condition: and no individual to be permitted, without the special permission of the Honorary Officers, to make any alteration in the building; to affix bills to any part of it, or to tear any thing [sic] down therefrom.

....

8. Children under Four Years of age shall not be admitted into the Synagogue, not even into the ladies' gallery.

....

11. None but the חזן [cantor] shall, on ordinary occasions, be permitted to read Prayers.⁶⁰

....

14. The duration of the Service (exclusive of the Sermon) to be limited as here specified: —

שבת וקבלת שבת to 1 hour. [*Mincha V'Kabbalat Shabbat*, Sabbath Day and Eve]

בשבת to 2 ½ hours. [*B'Shabbat*, Sabbath Day]

יום טוב to 3 hours. [*Yom Tov*, holiday prayers]

בראש השנה to 5½ hours. [*B'Rosh Hashanah*, New Year's Day]⁶¹

59 This both fostered cooperation between the Board of Deputies and the chief rabbinate, and it retained the right of veto over the opening of new synagogues for the chief rabbi. This regulation was likely intended to keep all religious reform within the purview of the chief rabbinate. Clearly Adler sought to prevent another WLSBJ-style occurrence. Only a congregation and/or synagogue willing to make do with no higher institutional representation would ignore this rule.

60 This was a departure from an older traditional form that permitted any Jewish male present to lead prayers. The use of occasional Hebrew terms in the rules illustrates Chief Rabbi Adler's blending of traditional Jewish religious terms and concepts with Christian notions of decorum and deportment in a house of worship.

61 Not quite the brevity required in the WLSBJ, but still a shortening of the traditionally allotted time for services.

15. A solemn and reverential silence shall pervade the Synagogues. A noisy entering, a congregating of individuals, conversation on any subject whatever, the quitting of seats, even for the purpose of saluting the ספר תורה [*Sefer Torah*, Torah Scroll], or listening to the Sermon, and finally, the quitting of the Synagogue prior to the conclusion of the Service, to be *most strictly* avoided.⁶²

....

18. The Congregation to pray תפלה בלחש [*tefilah b'lakhash*, silent prayer—a section of the service] in profound silence. . . . Those prayers and passages, however, which the Congregation has to recite by itself, and which are specified below, shall on Sabbaths and Festivals, be chanted in an appropriate manner by a Choir (composed of Jewish members) expressly trained for that purpose, and occupying a special place in the Synagogue. . . .”

....

29. On פורים [*Purim*, the Feast of Esther] the customary passages to be chanted by the Choir, accompanied by the Congregation in a subdued though audible manner. . . . Knocking during the מגילה [*Megillah*, Purim Scroll] is strictly forbidden.⁶³

....

37. Without the consent of the Honorary Officers and of the Chief Rabbi, no one shall be permitted to deliver a religious discourse in the Synagogue.

....

42. Every alteration of these Regulations must have the written sanction of the Chief Rabbi.

62 The traditional Orthodox synagogue was a place for prayer and social interaction; thus, unlike English churches, there was quite a bit of noise from talking, not so silently uttered “Silent Prayer,” coming and going, etc.

63 Traditionally, loud noise (by knocking on wood or waving rattles) is made in an effort to blot out the name of Haman, would-be exterminator of the Jews, during the reading of the *megilah*.

As these regulations clearly demonstrate, the chief rabbi was determined to assert his authority over Jewish religious matters, firmly steering a course toward increased respectability while maintaining the Orthodox nature of Anglo-Jewish practice. Interestingly, the institutional (as opposed to religious) form Orthodox Anglo-Jewry adopted, embodied in the Office of the Chief Rabbi under Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler, also drew from English Protestantism. Adler sought to establish Anglo-Jewish Orthodoxy as the Jewish equivalent of the Church of England, and the chief rabbi as Jewish “archbishop.” As historian Eugene Black has noted,

[the new chief rabbi] aimed at nothing short of establishing a unified Orthodoxy for the entire British Empire under his leadership. . . . While assuming an uncompromising resistance to Reform Judaism, Nathan Adler designed and executed an elaborate reconstruction of Orthodoxy to adapt it to British culture. His clergy wore neatly trimmed beards when they were not clean-shaven. They were “ministers,” and addressed as “reverend.” They wore Anglican clerical mufti when out of the synagogue.⁶⁴

Favoring his efforts in this endeavor was the fact that in England dissent and non-conformity had become associated with the middle and lower classes. Many Anglo-Jewish congregations, particularly those in London, were composed of wealthy Jews, and those who aspired to higher status. They did not view Reform Judaism as a means to increased status either within Anglo-Jewry or within British society more generally. This remained the case for most of the nineteenth century despite the fact that the Burton Street reformers were almost uniformly from Anglo-Jewish establishment families. Additionally, the search for social acceptance by their gentile countrymen that drove many Continental Jews into the Reform movement was not a major factor in England. Jews at all levels of society interacted with their non-Jewish social equals. Relations were not always wonderful, but interaction steadily increased in the decades after the chief rabbi took office. Also working in Adler’s favor was the conservative nature of English society, a nature that was innate to many of the increasingly native-born Jews of this period. Even those who were more progressive or reform minded generally remained Orthodox because “England was a very traditional society with a . . . preference for slow organic change . . . and the progressives . . . shared in this typically British

64 Black, *Social Politics*, 27, 52. Endelman advances a similar theory in *Jews of Britain*, 115.

frame of mind. They desired certain religious changes in both doctrine and practice, but wanted those alterations to come in an evolutionary manner. . . .⁶⁵ Finally, "Orthodoxy was not felt to be inconsistent with the status of the English 'gentleman'; in fact, in some ways it was felt to be congruent with an emphasis on 'Englishness' since the conservative nature of Orthodoxy paralleled the conservative nature of the Church of England."⁶⁶ Religious adherence, or at least the appearance of such, was a hallmark of respectability, a vital component of nineteenth century "Englishness." It should be noted that while the majority of English Jews in the years 1840 to 1880 remained Orthodox in their synagogue attachments, they did not necessarily follow the dictates of Orthodoxy in their private lives. They publically supported the Jewish religious status quo with their continued membership in the established Orthodox synagogues, but many did not attend regularly, keep the Sabbath strictly or adhere to other Jewish *halakhic* requirements in their homes.

Adler's personality, mien, and cautious and dignified approach to change fit the (English) bill quite nicely. Under his leadership, the Office of the Chief Rabbi, and the chief rabbi himself, were constantly active. Driving his efforts may well have been his earlier exposure to the fractious and splintered nature of Jewish religious practice in Germany, both within Orthodoxy and Reform, and his determination to forestall such development in England. He deemed no detail too small or unimportant, and took every opportunity to assert the authority of the chief rabbinate. Adler's office extended letters of introduction for Jews traveling abroad, recommended individuals for situations in England, such as communal *shoḥet*, checked the suitability of marriage candidates, handled passport problems for English Jews abroad, and so forth.⁶⁷

Much of the chief rabbi's time was occupied by matters relating to *sheḥitah*, including the following: answering inquiries regarding the suitability of a particular *shoḥet*; and handling requests for assistance, such as the one from a provincial community seeking a *shoḥet* who could both ritually

65 Singer, "Jewish Religious Thought," 206–7. Interestingly, excepting its initial reforms, the West London Synagogue was also "English" in its conservatism and reluctance to adopt additional changes. See also Meyer, *Response to Modernity*, 179. Meyer believes this conservative attitude "was . . . partly responsible for the failure to gain wider support [among London's Jews]."

66 Sharot, "Reform and Liberal Judaism," 211–28, esp. 224.

67 CR, copy letter book, June 1851, ACC/2805/1/1/1, LMA. ACC/2805/1/1/7 begins June 1862; ACC/2805/1/1/8 begins June 1863. For passport problem, see ACC/2805/1/1/5, which begins May 1858.

slaughter and speak enough English to give Hebrew language instruction to the community's children. ("In reply to your letter I beg to state that it will be very difficult to get a *shohet* who knows english [sic] enough to instruct the children in hebrew for ten shilling fixed salary." The chief rabbi went on to suggest a "Mr. Spiro" who might, in fact, prove satisfactory and offered to examine him if the community wanted to pursue the matter further.)⁶⁸ This goes to the heart of nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish identity formation and the difficulties of negotiating the boundaries of this identity. The community in question wanted a *shohet* to maintain traditional Jewish religiosity by meeting the requirement of eating kosher food. At the same time, the community wanted a Hebrew language teacher for its children to learn the holy tongue. However, this same community was already English enough to need the Hebrew instruction to come from someone who could provide it in English (and to do this all for a pittance!)

The chief rabbi had exclusive authority to appoint kosher slaughterers in the United Kingdom. All *shohetim* who wished to operate in England needed his approval. This applied even to those who had been trained and granted authority in their communities of origin abroad. Those who wished to import kosher meat (from Australia) also needed the chief rabbi's permission and had to meet the standards established by his Board of *Shechita*.⁶⁹ This requirement is a unique aspect of the Adler regime, in that he (and subsequently his son, Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler) actively controlled access to the Jewish community through the chief rabbinate. This meant that nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish religious identity was necessarily very tightly bound up with the Adlers and their administrative hierarchy. In refusing to accept religious functionaries trained and certified outside the chief rabbinate's reach (meaning on the Continent) the Adlers sought to centralize all access to Anglo-Jewish religious practice through their offices.

The chief rabbi's duties included awarding and revoking certificates of *kashrut* for sellers of kosher meat. A printed flyer from 1860 reads,

The Jewish Ecclesiastical Administration hereby give notice that they have withdrawn their permission from Mr. Angel, Poulterer, of 35, Compton

68 CR, copy letter book, beginning September 1856, ACC/2805/1/1/4, LMA. For more on *shehitah*, see ACC/2805/1/1/15, which begins 1875; and ACC/2805/1/1/16, which begins September 1876.

69 CR, copy letter book, beginning 14 September 1856, ACC/2805/1/1/4, LMA. See also CR, *Shechita Board*, 1868–1904, ACC/2805/2/1/1, LMA—this contains a large collection of newspaper articles and reprints (mostly from *The Times*), letters, secular court cases, etc., all relating to *shehitah*. NB: a *shohet* and a butcher (that is, seller of kosher meat) are not the same thing.

Street, Burton Crescent, for selling Poultry to the Jewish Public. By order of the Chief Rabbi, J. Ackermann, Sec. London, 1st May, 5621.⁷⁰

The chief rabbi's office also issued printed "Rules and Regulations to be observed by Retail Butchers in London, authorized to Sell Meat for the Jewish Community."⁷¹ Again, this emphasized the chief rabbinate's concern with and assertion of control over all things related to Anglo-Jewish religious practice.

Chief Rabbi Adler was frequently called upon to answer questions for, mediate disputes between, and investigate accusations made by various individuals and factions in Britain's far-flung Jewish congregations.⁷² His office dealt with requests from chief rabbis abroad and certified, using rabbinical records, individual's countries of origin. The office also answered questions from the British secular authorities regarding the intricacies of Jewish law—for example, queries on issues of consanguinity (that is, which level of relations may marry within the Jewish community).

As required by the constitution of the Board of Deputies, Chief Rabbi Adler notified the Board that certain synagogues "constitute[] . . . Jewish Synagogue[s]" for purposes of representation on the board.⁷³ Similar to the Anglo-Christian clergy, he also issued forms of prayer during times of

70 CR, copy letter book, beginning December 1859, ACC/2805/1/1/6, LMA.

71 Ibid. The rules' flyer was apparently also used as a contract, as the bottom of the sheet on which the eleven rules appeared contained a space for a signature followed by the words, "I agree to these conditions."

72 See CR, copy letter book, beginning September 1877, ACC/2805/1/1/17, LMA—this contains letters to congregations in Kimberly, South Africa, and in Australia (Sydney and the state of Victoria); ACC/2805/02/01/004, from the mid-1870s, contains letters relating to the Melbourne and Sydney congregations; ACC/2805/02/01/006, from 1877–82, contains letters from Cape Town and Kimberly. These letters deal with divorce, conversion, *shehitah*, condolences, and, that old standby—communal bickering. See ACC/2805/1/1/16, which begins 1876 and which contains a letter indicating that the chief rabbi, having reviewed the information sent by foreign rabbis, approves of one of the Australian congregations hiring a rabbi from San Francisco. However, said rabbi is not to alter the content or order of the prayer service without permission from London, and is to serve on the local religious court. See also CR, correspondence files, various, Hull, ACC/2805/2/1/2, LMA—this deals with communal disputes in Hull in the late 1870s relating to the office of treasurer of the Hull Synagogue. The case apparently went to a local magistrate. This is quite a large file. At one point in the dispute, as reported in 1878 in the *Hull Packet*, one of the parties to the dispute spit on another in synagogue, another implied that a member ate pork and called it mutton, etc. One faction also refused to deliver marriage licenses, approved by the chief rabbi, to the other faction.

73 CR, copy letter book, beginning 1870, ACC 2805/1/1/12, LMA. Notification was conveyed via a form titled "Certification of Place of Worship." Like other Victorians, the organized Jewish community created forms, form letters, and licenses for any and

national crises and celebration such as the “Form of Prayer for Relief of the Plague among Cattle and for protection against the Cholera,”⁷⁴ “the Jewish form of prayer for the Day of Humiliation” declared by Queen Victoria after the outbreak of Crimean hostilities,⁷⁵ an order of service marking the end of the Crimean War,⁷⁶ a “form of thanksgiving for the safe delivery of Her Majesty and birth of a Princess,”⁷⁷ and others. The forms were to be followed in all British congregations recognizing the authority of the chief rabbi (that is, the “United Congregations”). These forms or prayer served to further the knitting together of Jewish and English identity in times of crisis.

The chief rabbi was attentive to the need to connect the Jewish and general populations at other times, as well. In 1862, *The Times* printed a copy of a letter he had sent to “the clerical and lay authorities of the Jewish congregations in the British Empire.” The letter made an eloquent plea for Jewish assistance to be given to “many hundreds of thousands of our countrymen in the cotton manufacturing districts [who] have through no fault of their own been thrown out of employment and plunged . . . into extreme distress.”⁷⁸

Not all of the chief rabbi’s time in office was spent resolving mundane issues, although it was these issues that allowed the chief rabbi to continue to extend the reach of his office to control and encourage the ongoing development of communal identity. There were periodic challenges to the limits of the authority of the chief rabbinate and the Board of Deputies (the mainstays of organized Anglo-Jewry) to be addressed. In 1853, a heated battle was waged at the Board of Deputies between those deputies (and the congregations that elected them) who sought board recognition for the West London Synagogue, and those led by Montefiore and his allies who were determined to keep the Reform congregation from gaining representation.⁷⁹ This dispute involved Jewish congregations outside London as

all eventualities. Adding an Anglo-Jewish wrinkle to this form mania, this letter book ends with eight pages of people licensed to sell Passover foods.

74 CR, copy letter book, beginning 28 March 1864, ACC 2805/1/1/9, LMA.

75 *Times*, 25 April 1854, 5.

76 *Times*, 2 May 1856, 12. This service appeared in the newspaper immediately beneath the “Form of Prayer for the General Thanksgiving” issued by the archbishop of Canterbury.

77 *Times*, 29 May 1846, 8. The article was titled “Accouchement of Her Majesty—Jewish Thanksgiving.”

78 *Times*, 5 December 1862, 6. The column was titled “The Jews in Relief of Lancashire Distress.”

79 The discussion of these events is drawn from the account given in Finestein, “Anglo-Jewish Revolt,” 103–13.

well. In that year's elections for deputies, provincial synagogues chose four members of the West London Synagogue to serve as their deputies on the board. Because these would-be deputies were members of the West London Synagogue, which was not recognized by the chief rabbi as a Jewish place of worship, the board was placed in a considerable bind. Its constitution required it to consult with the chief rabbi and the *hakham* in religious matters, but the chief rabbi, holding with Orthodoxy, clearly did not recognize this synagogue as Jewish.

On the surface, the issue appeared to be a fairly straightforward conflict over religious and organizational recognition. However, a closer look proves that the dispute was more involved than this. The sense among many in the Anglo-Jewish community, both in London and the provinces, was that it was time for the board to share its authority with those beyond the entrenched London Jewish "aristocracy."⁸⁰ A growing Jewish middle and upper-middle class sought a voice in communal affairs. These men did not wish to be represented by Montefiore and the small section of the Anglo-Jewish establishment that comprised the board. Keep in mind the board claimed to speak for all.

This explains the willingness of provincial communities to elect members of the West London Synagogue of British Jews to serve as their representatives on the board. The board was trying to force an Anglo-Jewish conformity much as the Anglican Church did on a considerably larger scale. If nonconformity was a middle- and lower-class phenomenon in England, then the men of the West London Synagogue, even if mostly upper class themselves, could strike a blow for wider religious and class representation on the board. This, by extension, would mean broadening the definition of Anglo-Jewish communal representation to include more than just the elite. It would also mean extending Anglo-Jewish communal identity beyond the fairly narrow traditionalist religious boundaries set by Adler, Montefiore, and others. Militating against this continued narrow traditionalist religious test for Anglo-Jewish communal membership was the fact that "[t]he obliteration of religious tests in public life was [increasingly] held to be the mark of enlightenment."⁸¹ If Anglo-Jews sought political emancipation (in the face of a religious test of sorts), and ever wider acceptance by their gentile countrymen, then should not the organization that served as their princi-

80 Not all members of this "aristocracy" were opposed to opening up the board's membership. For example, Lionel de Rothschild, who in 1858 would become the first Jewish member of Parliament, favored seating the WLSBJ Deputies, as did David Salomons, who in 1855 would become the first Jewish Lord Mayor of London.

81 Finestein, "Anglo-Jewish Revolt," 111.

pal communal contact with the government be above reproach on issues of this sort? It must have seemed to those opposed to seating the deputies affiliated with the West London Synagogue as if Isaac Lyon Goldsmid's letter of 1838 had returned to haunt them with an army of followers in tow.

As can be imagined, the board, and much of the London Jewish establishment, was thrown into turmoil. The board's meetings became increasingly contentious and heated. At one meeting held at the Great Synagogue, the discussion became so animated that the police were called and "Montefiore fled the hall . . . vacating the chair and thereby terminating the meeting."⁸² Ultimately, on December 8, 1853, after months of argument, the board took a final vote on whether to seat the four deputies. The vote was evenly split (twenty-three in favor, twenty-three opposed) and it was left to the president, Moses Montefiore, to cast the deciding vote. Not surprisingly, he voted to keep them off the board, later stating "he did so with pleasure and on 'religious grounds.'"⁸³

Frustrated with being continually stymied by the old guard at the Board of Deputies and by the chief rabbi's office, the West London Synagogue took matters outside the Jewish community. It might not be able to force the issue of board representation in its favor but its members could use their influence directly with Parliament to widen their congregational authority. In 1856, with the passage of an act to amend the marriage and registration acts, the West London Synagogue of British Jews won a measure of official recognition, and a victory over the proponents of organizationally enforced traditional religious practice. The act provided that "twenty members of the West London Synagogue of the British Jews, or of any synagogue in connection therewith, may certify a secretary to the registrar-general, as a registrar of marriages."⁸⁴

The traditionalists, under continued pressure from Montefiore and Chief Rabbi Adler, among others, remained unrepentant. The board did not agree to accept deputies from the West London Synagogue until 1874, after Montefiore finally stepped down as president. However, by this point the synagogue was in no hurry to come to terms with the board. It was not until 1886, in a world very different from that which had been familiar to Anglo-Jewry of the mid-nineteenth century, that deputies from the

82 Ibid., 110.

83 Ibid., 112.

84 "An Act to Amend the Provisions of the Marriage and Registration Acts," 19 & 20 Victoria, cap. 119, §22. The relevant section is "Acts of Parliament Relating to the Jews of England," by Joseph Jacobs, at: <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/752-acts-of-parliament-relating-to-the-jews-of-england>.

West London Synagogue of British Jews were finally seated on the Board of Deputies of British Jews.

Postscript

The entire dispute, had they known or cared about it, would have struck many of the post-1880 Jewish immigrants as absurd. They were still years away from becoming anglicized, and dealt with organized Anglo-Jewry, for the most part, by ignoring its religious and institutional structures. Many of the immigrants were traditionally Orthodox from poor Jewish communities in eastern Europe. They had no interest in being told how to properly comport themselves during prayer, and even less interest in issues relating to Reform Judaism. They determined for themselves what constituted an appropriate place of prayer: any room would suffice. The importance was to worship according to Jewish dictates with nine of their fellows, if possible. Some of the new immigrants had received Orthodox ordination in Europe, and others were religious scholars. So, the new immigrants did not need to avail themselves of the religious functions performed under the auspices of the chief rabbinate. The grand edifices, practiced choirs, and English sermons of the established Anglo-Jewish community were simply not necessary for them to fulfill their religious obligations, nor did they view them as desirable. In his own estimation, Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler was an observant Jew. But his anglicized clerical dress, behavior, and mode of prayer were completely alien to the new arrivals. His decades of effort to ensure that an anglicized form of Orthodoxy developed and remained the dominant form of worship among Anglo-Jewry was meaningless to them. His creation of a centralized Jewish religious hierarchy (a Jewish episcopacy, if you will), with himself at the top, offended their traditionalist sensibilities. They did not trust his religious courts, his ministers, or his supervision of *kashrut*. Some of the new immigrants went so far as to refer to him (or possibly his son) scornfully as "the West End *goy*."⁸⁵ Furthermore, while the new immigrants accessed communal charitable institutions (and created their own) they saw no particular need for, nor frequently even had any awareness of,

85 Englander, "Anglicized Not Anglican," 265. It is not clear from Englander's account whether this epithet was leveled at Rabbi N. M. Adler or his son, Rabbi Hermann Adler. In truth, it doesn't much matter, as the son followed in his father's footsteps, serving as delegate chief rabbi from 1879 to 1890, after his father was forced into semi-retirement because of failing health, and succeeding him as chief rabbi in 1891.

the Board of Deputies. In short, the collective identity of the new immigrants was in no way connected to the Anglo-Jewish communal identity so carefully crafted in the decades before their coming.

And yet, despite the newcomers' initial indifference to the organizational forms developed by Anglo-Jewry, they could not remain immune to the pull of English society. Their natural inclination to maintain traditional Jewish separatism warred with their desire to experience the freedoms and economic bounty the larger English community had to offer. With time, they came to accept aspects of the hybridized Anglo-Jewish culture and community created by the preceding generations, and to add elements of their own.

Chapter Three

London Jews and the Giving of *Ẓedakah* and Charity: Creating Anglo-Judaic Practice

Ẓedakah's Traditional Role in Judaic Practice

The Hebrew word *ẓedakah* is generally rendered in English as “justice” or “righteousness” and “is limited in the Talmud to one aspect of righteousness, namely the giving of alms or assistance to the poor through material gifts.”¹ Giving *ẓedakah* is a Jewish religious commandment (*mitzvah*), and a central tenet of Judaism, with both biblical and later Talmudic roots.² Although the term *ẓedakah* is frequently used interchangeably with the

1 *Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, s.v. “Charity,” 154–55.

2 See, for example, Deut. 15:11, “For destitute people will not cease to exist within the Land; therefore, I command you, saying, ‘You shall surely open your hand to your brother, to your poor, and to your destitute in your Land.’” On gifts to the poor, see Lev. 19:9–10, on gleaning; and Deut. 24:19–22, on gleaning as it applies to the proselyte, orphan, and widow. On loaning money to the poor without interest, see Exod. 22:24. Of note, the law, as regards the “integrity of the judicial process,” applies regardless of any desire to give the poor special consideration (Exod. 23:3). On preventing poverty by giving interest-free loans, food, and shelter, see Lev. 25:35–37. On tithing, see Deut. 14:28–29. See Deut. 24:10–13 and 24:17 on treating the poor/debtor and widow or orphan with respect. See also Esther 9:22 on gifts to the poor. All translations are from: *Tanach*, Stone Edition, ArtScroll Series (Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, 1996).

English word “charity” the two are not identical in meaning. Charity implies altruism, encompassing feelings of love and/or affection (and in the case of the Victorians, a not insignificant measure of sentimentality³) on the part of the giver for the recipient, while the giver of *ẓedakah*, regardless of his feelings for the recipient, does so as a matter of duty and justice.⁴ He gives because to do so is right and just. To the extent that love is involved in the act of giving *ẓedakah*, it is purely incidental. This is not to suggest that the giver’s state of mind (that is, his willingness or love for his fellow man) is ignored in assessing the righteousness of his act. For as the great twelfth-century Jewish ethicist and philosopher Maimonides indicated, positive intent further elevates the righteousness of the giver and his act.

In his great legal work, the *Mishneh Torah*, Maimonides delineated eight degrees of *ẓedakah* or alms giving.⁵ The highest and most meritorious degree consists in “yielding support to him who is cast down, either by means or gifts, or by loan, or by commerce,” for in so doing you give him the ability to help himself, to raise himself out of his poverty.⁶ This is considered “rehabilitative” *ẓedakah*.⁷ The next degree of *ẓedakah* is that in which both the giver and the receiver remain anonymous, that is, unknown to each other. The lowest degree of *ẓedakah* is that given grudgingly, accompanied by feelings of ill will on the part of the donor, though it still fulfills the religious requirement.

From biblical times, *ẓedakah* has been integral to Judaism. It is considered so important by Maimonides that he even urges subterfuge in its distribution, if necessary. He writes, “[i]f there be a Poor man who refuseth to

3 See, most famously, Charles Dickens, *A Christmas Carol*, 1843.

4 See *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Charity” for more on the term’s Christian origins as a manifestation of love, initially, of the divine for man, through the giving of his only son, and later, of man for his fellow man.

5 See Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon [Maimonides], *The Laws of the Hebrews, relating to the Poor and the Stranger from the “Mishna-Hatora” of the Rabbi Maimonides*, trans. James Watts Peppercorne (London: Pelham Richardson, 1840).

6 Maimonides, *Laws of the Hebrews*, 10:7, 10:7–14. Judaism generally distinguishes between *ẓedakah* and *gemilut ḥesed* [pl. *gemilut ḥasadim*] (act(s) of loving kindness). The latter can be directed toward anyone, rich or poor, living or dead, and is sometimes considered a more righteous act than the giving of alms or in-kind contributions encompassed by the former. The granting of interest-free loans is considered a form of *gemilut ḥesed*, as it enables self-sufficiency while avoiding the humiliation that can be attached to accepting ‘gift’ money. See *Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, s.v. “*Gemilut Ḥesed*”.

7 See *Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, s.v. “Charity” on the eight degrees of *ẓedakah* and the rehabilitative nature of the highest degree.

receive Alms, artifice must be employed, and under the name of a Gift, or a Loan, let him be relieved."⁸ Maimonides further stressed that even the poor, themselves in receipt of alms, were nevertheless "required to give Alms to other Poor."⁹ Leaving nothing to chance, he also discussed the appropriate way to collect and distribute alms, writing, "[i]n every city inhabited by Israelites, Collectors-of-Alms are to be appointed . . . who are to go amongst the Public to receive from every one Alms, according to his means, or according to the stated assessment; and upon every Sabbath-eve they shall distribute the Money. . . ."¹⁰ Food alms, in the form of daily voluntary collection and distribution, were also discussed by Maimonides.

The fact that Maimonides and other Jewish scholars devoted so much time, thought, and commentary to the laws surrounding *zedakah* emphasizes its central role in Judaic practice. It is also likely that Maimonides and others, aware of the all too human temptation to hold tight to the fruits of one's labor, saw the need to expound on this basic precept, reminding Jews of their duty to their coreligionists in all its intricacies.

Anglo-Jewish Philanthropy: Class and Social Control?

In the modern era, particularly with the post-emancipatory dissolution of self-contained Jewish communities, the mechanisms for donating *zedakah* and at times even the appropriate amounts to give have been opened to argument.¹¹ Mordechai Rozin argues that Anglo-Jewish philanthropic institutions, most notably the Jewish Board of Guardians (founded 1859), were created and acted—not out of religious conviction, ethnic solidarity, or concern for the Jewish poor—but principally out of class concerns that led upper class Jewish contributors to attempt to control working-class behavior through charitable organizations and contributions.¹² Thus, he questions the motives of some Jewish charitable organizations (principally those founded by the Jewish elite), as well as of their contributors. Rozin asserts

8 Maimonides, *Laws of the Hebrews*, 7:9.

9 Ibid., 7:5.

10 Ibid., 9:1. Later rabbinic codes on the giving of alms generally viewed Maimonides's as determinative; see, for example, the Laws of Charity in the *Shulchan Aruch*.

11 This is not to imply that in traditional Jewish communities *zedakah* was always given as generously or in the amounts required by Jewish law. It was, however, easier to bring pressure to bear on recalcitrant donors in a relatively closed society.

12 Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor*. See also "Philanthropy and Social Control" in Black, *Social Politics*, 71–103. Black has written on the Board of Guardians and social control; his treatment is shorter (chapter length) and much more balanced.

that “[a]loof from the poor and encouraged by its [own] achievements, the Jewish élite . . . embraced Benthamism, Smilesianism, Social Darwinism and economic theories associated with *laissez-faire* [sic] as a basis for the policy of its philanthropic institutions . . . [this is] reflected in the activities of the London Jewish Board of Guardians—the key institution of the élite for controlling and regulating the poor.”¹³ Rozin sets what he views as the collectivist nature of traditional Jewish society against the individualistic nature of the emerging *laissez-faire* capitalist system of nineteenth-century England, and finds the new system wanting.¹⁴ In his interpretation, attempts were made by the communal hierarch (albeit, sometimes under pressure from community members) to achieve some level of equitable distribution of *zedakah* in the older self-governing Jewish communities, although they generally failed. By contrast, Anglo-Jewish elites and the upper-middle class, in adopting wholesale the logics of individualism and class loyalty, left their poorer brethren (reinforced by unceasing immigration) to fend for help from organizations that were communally oriented in name only, thus pursuing an agenda of social control rather than of charitable assistance.

Traditional European Jewish society was neither egalitarian nor all that collectivist in nature. In truth, traditional Jewish communities were not without their glaring inequalities. As such, traditional Judaism contrasts strongly with Pauline Christianity and its universalism and egalitarianism. Within traditional Judaism, divisions between Jews and Gentiles, rich and poor, scholars and plain folk, were accepted (by Talmudic and rabbinic ruling) and, at times, even encouraged.¹⁵ Jewish communal wealth, such as it was, was frequently married (literally) to that other Jewish religious commodity: scholarly achievement.¹⁶ Families possessing neither wealth nor scholarly ability were distinctly disadvantaged, particularly in the

13 Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor*, ix. See Frank Prochaska’s review for an opposing perspective: “Charity and Control,” *Times Literary Supplement* (March 9, 1999). Prochaska thinks Rozin’s criticism of the board is overly harsh, based on outmoded 1970s theories of “social control” of the poor. While he concedes that Rozin’s book provides a corrective to the sunny approach of earlier work on the Board of Guardians—such as that of Lipman in *Social Service*—he believes that “charitable enterprise was more complex than is suggested here.” For a more positive review of Rozin’s work, see David Gladstone, reviews, *Journal of Social Policy* 30, no. 1 (January 2001): 161–62.

14 Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor*, 215–26.

15 Norman Cantor, *The Sacred Chain: The History of the Jews* (New York: Harper Collins, 1994), 106–9.

16 See Cantor, *The Sacred Chain*, 107, for a discussion of elitism in traditional Jewish communities, as well as the fusion of learning and wealth (that is, wealth used to acquire scholarly marriage candidates).

traditional Jewish community's dealings with outside authority, which were frequently mediated by representatives of the communal authorities.¹⁷ The communal authorities were generally comprised of the wealthier members of the community, the chief scholars of the community, or a combination of the two. This is not to imply that the view of the traditional Jewish community, as one in which most action was communally directed, is inaccurate. Rather, the notion that such efforts were generally concentrated on achieving a level of communal social justice, as well as equitable distribution of communal funds, is questionable. Moreover, even when efforts were directed to such equitable ends, the results were usually far from equal. This conception of social justice harkens back, like that of the proponents of a return to Merrie Olde England—to a time that never truly existed.

The Jewish community, as it developed in nineteenth-century London (and in England more generally), possessed elements of the older communal consciousness blended increasingly with emerging market, individualistic, and class-based awarenesses. For that matter, the very act of learning/coming to identify with a particular class was part of the process of anglicization. However, this does not mean that class interests necessarily trumped religio-ethnic loyalties and ties. Certainly, class and social hierarchical awareness existed within the Anglo-Jewish community, as in the larger society. After all, the English Jewish community did not exist in a vacuum. But, the desire to shape, guide, and possibly even control the poor was only one of several competing elements driving charitable giving, even for Rozin's despised Jewish elite.

Rozin greatly overstates the case for class control as the motivation in Jewish charitable giving and imputes negative motivation where there was little. Nineteenth century changes surrounding donations to the London Jewish poor were certainly affected by the developing class awareness of the Jewish middle and upper classes. This development was, in turn, part of the process of anglicization (that is, acculturation) of the Jews of England in this period, which led many to adopt elements of English behavior, even in something as fundamental to Jewish religious identity and practice as the giving of *zedakah*. The question that must be answered, then, is the

17 As, for example, when local Jewish communal authorities in Russia decided which Jewish boys would be selected to fill tsarist military conscription quotas under the *rekruchina* between 1827 and 1856. Boys as young as eight were sent to fulfill a twenty-five-year commitment. Many were chosen from families of the Jewish poor by agents of the community. Prior to this, Jews paid a special tax in lieu of military service. See Salo W. Baron, *The Russian Jew under Tsars and Soviets* (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1964), 29–32.

following: what do the organization and methods of the Jewish charitable institutions that functioned between 1840 and 1880 indicate about the development of the London Jewish community as a community, as part of the larger English polity, and what do they tell us about London's Jews as conscious (or unaware) members of various classes? Further, did the contributors to Jewish charitable organizations seek "control of the poor"? If so, did their donations still fulfill the Jewish conception of *zedakah*? Did an English-Jewish hybrid of charitable giving and organization emerge during this period? Finally, did the voluntary nature of "membership" in the Anglo-Jewish community, as well as its constant growth, fueled by the immigration of economic refugees from abroad, necessarily alter the way in which London Jewish charitable giving was organized and distributed, or were other factors responsible, such as the emergence of a new Anglo-Jewish hybrid acculturated communal identity?

Anglo-Jewish Charitable Giving and Charitable Institutions: Individual and Communal Responses

Victorian paternalism could not but affect Anglo-Jewish conceptions of *zedakah* and its delivery, as it did charitable organization and giving in the larger society. As early as 1797 in Britain, certain conceptual changes in Jewish perceptions of charitable giving had already begun to manifest themselves. One of the oldest Ashkenazi charities in England, the Jewish Bread Meat and Coal Society (*Mashebat Naphesh*), founded in 1779 to provide these items to the Jewish poor of London, stated that

[t]o relieve the poor and to distribute the indispensable Necessaries of Life amongst the needy, is not only dictated to us by the natural impulse of the Heart, but expressly inculcated by the Duties of Religion: the very idea of wanting food and firing makes us recoil with horror at any season, how much more so in the dreary winter: to succour our fellow creatures from such DISTRESS, how laudable the endeavour! Experience has taught us, that the dispensation of actual necessaries, answers that desirable end, much better than pecuniary donations . . . [this institution aims to] give to every Subscriber the chance of administering assistance, to necessitous objects of his own selection.¹⁸

18 Jewish Bread Meat and Coal Society, "Laws and Regulations of the Society Called *Mashebat Naphesh* for the Relief of the Poor," 1797, ACC 2944/01/01/001, LMA, i–iii.

"Duties of Religion" here clearly refers to religiously accepted notions surrounding the giving of *zedakah*. However, the introduction of subscriber choice in the administration of assistance "to necessitous objects of his own selection" is new, with no basis in religious practice.¹⁹ These "charity voting schemes" were uniquely British and were increasingly disliked by many philanthropists as the nineteenth century progressed. For example, Florence Nightingale spoke of "charity voting schemes" as "the best system of electing the least eligible, or, at any rate, the system for preventing the discovery of the most eligible."²⁰

The subscriber-voting favored by the Bread Meat and Coal Society is an early example of the fusion of English practice with Jewish religious imperative. Other Jewish charities used this selection method well into the nineteenth century as the following ad, which appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle*, May 13, 1842, demonstrates:

חברת מהסה לעוררים. [*Hevrat Maḥaseh l'Ivrim*, founded 1819]

Institution for the Relief of the Indigent Blind of the Jewish Persuasion.

The Committee of management of the above Institution, give Notice that an Election for Two Pensioners, will take place on Sunday, 22nd instant, at 1 o'clock precisely, at their Committee Room, 7, Castle Street, Houndsditch,

By order.

13th May, 5602.

S. Solomon, Secretary.

23, Great Prescott Street²¹

Despite the opprobrium directed at this method, voting schemes remained in vogue with certain Jewish charities for quite some time. More than a

19 Ibid., 1. A subscriber was "[a]ny person of the Jewish Community . . . paying four shillings and four-pence per annum. . . ."

20 Quotation appears in Black, *Social Politics*, 173–74. Black refers to this system as "neither useful nor humane." One possible explanation for the preference shown this system is that in allowing contributors to choose specific recipients charities tied contributors more tightly to both the charity and the poor person.

21 For more on subscriber-voting, see also "Rules and Regulations of the *Hevrat Ozair l'Ivrim* Institution [founded 1830] for the Relief of the Indigent Blind of the Jewish Persuasion," 1832, MS 116/178, AJA, Southampton. Interestingly, these two different organizations each had the same English name. However, the different Hebrew names and founding dates seem to indicate they were separate organizations. Maḥaseh l'Ivrim was founded by Bevis Marks. I can find no detailed information about Ozair l'Ivrim and wonder if they didn't serve different constituencies (that is, Sephardim or Ashkenazim). Both are listed in *The Literary Gazette and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, and Sciences*, *é. c.*" no. 1094 (1838): 503.

decade later this type of notice was still regularly found in the advertising section of the *Jewish Chronicle*:

נִיה זְדֵקָה [Neveh Zedek]—Jews' Hospital, Mile End.

For the Support of the Aged, and for the Education and Employment of Youth.

A Special General Court of the Governors of this Institution will be holden at the House, Mile End, on Sunday, the 27th of February, 1853, at Eleven for [sic] Twelve o'clock in the Forenoon, for the Election of One Woman, Six Boys, and One Girl, as Inmates; and for such other Business as may occur.

The Ballot will commence at Twelve and close at Two precisely.

(By order)

S. SOLOMON, Secretary.²²

From the late 1820s, modern moral notions, rationalist and/or utilitarian in nature, increasingly entered into the rationale given for founding Jewish charitable organizations and giving *zedakah*, although not necessarily into the actual dispersal of assistance. The older impetus had been to fulfill biblical and Talmudic requirements for giving alms. Now, at least in theory, it was no longer sufficient for a recipient of charity to be merely poor. He had to be a member of the “deserving,” “industrious,” or “respectable” poor. *Zedakah* was not to be given privately when the need arose; increasingly, it had to be centrally organized and supervised, through Jewish charitable institutions. Additionally, the individuals responsible for awarding it seemed to think they had to justify the actions of their organizations in acceptable Victorian moral terms. Yet, in what these charities provided, if not always in the way in which they did so, the essence of Jewish *zedakah* remained intact.

Prior to 1859, and the founding of the Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor, communal relief was provided by the major synagogues and a variety of voluntary charitable funds and organizations. *Zedakah* given by London's synagogues to those who could demonstrate some claim to a particular synagogue's funds was simply not adequate to the task of relieving the Ashkenazi poor of London's growing Jewish community. By

22 *JC*, 25 February 1853. A similar ad appeared November 14, 1845, for the election of a widow pensioner to the Society for Relieving Distressed Persons. On June 4, 1852, subscribers were informed of the results of voting for pensioners for the Society for Supporting the Aged Needy (the three elected pensioners would now each receive thirteen pounds per year, for life).

the nineteenth century London's Jewish population had grown enough in size (to somewhere between 10,000 and 16,600)²³ to require charitable funds and institutions beyond those provided and/or administered by the New, the Hambro', and the Great Synagogues.

Although Jewish ratepayers paid Poor Law assessments, Poor Law funds were generally inadequate, and the expectation in the Jewish community was that they were to be avoided if possible. There were a number of reasons for this expectation. As was noted at the 1849 annual dinner of the Jews' Hospital, "the destitute members of the Jewish community . . . were excluded by their religious tenets from availing themselves of the relief afforded by the Poor Law and . . . were, therefore, thrown upon the charitable contributions of their own body."²⁴ Indoor relief became the usual distribution mechanism of assistance after the passage of the New Poor Law of 1834. Entry into the workhouse entailed the splitting up of families; men and women were housed separately and not allowed to mix. This was anathema to the Jewish conception of the sanctity of the family. Inmates were expected to work on the Jewish Sabbath and on holidays, and kosher food was not generally available. Workhouse officials, when approached by wealthier members of the Jewish community, were not hostile to Jewish religious requirements and attempted accommodations when possible. However, the workhouse as an answer to Jewish poverty was, clearly, far from ideal. Further, uncertain regarding their status within English society, elements of the emerging Jewish upper-middle class and elite were concerned they would be viewed with disapprobation if their poorer brethren became a burden on the poor rates, and fearful they would be regarded as affiliated with the poverty, dirt, and disorderliness of the lowest Jewish orders by the English public.

Certainly, the Jewish imperative to give *zedakah* figured in the founding of the various voluntary Jewish charitable funds and groups. But they took on conventional English forms, holding annual charitable dinners and/or balls, just as their non-Jewish counterparts did. At these functions, both Jewish and non-Jewish patrons were honored, the health of the royal family was regularly toasted, military bands or singers performed,

23 London's Jewish population is generally estimated to contain two-thirds of the total Jewish population of England. To arrive at the range of population figures given above, Todd Endelman's early nineteenth century Anglo-Jewish population estimate of 15,000 (see *Jews of Britain*, 41–42), and Lipman's of 25,000, for the same period (see "Age of Emancipation"), were each multiplied by two-thirds.

24 *Times*, 5 June 1849, 5.

and representative “charges” of some of the charities were paraded for the assembled contributors to see.²⁵

As it did with non-Jewish charities, *The Times* regularly printed coverage of these Jewish functions. Among other Jewish charities, the Jews’ Hospital (established 1807), the Jews’ Free School (founded 1817), and the Jews’ Orphan Asylum (founded 1831) all received fairly regular notice in *The Times* between 1840 and 1880.²⁶ The Jews’ Hospital was founded “For the Support of the Aged, and the Education, Maintenance, and Apprenticeship of Youth.” However, “[i]ts overall impact on the extent of Jewish poverty in London was limited. . . . [E]nrollment was limited to the children of the ‘respectable poor’ (persons who had lived in London for ten years and had a claim on one of the three City synagogues), those most in need of help and least anglicized, the most recently arrived—were automatically excluded from receiving assistance.”²⁷

The Jews’ Free School was the successor to the Talmud Torah, founded in 1732 in affiliation with the Great Synagogue. The Jews’ Free School was established to counter the various Christian organizations that sought to educate and convert the children of the Jewish Poor.²⁸ “Based on the Lancastrian monitorial system of the British and Foreign Society schools (a labor-saving method of teaching by rote that utilized older students, coached by the master, to teach less advanced students), it was able to provide large numbers of the poor with a rudimentary secular and religious education. . . .”²⁹

The Jews’ Orphan Asylum was founded “. . . during the terrible visitation of the cholera, which had in one night rendered 17 children orphans. . . . The objects of the society were to maintain those who had lost either one or both

25 See, for example, the description below of a fundraising dinner held for the Jews’ Hospital in 1840. *Times*, 19 May 1840.

26 *Times*, 3 May 1850, 4. In 1850, the asylum “merged within itself the Jewish Infant Orphan and the Fatherless Children Societies [Orphan Charity for Maintaining, Clothing, Educating, and Apprenticing Fatherless Children also known as *Hevrat Honen l’Yitomim*, established c. 1818].” Subsequently, the Jews’ Hospital, and the Jews’ Orphan Asylum merged in 1876 to form the Jews’ Hospital and Orphan Asylum, which by 1956 was renamed the Norwood Home for Jewish Children. For a general chronology of the organization’s history, see <http://www.norwood.org.uk/Page/A-History-of-Norwood>. For a book-length study, see Lawrence Cohen, *Care and Conflict: The Story of the Jewish Orphanage at Norwood* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2014).

27 Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 83.

28 “Dissenters, Catholics and Jews . . . founded innumerable charities . . . [in part to] safeguard[] against proselytizing evangelicals.” Frank Prochaska, *Royal Bounty: The Making of a Welfare Monarchy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 69.

29 See Roth, *The Great Synagogue*, 227–29. Quotation is from Endelman, *Jews of Britain*, 85.

parents, to supply them with a good education, and . . . to apprentice them or otherwise provide for their future welfare."³⁰ More romantically, Cecil Roth records that during the cholera outbreak of 1830,

[a] poor couple named Assenheim, husband and wife, died within a short time of one another, leaving three helpless children. There was at the time no provision for such cases. A poor cucumber-seller, Abraham Green, whose sense of pity was aroused, left his stall and went round the streets and private houses and shops in the Jewish quarter to find help. Carrying two of the children in his arms and leading the third by the hand, he appealed to his warm-hearted coreligionists until he had collected in his cucumber-bowl the nucleus of a maintenance fund. This was the origin of the Jews' Orphan Asylum. . . .³¹

Throughout the period of 1840 to 1880 Jewish charitable dinner functions were generally held at the London Tavern, Bishopgate: a venue popular with Jews and non-Jews alike. The tavern accommodated Jewish dietary requirements by allowing function organizers to bring in outside Jewish caterers. Charitable balls, such as those occasionally hosted by the Jews' Orphan Asylum, were held at Willis's Rooms, King's Street, St. James. Willis's Rooms, originally run by Almack, were also popular with the English gentry and upper-middle class for charity balls and dances.

While providing an historical record of these events, *The Times* coverage is also interesting for other reasons. Its descriptions make clear that in their public events Jewish organizations adopted Victorian organizational practices and notions of morality and respectability. The traditional religious practice of giving *zedakah* was increasingly garbed in a cloak of English rationale. For example, *The Times* noted that "[t]he principle of the charity [the Jews' Hospital] is to educate the young committed to its care practically, by bringing them up to some employment of trade, and encouragements are held out to them in after life to persevere in the habits of industry and honesty which they have acquired while in the hospital."³² At an annual dinner of the Jews' Orphan Asylum, the chairman stated "[w]hatever our religions might be, we were one as a nation and it was our first duty (a duty less political than religious) to educate and to train the young." He then suggested that the children, who had "been introduced

30 *Times*, 9 March 1859, 5. More generally, see Edward S. Conway, "The Origins of the Jewish Orphanage," *TJHSE* 22 (1968–69).

31 Roth, *The Great Synagogue*, 221–22.

32 *Times*, 25 May 1847, 5.

and paraded around the room in the usual manner,” sing “Britannia, the pride of the ocean,” which they did.³³ At another dinner of the orphan asylum, in 1869, the evening’s chairman noted that “the destitute by being taken care of while young were prevented from becoming a disgrace to the community.”³⁴ And again, at an annual dinner of the Jews’ Free School *The Times* reported that

the school . . . originated in the general feeling [of its founders] then [in 1817] entertained of the necessity of diffusing knowledge among the poor. . . . Many children . . . who would have wandered idly about the streets, devoid alike of religion and knowledge, and who might easily have been ensnared into courses of vice and infamy, have by means of the institution been instructed in their religious duties and the elementary branches of knowledge, and have thus trained to become respectable and useful members of society.³⁵

While the wish to deny “vice and infamy” a victory is certainly admirable, it is an English philanthropic goal with no basis in Jewish notions of *zedakah*.

Evidence of the emergence of an Anglo-Jewish hybrid of Jewish *zedakah* and English charitable practice can be found even earlier. In an 1841 article on the Jews’ Free School that appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle*, the language closely matches that of *The Times* article above. The *Chronicle* noted that

[i]gnorance combined with idleness, is the bane of society; both are sources of licentiousness and vice. . . . The children of the poor are particularly exposed to misfortune and vice: uneducated, ignorant of all religious, moral or social duties, and unoccupied, their time becomes devoted to mischievous sports or wicked courses; and habits are produced, which eventually prove destructive to the individual; and injurious to society. . . . To raise the future generations of the poor from so degraded a condition—to crush in the bud all growing disposition to vice—to implant in their minds the germs of knowledge; the tenets of our holy law; the elements of moral and religious truth; and thereby enable them to claim and uphold a due rank among their fellow citizens—are objects which must ever demand the attention of the philanthropist, and call forth the aid of the public.³⁶

33 Ibid., 6 May 1855, 8.

34 Ibid., 4 March 1869, 9.

35 Ibid., 3 June 1864, 11.

36 *JC*, First Series, 26 November 1841. The *Jewish Chronicle*, the longest continuously publishing English-language Jewish newspaper in the world, began publication in

This appeal nicely fuses the Jewish religious imperative to learn the “tenets of our holy law” (that is, to study the Torah) with English notions of the improving nature of philanthropy and the degradation and viciousness to which poverty leads. It further stresses that charitable contributions will ultimately lead recipients to take their place and “uphold their due rank among their fellow citizens,” presumably as Anglo-Jews and adherents to the class to which they appropriately belong.

Jewish charities adopted Victorian middle-class and elite attitudes, including concern over the potentially debilitating affects of charity upon the recipient. As the Jewish population of London grew, and with it those who relied upon charitable institutions, contributors worried that their largess might be taken advantage of, and that their generosity might also encourage continental Jewish poor to head to London. For example, at a meeting of the United Synagogue “a letter was read from Sir Anthony Rothschild, calling attention to the large number of young men, mostly foreigners, who demand & accept Charity at the Holy days . . . (April 22, 1873).” That same year the “Report of the Overseers’ Committee on the Motzo [sic] Distribution to the Poor” (from December 1, 1873) contained a lengthy discussion of the need to distribute matzo only to the “deserving poor,” and to consider a scheme that would make the poor more reliant on themselves for Passover provisions, as they were reputed to be in Amsterdam.³⁷

At the annual dinner of the Jews’ Free School in 1869, it was reported that

Sir Benjamin Phillips,³⁸ responding to the toast and honour of the City Corporation, alluded to the increasing number of children educated in the school [twenty-five hundred boys and girls, and this was before the post-

1841. Publication was suspended from May 20, 1842, until October 18, 1844. The paper has been published bi-weekly or weekly since October 1844. Over the years, it merged with, or forced out of business, several other Jewish papers, including *Voice of Jacob*, *Hebrew Observer*, and the *Jewish Record*. For more on its history and its role in the Anglo-Jewish community, see David Cesarani, *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841–1991* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

37 United Synagogue, minute book (council, vol. 1, part 1), 1870–79, ACC 2712/1/1, LMA.

38 The son of a tailor, Benjamin Phillips (1811–1889) was educated at Neumegen’s School (see below). He became the second Jewish Lord Mayor of London (1865) and subsequently received a knighthood for his services. He was active in the fight for Jewish emancipation, and the founding of the United Synagogue. A three-decade member of the BD and a tireless communal worker, he was elected president of the Institution for Relieving the Indigent Blind of the Jewish Persuasion (*Hevrat Maḥaseh l’Ivrim*) in 1850 and vice-president of the Anglo-Jewish Association (founded 1871). See *JE* (1906),

1880 influx!], and expressed a fear that the practice of opening the doors to “an unlimited number” fostered a spirit of dependence among those who could well afford to educate their children themselves, if it did not attract poor families from the Continent.³⁹ He desired to treat every one of his people as a brother, but expected the same treatment in return.⁴⁰

Apparently, others shared his concerns. At the following year’s dinner it was noted that the “Committee . . . feel with regret that the number of pupils now in the school cannot, under present circumstances, be exceeded [because the schools’ current ‘reliable income’ does not even cover the students currently enrolled]. . . . Of the total number of children now on the books of the school at least 70 per cent are of foreign parentage, and no less than 563 of them were actually born abroad.” It was further lamented that many of the school’s students arrived speaking no English, not even responding to their names in this “foreign” language. These same children frequently left school early to join the workforce, because neither they nor their parents had “yet learnt to set a proper value on education. . . .”⁴¹ Despite this early leave-taking, the enrollment at the Jews’ Free School in 1870 had grown to 1,600 boys and 1,043 girls, an increase of 143 from the previous year.

The Times articles also indicate that Jewish elite and upper-middle-class concerns or anxieties regarding English perceptions (or misperceptions) of their customs, religion, and culture had some basis in fact. At one Jews’ Hospital annual dinner, *The Times* reported that “[t]he dishes are, generally speaking, of a very peculiar description. . . .”⁴² Later, it was reported that “[w]e are at a loss what to say of the dinner, as it was given in the Jewish fashion.”⁴³ The next year the paper again reported that “[t]he dinner was served in the Jewish style, and we therefore hesitate to pronounce upon its

“Phillips, Sir Benjamin Samuel,” by Joseph Jacobs and Goodman Lipkind, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/12110-phillips-sir-benjamin-samuel>.

39 Concern over creating dependence through charity is not out of line with the Maimonidian hierarchy of *zedakah*, which ranks a gift that enables the recipient to rise out of poverty as the highest form of *zedakah*. This type of rehabilitative charity seems to be the antithesis of *zedakah* that creates helplessness, or in the worst case, a permanent underclass. However, Phillips’s concern is most likely based in his adoption, like other charitable supporters of the JFS, of Victorian notions regarding charitable giving, and not Jewish concerns.

40 *Times*, 20 May 1869, 5.

41 *Ibid.*, 14 June 1870, 12.

42 *Ibid.*, 10 June 1843, 5.

43 *Ibid.*, 15 May 1847, 5.

merits."⁴⁴ And again, the following year, it was stated that "[t]he dinner was served in the Jewish style. . . . We do not feel ourselves very competent to pronounce upon its merits, but it appeared to give general satisfaction."⁴⁵ This perplexity over the alien nature of Jewish food and/or dining styles, it should be stressed, appeared repeatedly in one of the country's leading papers.

The Jews' Hospital annual charitable dinner of May 29, 1840, is representative of these types of yearly fundraising events. As reported by *The Times*, the chair of the evening was the Duke of Sussex. Attendees included the Duke of Somerset, Sir George Carroll, Sir F. Ommanney, Moses Montefiore, Mr. Rothschild, and others. Attendees subscribed more than twelve hundred pounds. "The healths [sic] of the Queen and her illustrious consort were drunk with great cheering, as were also those of the Queen Dowager, the rest of the Royal family, &c."⁴⁶ At one point in the evening "the children who are supported and educated by the funds of the hospital marched around the room and exhibited the results of their labour and industry in various branches of manual labour."⁴⁷ A girl also recited an ode. At the annual dinner held in 1843, "[a] military band was stationed in the gallery at the lower end of the room, and greatly contributed to increase the pleasure of such of the guests as were lovers of 'the concord of sweet sounds.'"⁴⁸ The paper noted that this dinner was chaired by his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, as his brother (the Duke of Sussex, a great supporter of the charity) had recently died.⁴⁹

Attendance at the dinners generally ranged from one hundred to two hundred people (although some attracted nearly three hundred people), while balls could attract several hundred men and women. Attendees were mostly Jewish, with a small number of favorably disposed gentiles in attendance as well. In 1856, "276 gentlemen sat down to a splendid entertainment, comprehending all the leading members of the Jewish community in England, and many of the oldest and most respected commercial men of the city of London, who desired, in common with their Jewish fellow

44 Ibid., 24 May 1848, 5.

45 Ibid., 5 June 1849, 5.

46 Ibid., 29 May 1840, 5.

47 *Times*.

48 Ibid., 10 June 1843, 5.

49 For a touching eulogy, delivered at Bevis Marks on the day of his burial, see Dr. Louis Loewe, *A Discourse delivered [. . .] on the Day of the Funeral of H. R. H. Prince Augustus Frederick Duke of Sussex* (London: Wertheimer, 1843).

citizens, to do honour to the first Jewish Lord Mayor.”⁵⁰ Attendance at the Jews’ Orphan Asylum Ball of 1845 was nearly seven hundred, including “Baron Rothschild, Lord D. C. Stuart, General Caulfield, Sheriff Sidney, Alderman Farebrother, &c., and nearly all the higher class of the Hebrew nation in London.”⁵¹ The following year’s event boasted continued patronage from “her Majesty the Queen Dowager (an annual subscriber of ten guineas), his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, K.G., the Duke of Buccleuch, &c. Among the distinguished guests were Lord Mandeville, Lord Dudley Coutts Stuart, Count Loure de Noailles, Baron de Rothschild, Hon. Colonel Evans Freke, Mr. David Salomons, Mr. P. Salomons, Sir Bellingham Graham, Bart., Sir Henry Webb, Bart., Captain Home Purvis, and Mr. Frederick Hart, president of the institution.”⁵²

There were many other Jewish charities and charitable institutions functioning in London in addition to those already discussed here. Some, such as the Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor, were founded as London’s Jewish population expanded after 1840, while others were already in existence by this date.⁵³ Collectively, they encompassed the full range of Jewish and/or human needs envisioned by the definition of “[c]ustomary forms of *tzedakah* . . . [including] aiding a couple about to be married . . . supplying the poor with their *Pesah* [Passover] needs . . . provision for education, soup kitchens, temporary lodgings for poor travelers, hospital services, old-age homes for the needy, and free burial for the indigent.”⁵⁴ London’s Jewish charities included, in no particular order, the Beth Holim Hospital

50 *Times*, 18 February 1856, 7. The chairman of the evening was the Right Honorable Lord Mayor David Salomons (1797–1873), the first Jewish sheriff of London (1835), the first Jewish alderman of London (1847), the first Jewish lord mayor of London (1855), and a leading figure in the fight for Jewish emancipation. On this evening, more than £1,770 were subscribed to the charity. For more on Salomons, see *JE* (1906), “Sir David Salomons, Bart.” by Joseph Jacobs, Goodman Lipkind, and Isidore Harris, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/13038-salomons>.

51 *Times*, 9 May 1845, 4.

52 *Ibid.*, 23 April 1846, 5.

53 Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor, 1854–72, MS Add 8, University College Archives, London. The Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor was founded November 26, 1854, “in consequence of the inclemency of the Weather and the High Price of Provisions. . . .” Donations by those present at this first meeting amounted to £162.18.6. The charity operated at Black Horse Yard, Aldgate, moving to 5 Fashion Street, Spitalfields, in the late 1880s. See also Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor, minute books, 1872–89, ACC 2942/2, LMA, for insight into the workings of the soup kitchen. The minutes “resolve that the Soup Kitchen be opened for the season” usually in December, so it must not have been open all year.

54 *Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, s.v. “Charity,” 155.

(Sephardi, 1747),⁵⁵ Jews' Deaf and Dumb Home (1866), Joel Emanuel's Almshouses for the elderly indigent (1840), Charity for the Relief of the Aged Destitute, Widows' Home Asylum (1843), Holy Land Relief Fund (1805), *Honen Dalim* ("charitable to the poor," Sephardi, 1724), Passover Relief Fund, Society for Allowing Marriage Fees and a Portion to Young Men and Virtuous Girls of the Jewish Persuasion (1850),⁵⁶ Society for Cheering the Needy at the Festivals of Passover and Tabernacles (1829), Society for Initiating the Children of the Poor into the Covenant of Abraham (Sephardi, 1745), Society for Providing Strangers with Meals on Sabbaths and Festivals (1868), Society for Relieving the Aged Needy (1829), Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor (1854), Spanish and Portuguese Marriage Portion Society (Sephardi, 1736), and Society for Relieving the Jewish Poor in Confined Mourning (1845). As Appendices 1 and 2 demonstrate, this represents only a partial list of the many Jewish charities that existed. They differed in their finances, effectiveness, longevity, and purpose. Yet they all aimed to fulfill the Jewish imperative of *zedakah*. Some of them functioned well, while others overlapped in function,⁵⁷ were inefficient, or irregularly run. Unfortunately, the records of many of them, particularly the smaller ones, have not survived, so it is difficult to describe the details of their operations accurately, including how funds were collected, spent, distributed (in monetary, or in-kind fashion), and to whom, specifically, they were given. Still, their formation and existence leads to the conclusion that the Jewish community was genuinely concerned about the religious and physical welfare of its own members and acted accordingly by establishing and supporting numerous charities.

Jewish charities and self-help organizations, like their English counterparts, were founded and staffed by individuals from disparate income levels and social backgrounds. For example, the Jewish Board of Guardians was founded by members of the London Jewish elite and staffed mostly by

55 When available, a founding date is given. Many named here are noted in Asher I. Myers, comp., *The Jewish Directory for 1874: Containing a Complete List of Metropolitan and Provincial Synagogues, Jewish Schools, Associations, Charitable and Other Institutions, Societies* [. . .] (London: P. Vallentine, 1874). See Appendices 1 and 2 for more information.

56 Note the use of "virtuous" in this instance; although *tsniut* (which loosely translates as "modesty") for women AND men is stressed in religious Judaism, this appears to be a Victorian usage.

57 See, for example, footnote 21 above regarding two (probably) separate organizations established to relieve the indigent Jewish blind.

middle-class Jews.⁵⁸ By contrast, self-help organizations, such as friendly societies, tended to be founded by people of the same social and economic level (generally lower-middle or working class, but not exclusively), specifically in aid of themselves and others of the same class level.⁵⁹

Again, a new English-Jewish hybrid emerged with the founding of these various groups, as they combined Jewish religious imperatives (such as providing for burial expenses, mourning ritual, and Passover supplies) with English class-based institutional forms, such as the aforementioned friendly societies. Many of these societies provided for members in times of sickness and granted allowances to their widows and orphans. Friendly societies also afforded their members opportunities to socialize, frequently conducting their business in taverns or eating establishments. Included among their ranks were branches of the Ancient Order of Foresters with names such as Shield of David (founded 1865), Sons of Abraham (1863), and Sons of Israel (1863). Also representative of Jewish friendly societies were the Jewish Mutual Benefit Fund (1862), Jewish National Friendly Matzo Association (1840), Path of Peace (1782), Sisterhood Society (1856), Society “Charity Escapeth an Evil Death” (1830), and the United Brethren (1856).⁶⁰ These groups fused an English organizational form (that of the friendly society) and English notions of self-help with the Judaic imperatives of religious observance found in the Jewish traditions of *bikur cholim* (visiting the sick) and the *chevra kadisha* (burial society). In effect, they are another example of the emergence of a recognizable Anglo-Jewish identity.

The Jewish Board of Guardians: Anglo-Jewish Paternalism

By mid-century, many in the elite and upper-middle classes of the London Jewish community came to believe that charitable giving had to be organized, centralized, and supervised in order to be most effective. They concluded this for two reasons. As the nineteenth century progressed the Jewish elite increasingly took their organizational (and social) cues from the

58 See Lipman, *Century of Social Service*, Appendix 2, for a list of officers of the board; see also Laurie Magnus, *The Jewish Board of Guardians and the Men Who Made It, 1859–1909: An Illustrated Record* (London: Jewish Board of Guardians, 1909), appendix. See Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor*, for a much more critical appraisal of the board, its activities, and its members.

59 On Jewish friendly societies generally, see R. P. Kalman, “The Jewish Friendly Societies of London, 1793–1993,” *Jewish Historical Studies* 33 (1992–94).

60 Those listed here are drawn from Myers, *Jewish Directory*. For more information on these and other societies, see “Friendly Societies” in Appendix 2 below.

surrounding English society. The English upper and upper-middle classes, under the influence of popularized Benthamite thought, came to believe in the importance of the rational organization of charity—that is, the need to create a system for charitable giving and distribution. In the words of an early (and hagiographic) historian of the Jewish Board of Guardians:

Prior to the foundation of the Board the system of relieving the needs of the Jewish poor could hardly be dignified by the name of system at all. It is scarcely remembered . . . how towards the end of the period [prior to 1859] when rich and poor lived together in the East End of London, charity was administered indiscriminately by means of doles distributed through the paid officials of the Synagogue. . . . To this system, with its lack of investigation and its plainly demoralizing tendencies, the name of "*schnorring*" has been given, a name surviving to-day [sic] chiefly in a historical sense, but representing in times past a very real and a very dangerous evil.⁶¹

Dramatics aside, prior to the emergence of adequate state provision for the poor some upper- and upper-middle-class Jews (similar to their Victorian counterparts) believed supervision and centralization of charitable activities were needed. This was to ensure that charity would be distributed in such a way as to dissuade those not genuinely in need from joining the queue for assistance, and, conversely, to make certain that those who did receive charity were "deserving."⁶² While the Victorian Jewish founders of the Board of Guardians found these priorities admirable, they had no basis in Jewish teachings or in the requirements governing *zedakah*, but, rather, were adopted from the surrounding English society.

The other reason for the desire to place the collection and distribution of charity under one central body was that, in spite of the many Jewish charities already in existence, the three main Ashkenazi synagogues (the Great, the

61 See Magnus, *Jewish Board of Guardians*, 10–12. The reader can easily imagine Magnus shivering in horror as he wrote the dread word *schnorring* (begging).

62 See Lipman, "Structure of London Jewry," 255–58; Lipman, "Survey of Anglo-Jewry," 186–87; and Joseph Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics, Social, Vital and Anthropometric* (London: D. Nutt, 1891), 14. One reason for their concern was the increasing number of Jewish poor requesting relief. Lipman estimated London's Jewish population in 1850 to be 18,000–21,000. He calculated that 25–30 percent of this number (5,000–6,000) were "poor on occasional or regular relief." Jacobs estimated that by 1882 roughly 23 percent of London's Jewish population of 46,000, or 11,000 people, received some form of Jewish charity. Thus, for our period (1840–80) although the percentage of Jews requiring assistance remained fairly constant, the number of individuals needing relief roughly doubled.

Hambro', and the New), and by extension their paying members, felt they bore an increasingly large and unreasonable share of the burden for the provision of communal charity. The ultimate desire may have been to systematize all Jewish charity, but the initial focus of these reformers was on that portion of charity/*zedakah* handled by the three synagogues.⁶³ Traditionally, these synagogues had divided poor Jewish supplicants into three separate categories: the stipendiary poor, the "casual" poor, and the "strange" poor. Covered in the first category were members of one of the three synagogues, or their families, who had slipped into poverty. "As such they were able to claim a [monthly] share in the various bequest and trust funds reserved for the relief of members and their families."⁶⁴ The monthly allowances given by the Great Synagogue ranged between five and eight shillings.⁶⁵ It is reasonable to assume that the New and the Hambro' disbursed similar amounts, but to smaller numbers of people, as they had smaller memberships. Although the individual sums given were small, the synagogues spent considerable effort in ensuring that those on the "monthly distribution list" were there legitimately.

The "casual" poor were those who, although not members of one of the synagogues, could claim some connection. This was possible if they had rented a seat for six months, were the child(ren) of someone who had done so, had been married in the synagogue, or were the child(ren) of someone who had been married in the synagogue.⁶⁶ Thus, "casual" was something of a misnomer, as a direct connection had to be established to be considered under this category. Furthermore:

Since the synagogue was *bound*, by its constitution, on payment of the proper fee, to marry any child of persons [previously] married in the synagogue, a dynasty of hereditary paupers could thus be established by an initial marriage. Such a marriage could take place on payment of half a guinea, with the permission of the president of the synagogue, though permission would usually be refused if it were known that the parties to be married had no visible means of support.⁶⁷

There were roughly 250 people a year in the "casual" category who were able to claim funds from the Great Synagogue of between one shilling six pence and five shillings a month.

63 Lipman, *Social Service*, "Origins of the Board," 1–32.

64 *Ibid.*, 14.

65 Lipman only provides information on the Great Synagogue's distribution of funds.

66 Lipman, *Social Service*, 14.

67 *Ibid.*

The category of greatest concern to the three synagogues, and the one that initially occupied the Jewish Board of Guardians's full attention, was that of the so-called "strange" poor. This term refers to foreign Jewish poor, recently arrived in England, who had no direct constitutional claim on the funds of the synagogues, although as fellow Jews, they could (and did) claim a connection under the rules governing *zedakah*. The synagogues also concerned themselves with the "strange" poor because they believed that poor immigrant Jews should not become a burden on the non-Jewish ratepayers of London.⁶⁸ The worry was that accessing the poor rates might lead to the growth of a general anti-Jewish sentiment in England and the reinforcement of certain popularly held prejudices. As it was, Henry Mayhew noted shortly after the founding of the Jewish Board of Guardians that, "[n]ot only do the Jews voluntarily support their own poor and institutions, but they contribute—compulsorily it is true—their quota to the support of the English poor and church. . . . This is the more honourable and the more remarkable among the Jews, when we recollect their indisputable greed of money."⁶⁹ Clearly, then, Anglo-Jewish concern regarding how they were perceived by the non-Jewish population was not unfounded. Beyond these concerns, English Jews also viewed relief provided by the Poor Law, both before and after the reforms of 1834, as religiously and financially inadequate. They, therefore, felt compelled to create an alternative.

In the late eighteenth century, the three synagogues agreed among themselves on a formula to provide for the "strange" poor. The Great Synagogue, the wealthiest and largest of the three, would pay for half of all expenses relating to the "strange" poor, while the New and the Hambro' Synagogues would each contribute one quarter of the expenses. Initially, the recipient of relief had to visit each synagogue to pick up a percentage of the total funds to which he was entitled. The three synagogues also distributed Passover flour and related provisions to the poor.⁷⁰ In 1804, it was decided that the Great Synagogue would administer all funds for the "strange" poor,

68 Many Jews also paid poor rates. So, in essence, middle- and upper-class Jews were expected to pay twice, first to the general poor rates, and then to Jewish charities to make sure poor Jews never availed themselves of funds from the general poor rates.

69 Henry Mayhew, *London Labour and the London Poor; A Cyclopaedia of the Condition and Earnings of Those That Will Work, Those That Cannot Work, and Those That Will Not Work. The London Street-Folk*, vol. 2 (London: Griffin, Bohn, 1861), 127. See also section titled "Of the Charities, Schools, and Education of the Jews," 127–30.

70 In addition to these "joint" dispersals, the synagogues continued to make individual distributions. See Great Synagogue Distribution of Mazzoth [sic] to Poor, 1846–61, ACC 2712/GTS/51–61; Great Synagogue Charity Ledgers, 1841–71, ACC 2712/GTS/119–120; Hambro' Synagogue Distribution of Coal, 1845–70, ACC 2712/HBS/48;

and that the other two synagogues would each reimburse a quarter of the costs. Rotating responsibility for the burial of the poor was also introduced at this time; the “Great Synagogue [w]ould bury two paupers, and the others each one in turn.”⁷¹

By 1834, a new agreement was reached by the three synagogues, now known, for purposes of the agreement, as the “conjoint synagogues.”⁷² The Great Synagogue’s overseer of the poor would rotate responsibilities for relief with the overseers of the other two, six months for Duke’s Place, and three months each for the New and the Hambro’. The amount granted to any one member of the “strange” poor was not to exceed ten shillings in any particular month, although the amounts awarded were generally much smaller than this. This system, with few alterations, was in effect in 1859, at the time of the founding of the Jewish Board of Guardians. It was inefficient and rather slapdash. Most of the people applying to the synagogue overseers for funds were unknown to them, and there was a sense, fostered by the growing melding of the Judaic precepts of *zedakah* with English notions of philanthropy, that a knowledge of the “suitability” of the applicants for relief was needed. A further concern was that providing *zedakah* without any mechanism for encouraging some measure of anglicization relegated the “strange” poor to a life of poverty on the margins of English society. The Anglo-Jewish upper echelons likely feared this fostering of a non-anglicized Jewish poor might also adversely affect the status of the growing native-born Jewish middle and upper classes.⁷³ As Magnus, reflecting the views of wealthier Jewish donors, noted in his history of the board,

[t]he foreign element among the Jewish poor was not to be civilized by the beadles. No influence was brought to bear upon them which was likely to encourage them to cultivate habits of industry, and thereafter to regulate their home-life in accordance with the hygienic requirements . . . of English

Hambro’ Synagogue Register of the “Strange Poor,” list of 259 names, c. 1850 [not dated in register], ACC 2712/HBS/49. These records are available at the LMA.

71 Lipman, *Social Service*, 15.

72 Only the three main Ashkenazi synagogues were party to this agreement. However, other synagogues in London depended on them for cemetery access, etc. They included the Borough (Southwark), the Western (Westminster), and the Maiden Lane Synagogues, and smaller congregations such as the Gun Yard (1792) and Polish (Cutler Street) Synagogues.

73 Jewish political emancipation, which really applied only to the Jewish elite, was not achieved until 1858, the year before the creation of the Jewish Board of Guardians. For a discussion of Jewish responses, from all classes and degrees of religious observance, to emancipation, see “Anglo-Jewish Attitudes toward Political Emancipation,” in Gilam, *Emancipation of the Jews*, 38–71.

law and custom, and give their children the advantage of such benefits of education and technical training as would enable them to fill the[ir] part in English life. . . .⁷⁴

Finally, there was a sense among the founders of the board that the provision of communal *zedakah* to the foreign poor should be formalized and professionalized. Interestingly, Magnus (honorary secretary of the board in 1909) points out, disapprovingly, that there was still considerable residential mixing between the Jewish wealthy and poor well into the 1850s, and that this led to a distinct lack of professional detachment in their interactions over *zedakah*. Once wealthier segments of the community moved to West and Northwest London in large numbers, "[t]he residential separation of the rich and the poor removed the specious pretext advanced by many indiscriminating almsgivers that every one was intimately acquainted with the circumstances of his neighbor."⁷⁵ This separation, then, was important because it created a need for the mediation of the Board of Guardians in giving *zedakah*. Thus, the Jewish Board of Guardians was established to address a variety of concerns, Jewish and Anglo-Jewish.

In February 1859, it was unanimously resolved "[a]t a meeting of the Vestry of the Great Synagogue . . . [t]hat it is highly expedient that the relief of the strange poor called *Orchim* [visitors] be managed by a Board of Guardians constituted of delegates from the three city united congregations. . . ."⁷⁶ The Board was initially composed of representatives of the conjoint synagogues—seven from the Great Synagogue, and six each from the New and the Hambro.⁷⁷ Ten representatives, elected by those who contributed to the board, were added to the governing body in 1865. By the mid-1870s, the governing body of the board had expanded to forty, including fifteen elected contributors' representatives, and twenty-five synagogue representatives chosen by the United Synagogue. The additions in 1865 and

74 Magnus, *Jewish Board of Guardians*, 14.

75 Ibid., 12.

76 BG, minutes, 1859–69, MS 173/A 861, AJA, Southampton, 1.

77 Lipman, *Social Service*, 39. Although startup funds came from the conjoint synagogues, once established, the bulk of the board's funding came from the Jewish public. Contributions from the conjoint synagogues never amounted to more than 14 percent of the board's total funds, and by 1879 made up less than 10 percent of the money raised for the year. That year the three synagogues (through the United Synagogue) provided £1,274 of £15,128 contributed to the board.

the 1870s were made in an effort to expand beyond the three oldest established Ashkenazi synagogues.⁷⁸

Under the leadership of its president, Ephraim Alex, and secretary, Lionel Lewis Cohen, the board adopted a constitution stipulating that the “strange” poor had to be resident in England for at least six months before they became eligible for relief. This measure, passed in an effort to dissuade poor Jews from immigrating to England if they had no immediate means of support, was based in Victorian notions regarding the “deserving” poor, and Jewish elite concerns regarding that class of habitual Jewish poor known as *schnorrers*.⁷⁹ The measure was not based in Judaic precepts. As previously discussed, *zedakah* is given to the poor as a matter of duty. Of course, no one wants to be taken advantage of, but withholding *zedakah* from someone who is poor, regardless of the reason, is not countenanced in Judaism.

The board encouraged self-help in those it aided, in the belief that assistance should enable the poor to become self-supporting. The concept of self-help, most famously elucidated by Samuel Smiles, was not alien to the Jewish precept of *zedakah*.⁸⁰ As Maimonides indicated in his *Talmud Torah*, the highest level of *zedakah* is that which enables the poor man to lift himself out of poverty. Thus, the self-help encouraged by the middle-class civil servants of the board could have derived from Victorian or Jewish beliefs, or, more likely, a combination of the two.

Home visitation for recipients of assistance was a board policy that more clearly reflected English/British influences. “Domiciliary visitation” was introduced in Glasgow in the early 1820s. “Visiting and investigation were further developed by the Visiting Societies in London, largely under

78 Ibid. The United Synagogue was founded in 1870 and recognized by act of Parliament: the Jewish United Synagogues Act (33 & 34 Victoria, cap. 116). See also United Synagogue Act—Formation of United Synagogue, 1870, ACC 2712/15/1473, LMA. The United Synagogue was tasked with . . . the maintaining, erecting, founding, and carrying on, in London and its neighbourhood, places of worship for persons of the Jewish religion who conform to the Polish or German ritual, the providing means of burial of persons of the Jewish religion, the relief of poor persons of the Jewish religion, the contributing with other Jewish bodies to the maintenance of a Chief Rabbi and of other ecclesiastical persons, and to other communal duties devolving on metropolitan congregations, and other charitable purposes in connexion [sic] with the Jewish religion. . . .

79 Lipman, *Social Service*, 48n3. Lipman writes that “the history of Jewish boards of guardians everywhere can be regarded as an unending, and not always successful, war against schnorrers [beggars].”

80 See Samuel Smiles, *Self-Help: With Illustrations of Conduct and Perseverance*, rev. ed. (1866; repr., London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit, 1996). First edition published in 1859.

denominational management, during the nineteenth century and consolidated by the Metropolitan Visiting Relief Association in 1843.⁸¹ The board adopted home visitation as a requirement, forming its earliest visitation committee in 1861. It was thought that visitation would enable the board to better understand the needs of the poor and the conditions in which they lived. This in turn would help the board to be more effective in its relief efforts. Efficiency and effectiveness of this sort were the hallmarks of mid-century Victorian charities; in practice, though, the board's visitation committee members were frequently less concerned with the "worthiness" of the poor applicant than were other Victorian organizations.⁸² The board generally assisted those who applied or else referred them to other Jewish charities, adhering to the Jewish community's unstated policy of maintaining its own poor separately from the general population.⁸³

From the start, the board found itself providing for native Jewish poor as well as the "strange" poor. In fact, "native-born applicants during the 1860s never dropped below 65 per cent of the total number of applicants" to the board.⁸⁴ Thus, the board quickly became one of the major providers of Jewish relief in London. The majority of its relief was distributed in goods and services, rather than in money.⁸⁵ And, between 1868 and 1880,

81 Lipman, *Social Service*, 30.

82 Robert Humphreys, *Sin, Organized Charity and the Poor Law in Victorian England* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 5–13; Robert Humphreys, *Poor Relief and Charity, 1869–1945: The London Charity Organization Society* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 1–60. The Charity Organization Society (COS), founded in 1869, adopted home visitation/investigation of applicants as one of its central tenets in an effort to systematize and rationalize Victorian charitable giving. The founders of the COS believed that sentiment-based charitable giving encouraged the non-deserving poor, and that even the "deserving" poor were, on some level, responsible for their straitened circumstances. The COS was intended as a clearinghouse, evaluating the worthiness of poor applicants (and charities) and referring them to charities or the poor law guardians. The COS strongly discouraged outdoor relief. It should be noted that not all charities accepted or appreciated its efforts.

83 Interestingly, although middle- and upper-class Anglo-Jews contributed to non-Jewish charities, they did not tend to take an active role. F. D. Mocatta was the exception to this general rule. "More than any other individual, Mocatta provided a liaison between Jewish and non-Jewish philanthropy, especially between the Board . . . and the [COS], in which he was also a leader." David Owen, *English Philanthropy, 1660–1960* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964), 420–28. Quote from p. 420.

84 Lipman, *Social Service*, 47.

85 The following "General Statement of Relief Distributed [1867]" is representative:

Money relief . . .	£994 14[s] 3[d]
Special relief, viz: <i>tephillin</i> [phylacteries], coals, bedding, and tickets of various charities.	189 10 0

the board's annual disbursements grew from just over £3,000 to more than £12,500, as the number of cases, new and old, grew steadily.⁸⁶

During these years, between two hundred fifty and one thousand Jewish immigrants arrived each year from Holland, Germany, Poland, Austria, and Russia.⁸⁷ Not all of the new arrivals required aid, or, if they did, applied to the board for assistance. Of those "strange" poor who did apply to the board between 1871 and 1880, roughly half "were assisted ONLY to emigrate," more specifically, to return to their country of origin or to travel on to a third country.⁸⁸ This fact was stressed in the board's annual reports and was clearly an important component of its developing policies during

Tickets for necessaries of life and provisions.	1,606 5 0
Total general gifts	2,790 9 3
Loans advanced in money	£190 0 0
Ditto from Eleazar Loan Fund	49 0 0
	<hr/>
	239 0 0
	<hr/>
Total general relief and loans	£3,029 9 3
Med. relief, wine, brandy, & c., per med. orders	£131 16 10
Trusses and surgical instruments	46 16 0
Cost of medical staff, apothecary, maternity tickets admission to Hospitals, extra drugs, & c.	330 8 0
	<hr/>
Total medical relief	509 0 10
	<hr/>
Grand total of relief	£3,538 0 1

From: Archives of Jewish Care, BG, ninth report, 1 January 1866–31 December 1867, MS 173/1/12/2, AJA, Southampton.

86 Figures taken from the Reports of the Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor, 1867–1880, MS 173/1/12/2 and /3, AJA, Southampton. In 1861, the board relieved 1574 cases (736 old, 838 new); by 1880, the number rose to 2,588 cases (945 new, 1,643 old). In 1869, the first year these figures were recorded, 1,170 relieved were foreigners resident fewer than seven years; 1,033 were native born or had been resident in England for fewer than seven years. By 1880, 963 relieved were foreigners who had been in England fewer than seven years; 1,625 were native born or had been resident in England for more than seven years. See Lipman, *Social Service*, Table 1, "Main Operations of the Board of Guardians."

87 Lipman, *Social Service*, 37.

88 This language is used in the sixteenth report (1874), 29; seventeenth report (1875), 32; eighteenth report (1876), 53; nineteenth report (1877), 27; twentieth report (1878), 27; twenty-first annual report (1879), 25; and twenty-second annual report (1880), 23. See also *JC*, 6 January 1865, for a discussion of the board's "fund for assisting their poor to emigrate to the United States or Australia."

these years.⁸⁹ This policy reflected the unease of the board's anglicized founders and contributors with the steady inflow of foreign Jews, rather than any spirit of *zedakah*. At least part of their concern was for their own status in English society and the effects that a large non-anglicized Jewish group might have upon it. A further worry was that the resources of the London Jewish community would not be up to the task of providing for the foreign arrivals. This does not mean that they turned their backs on their poorer brethren, but their assistance was tailored to their own concerns, as well as to the needs of those they aided.

It is clear that the Jewish Board of Guardians, as it developed from the 1860s to the 1880s, followed English form in much of what it did—from home visitation to vocational assistance,⁹⁰ to inquiring after the "respectability" of the poor Jews it helped relieve. However, there is no indication in the annual reports and various minute books of these years that either the elites who founded the board or the middle-class individuals who served as its staff were anything but sincere in their desire to assist their coreligionists. The fact that "[p]hilanthropy . . . conveyed a sense of power as well as performing a mitzvah, the obligation of the observant Jew"⁹¹ in no way lessens the intent of their activities. To argue, as Rozin does, that "[t]he

89 The chart below contains information on **new** cases extracted from reports of 1873–1880. Foreign ("strange") poor cases are listed by country of origin:

	Natives	Germans	Poles	Dutch	Other	Total/# funded to emigrate (% of total)
1880	93	106	673	52	21	945/428 (50%)
1879	111	171	709	56	16	1,063/503 (50%)
1878	57	147	609	47	13	873/474 (54%)
1877	59	103	617	66	17	862/389 (54%)
1876	43	60	431	65	7	606/325 (50%)
1875	50	51	428	41	7	577/258 (50%)
1874	32	38	441	55	2	568/260 (50%)
1873	62	39	615	42	6	764 [breakdown not available]
1872	55	48	605	73	3	784 [breakdown not available]
1871	121	60	364	80	4	629 [breakdown not available]

From: Archives of Jewish Care, BG, fifteenth report, 1 January 1873–31 December 1873, to twenty-first annual report, 1 January 1879–31 December 1879, MS 173/1/12/3; and twenty-second annual report, 1 January 1880–31 December 1880, MS 173/1/12/4, AJA, Southampton.

90 The board's work committee solicited work "for the borrowers of the sewing machines, leased under their supervision, as tailors, cap-makers, umbrella and parasol-makers, or slipper makers." *JC*, 1 March 1867.

91 Black, *Social Politics*, 74.

main interest of the élite [who founded the Jewish Board of Guardians] was expanding business and profits, undisturbed by the impact of economic and social problems related to Jewish poverty and immigration” is inaccurate. Certainly, “they feared Jewish poverty could bring about negative reactions from the host community, detrimental to [their] own position.”⁹² But their fears, and the actions they sparked, need to be measured against their demonstrated concern for their fellow English Jews, which manifested itself in extensive charitable organization and contributions. There is simply no evidence in the existing records to support Rozin’s view that the “[r]uling wealthy élites [of the Board], even when philanthropic in character, are generally hostile to the basic needs of the poor classes. . . .”⁹³ While not noticeably “hostile” to the poor, there is evidence, as discussed above, that the board’s officials guided it in such a way as to address their own concerns regarding those they relieved. These concerns reflected their growing identification with the larger English society and particularly with Englishmen of the same class level as themselves. This does not mean, however, that “[a]s far as the relief of the poor was concerned, the class interests of the elite overrode their ethnic solidarity.”⁹⁴ Class interests and religio-ethnic interests/concerns resided together, albeit uneasily at times, within the London Jewish elite (and within most English Jews, regardless of the class with which they identified). But for the most part, the Anglo-Jewish elite, and Anglo-Jewry more generally, remained attached to their developing sense of class and their older ethnic (or racial, in the parlance of the day) and religious solidarity. Their adherence to these seemingly disparate elements signaled the emergence of an evolving Anglo-Jewish communal identity. Otherwise, why not join the larger English society through conversion or by simply drifting away into the larger society, leaving the Jewish fold for good?⁹⁵

92 Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor*, 216. Regardless of upper- and middle-class Jewish reasons for donating time and money, those who received aid benefited. It can be argued that charitable activity “bound the social classes together in mutual dependence” by raising the social standing of those who gave, fulfilling the *mitzvah* of *zedakah*, and aiding the recipients. See Prochaska, *Royal Bounty*, 68–69.

93 Rozin, *The Rich and the Poor*, 31.

94 *Ibid.*, 217.

95 For a discussion of the small number of Jews in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century England who chose either the assimilationist or conversionist routes, see Endelman, “German Jews in Victorian England”; Endelman, “German-Jewish Settlement”; and Endelman, *Radical Assimilation*, 9–72.

The Anglo-Jewish Charitable Impulse

Before the Jewish Board of Guardians was founded, charitable requests regularly appeared in the advertising pages of the *Jewish Chronicle* (and the various other communal papers). Solicitations were made by private individuals on behalf of the indigent, or by the various organized charities for funds to continue their work. The typical private ad began "To the Benevolent Public" or "Appeal to the Benevolent." There followed a tale of hardship and woe and an appeal for assistance on behalf of the needy person or family. The following ads are illustrative:

Poverty and Madness.—A Case for the Benevolent.

The sympathy of the humane is earnestly solicited in behalf of the Wife and Four Children (the eldest seven years, and the youngest fifteen months old) of Aaron Hart, of No. 15 Tenter-street, Spitalfields, now an inmate of Bethlem Hospital for Lunatics. He is deprived of reason, which in a great measure has been brought on by the poverty and consequent privations the poor man saw his young family subjected to. The poor distracted wife is, unfortunately, at present unable to contribute towards the support of the children, she being in an advanced stage of pregnancy.

Donations will be thankfully received by Mr. Abraham White, 5, Middlesex-street, Aldgate, and at the Office of the Jewish Chronicle.

The following donations are thankfully announced:—Previously Advertised, £5 11s. 6d. Per Jewish Chronicle: Lily's Mite, 2s. 6d.; I. L. N., 10s.; Mrs., S. I. Waley, Devonshire-place, 10s.⁹⁶

To The Benevolent. Died, on the 11th inst., Benjamin Davis, of 2, Lower Chapman-street, Cannon-street-road, Commercial-road, leaving a wife and six children unprovided for. The oldest is unfortunately an idiot.

The advertiser having known the family when in good circumstances, trusts that his co-religionists will come forward with their mite and assist him in relieving so worthy a case, in order that the poor widow may be placed in a small way of business to enable her [sic] support herself and fatherless children. She is far advanced in pregnancy.

Recomended [sic] by Messrs. N. Magnus & Son, 6, New-street, Bishopsgate; Mr. Lazarus, 2, Wilson-street, Finsbury; who will also

96 *JC*, 1 July 1853.

thankfully acknowledge any donations they may receive. Donations will also be received at this office.⁹⁷

Although the particular circumstances of the individual(s) described in the “Appeal to the Benevolent” changed from ad to ad, the form was always the same: an appeal, generally accompanied by a brief testimonial to the upright and “deserving” nature of the person(s) in need, his/their temporary inability to help him/themselves, followed by an address to which contributions should be sent, and concluding with a list of those who had already given and the amount donated, or a promise to publish such a list in a future issue of the *Jewish Chronicle*. While the general form of the ads was similar to those in the non-Jewish press, it is clear that the solicitations/appeals were deliberately made to coreligionists with whom a natural affinity was presumed to exist. Private appeals in the *Jewish Chronicle* were regularly placed on behalf of the newly widowed woman with dependent children, the woman with children, who sought to join her husband in America, the family whose worldly possessions had been lost to fire or other disaster, and even the man who had “ruined himself in support of his synagogue, and . . . at the advanced age of seventy-four . . . [was] in danger of being thrown into prison for debts incurred in preserving a house for the spiritual welfare of the community. . . .”⁹⁸

At times, the advertising section of the *Jewish Chronicle* enabled donors to track the results of their benevolence, as, for example, in the case of Sarah Amsell. The initial solicitation on her behalf, in March 1858, noted that she had lost her husband and possessions in a fire the previous week.⁹⁹ The funds donated for her assistance (more than seventy-six pounds) can be traced through subsequent ads. By June, the generosity of the Jewish public enabled her to place the following advertisement:

Mrs. Sarah Amsell begs to offer her very sincere THANKS to the benevolent whose kindly aid and sympathy have tended to relieve her from much distress of mind, and to mitigate the severe affliction she sustained in the fire of March last. With the advice of her friends, she has returned to her former occupation,

97 Ibid., 19 January 1855. In the next issue, 26 January 1855, the same ad appears with the names of eight donors and the amounts (all small) they contributed affixed to the bottom. One of the donors gave a ticket for the Bread Meat and Coal charity distribution. Five more donations are acknowledged in the following issue, 2 February 1855, including another Bread Meat and Coal ticket.

98 See, for example, *JC*, 8 May 1857; *ibid.*, 26 March 1858; and *ibid.*, 28 January 1842.

99 *Ibid.*, 26 March 1858.

and has been enabled through the assistance afforded her to Commence Business as Stay and Bodice Maker, at 26, Wilson Street, Finsbury.¹⁰⁰

This ad was followed by a list of additional contributors and amounts given. After this acknowledgment, Amsell ran several brief ads for her new business: Mrs. Sarah Amsell, Stay and Bodice Maker, 26 Wilson Street, Finsbury.¹⁰¹

As mentioned above, Jewish charities also placed ads soliciting contributions, members, or individuals in need of their assistance. The following ad, placed in 1859 by one of the smaller charities, is typical of this type of solicitation:

Jewish Hawkers' License Aid Society. The President and Committee hereby give notice that they are again Prepared To Assist Persons in procuring Licenses.

Forms of application, which must be returned on or before the 25th inst., may be obtained from the Secretary, at 37, Duke-street, Aldgate.

By order, S. Solomon, Sec.

Donations and Subscriptions will be thankfully received by Walter Symons, Esq., President, 12, Clarendon-gardens, Maida-hill; Frederick Symons, Esq., Treasurer, 5, Lawrence Pountney-lane; P. Myers, Esq., Hon. Secretary, 29, Soho-square; Emanuel Myers, Esq., Temple Cottage, Ramsgate; Henry Weerden, Esq., 58, Edgbaston-hill, Birmingham; Joseph C. Cohen, Esq., Exeter-row, Birmingham; at the Jewish Chronicle office; and by the Secretary.¹⁰²

While private charitable appeals, as well as appeals issued by charitable organizations, regularly appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle's* advertising pages, it was rare to find a solicitation "to the benevolent" that combined an appeal to private benevolence with any mention of organized charitable relief, as in the case of the following appeal:

A Case of Real Distress.

Inserted for Duty only.

... A man and wife, with nine children, the youngest but four weeks old (the mother just out of her confinement), and the eldest (a boy out of employ) fifteen years old, are in want of both food and clothing. The Jewish Lying-

100 Ibid., 25 June 1858.

101 See, for example, *ibid.*, 9 July 1858.

102 Ibid., 18 November 1859.

In Charity have kindly, as far as their funds admit, granted the mother the usual relief. The parents were brought up respectably, and little expected that the time would ever arrive when they should be compelled to drink . . . the dregs of the bitter cup of adversity and poverty. To raise a few pounds, in order to place within their reach the means of earning a livelihood, the proprietor of the *Jewish Chronicle* respectfully and earnestly solicits the aid and co-operation of the benevolent. . . . [Concludes with a list of donors and amounts already given.]¹⁰³

One possible explanation for the infrequent appearance of this type of notice is that the “appeal to the benevolent” ads were likely perceived as requests of last resort. Mentioning funds already collected from organized charity may well have lessened the likelihood that individual contributors would give to the distressed.

With the inception of the Jewish Board of Guardians it is reasonable to assume that both private solicitations “to the benevolent” as well as appeals by various Jewish charities (and the number of such charities) on behalf of the poor would decline. Yet, after the board began its activities, and in spite of the centralization and organization it introduced, Anglo-Jewish charity continued to flourish.

As the large number of charities listed in Appendices 1 and 2 demonstrates, the Jewish impulses to give *zedakah* and to assist fellow Jews in financial need or distress, as well as the now accompanying Victorian charitable impulse and interest in organization, were not satisfied by the creation of the board. The continued existence of these various charities demonstrates both an unwillingness to leave the realm of Jewish communal or individual charitable action exclusively to the board, and a desire to maintain authority and connection to charity outside the board’s supervision. These “outside” appeals and charities were organized and run by Jews from all class levels, so the notion that the London Jewish elite hoped, through the board, to eventually harness all Jewish giving is demonstrably inaccurate. It is true that elements of the Jewish elite derived more than just the satisfaction of having fulfilled the imperative of giving *zedakah*, as “notables . . . drew the double benefit of publicity and charity, duly recorded in each issue of the Jewish press.” The ads in the *Jewish Chronicle* frequently listed the names of even the smallest donors or subscribers, so all donors potentially shared this benefit.¹⁰⁴

103 Ibid., 25 February 1853.

104 Black, *Social Politics*, 176. For example, the donations listed with the North London Synagogue appeal above ranged from £1 1s. to £105. It was also not unusual to see

Anglo-Jewish charitable impulses were not limited to other English Jews, or (see below) even exclusively to other Jews. Between 1840 and 1880 the Anglo-Jewish community, through the Office of the Chief Rabbi, or the Board of Deputies of British Jews, among others, was approached via letter or emissary on behalf of the Jews of Syria (Damascus Blood Libel of 1840), Bengal, Romania, Turkey, Persia, Morocco, Rome, Egypt, Russia, the German state of Posen, and other locations.¹⁰⁵ Lengthy requests for assistance from abroad were also made directly to the Anglo-Jewish public through the *Jewish Chronicle*, as the following ad demonstrates:

To my Brother Israelites in the British Dominions. An Appeal for aid to erect the first large Synagogue in Algeria. . . . [W]e Jews in Algeria have in recent years received our complete emancipation. We consider it our first duty to erect a house of worship where we and our children in Oran . . . shall offer up our grateful praises to Almighty God for our liberty, which begins with honouring our own religion. . . . [T]he Government of Algeria have granted us a valuable piece of ground for the erection of our Synagogue and School houses, under the condition that the building be completed in a stated number of years. To comply with this condition, I come to appeal to you in the name of my Jewish townsmen, 10,000 in number. They are not rich and require assistance from their brethren. Let there be no distinction between Jews in England, and in France or its Colonies. A bond of solidarity unites us all. What you do for us will re act on the well-being of the thousands and tens of thousands of Jews in Northern Africa, for we are engaged in the task of training in our schools young men who are intended to discharge the functions of ministers and of teachers. Help us then to work for the honour and the advancement of our holy religion.

Simon Kanoui, President of the Jewish Consistory of Oran (Algeria).

donations of only a few shillings listed in the ads of the *JC*. See, for example, the donations noted in the "Poverty and Madness" appeal above.

105 See CR, Roumanian Relief Fund, 1877, ACC 2805/1/1/17, LMA; and CR, Bengal Relief Fund, 1872, ACC 2805/1/1/13, LMA. See CR, miscellaneous, 1870s, ACC 2805/02/01/005, LMA, on distressed Jewish communities in Russia, Persia, Roumania, and Poland. For "Persian Famine Relief Fund (Jews of Shiraz)," "Odessa Relief Fund," and "Baghdad [Drought] Relief Fund," see BD, ACC 3121/A/11, LMA. See also BD, minute books, 1878–89, ACC/3121/A/12, LMA, for additional requests from the Jewish communities of Persia, Palestine, Syria, Turkey, Russia, etc., for financial or political assistance. This represents only a small sample of the causes/relief funds supported by Anglo-Jewry during these years.

Contributions will be gratefully received and acknowledged in this journal on being addressed to me . . . care of Mr. Samuel Abensur, 31, Great Prescott-street, Goodman's Fields, E.¹⁰⁶

Such appeals were supplemented in the *Jewish Chronicle* by information in its "Foreign Intelligence" column, and articles on "foreign" Jewish communities in Morocco, Tangiers, Bombay, Persia, Beirut, Fez, Constantinople, and elsewhere. Sometimes monetary aid was sought, while at other times political assistance or a combination of the two was requested. Generally, London Jewry, particularly the elites, but with support from the middle and even working classes, responded generously, doing what it could for these beleaguered communities. Appeals by Anglo-Jewish communal notables on behalf of oppressed Jewry in other countries appeared regularly between 1840 and 1880. For example, an ad appeared in 1844 for the "Committee for the Relief of the Sufferers at Mogador [Turkey]." Moses Montefiore chaired the committee and Baron Anthony de Rothschild served as treasurer. The ad sought subscriptions to help this group of Jews and concluded with a list of subscribers and contributions to date.¹⁰⁷

London Jews gave generously to English charitable causes as well.¹⁰⁸ As noted above, in November 1862, the chief rabbi's office issued a printed appeal to the Jewish community on behalf of the unemployed in the country's cotton manufacturing districts.¹⁰⁹ Contributions were also made to the various hospital funds collected each year. In particular "[o]ne Sunday each June was 'Hospital Sunday,' when every synagogue competed to raise funds for London hospitals."¹¹⁰ In 1874, the chief rabbi's office issued an "Order of Services to be used in the Synagogues of London on the occasion of making

106 *JC*, 16 May 1879.

107 *Ibid.*, 8 November 1844.

108 Christian Englishmen also gave generously of their time and money to Jewish causes, regularly contributing to Jewish charitable dinners. For example, Lord Mayor of London John Carter, a gentile, chaired the Jews' Orphan Asylum annual dinner in 1859. "In a most eloquent appeal he exhorted all present to contribute liberally in forwarding the aims of the society, and thereby to prove to the world that charity was not of one, but of all religions. . . . [T]he subscriptions [on this occasion] far exceeded all former occasions, and amounted to upwards of £1,800." *Times*, 9 March 1859, 5.

109 CR, copy letter book, 24 November 1862, ACC 2805/1/1/7, LMA. A copy of this circular also accompanied a letter to the editor in *Times*, 5 December 1862, 6.

110 Black, *Social Politics*, 161. See pp. 158–67 for a discussion of the various approaches taken by Jewish communal charities to health and health care. See also Appendix 2 below under heading "Hospitals Having Special Jewish Wards."

collections for the 'Metropolitan Hospital Sunday Fund.'" The chief rabbi's office also maintained lists of subscribers to the fund.¹¹¹

Throughout the period of 1840 to 1880, the Jewish religious imperative of *zedakah* continued to be observed by the Jews of London. As has been shown above, some of their charitable activities were increasingly cloaked in English garb, making use of terms such as "deserving" and "respectable" poor, establishing visitation committees, and educating the poor to "their station in life." Jewish law, in sharp contrast to mid-Victorian, post-Enlightenment philanthropic notions of the "deserving" or "respectable" poor, recognizes no such categories. Clearly, some London Jewish charitable organizations—in particular the Jewish Board of Guardians, but others as well—adopted or adapted Victorian notions regarding charity and philanthropy into their organizational actions and philosophies. Yet, they still maintained elements of Jewish giving or *zedakah*. In so doing, they helped create a new hybrid identity for themselves, and for the recipients of their largesse, that of Anglo-Jewry. This is particularly noticeable in our period, 1840–1880, as elements of the Jewish community came into their own financially and were able to give more strategically and regularly than before.

111 CR, copy letter book, 1872–74, ACC 2805/1/1/13, LMA. See also CR, copy letter book, 1875–76, ACC 2805/1/1/15, LMA. On July 7, 1876, Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler wrote, "To the Rt. Honorable the Lord Mayor. My Lord I have much pleasure in enclosing cheques for £630.16.2 being the total of the collections made in the Metropolitan Synagogues under my pastoral charge in aid of the Hospital Sunday Fund." For more on the fund and donors, see also ACC 2805/1/1/16.

Chapter Four

Anglo-Jewry on the Move: Demographic, Political, Social, and Economic Change

Anglo-Jewish Population in the Nineteenth Century

In 1815, the Jewish population of England was roughly 25,000, of whom at least 16,500 resided in London. By 1851, the population had increased by 40 percent to approximately 35,000 with 18,000 to 20,000 of this number living in London. Both natural increase and immigration fueled this expansion. Of those who lived in London in 1851, two-thirds (approximately 12,000) lived on the eastern side of the City or in Whitechapel, while the remaining third (6,000 to 7,000) lived primarily in Westminster and Marylebone (the West End of the time), although there was a small group who lived south of the Thames.¹

Between the end of the Napoleonic wars and the early 1860s, two to three hundred Jewish immigrants arrived each year from central and Western Europe. Starting in the 1860s the number of Jewish immigrants increased to three or four hundred per year, most coming from eastern Europe. By the early 1870s the number rose to nearly a thousand new Jewish

1 Lipman, "The Age of Emancipation," 70; Lipman, *Social History of the Jews*, 5; Lipman, "Survey of Anglo-Jewry," 174, 186. Lipman extrapolated his figures from three sources: Board of Deputies of British Jews statistics for 1852–53; the National Census of Worship of 1851; and information provided in tables in the *Jewish Chronicle* of July 23, 1847.

arrivals each year, still predominantly from eastern Europe.² The increased movement of eastern European Jews was caused by long-term deteriorating economic and social conditions coupled with periodic outbreaks of famine, disease, and anti-Jewish rioting.³ Among the factors drawing these emigrants to England were its relative openness to immigration, economic possibilities, and the presence of an established Jewish community.

England's Jewish population is estimated to have grown to 65,000 by 1880.⁴ Roughly two-thirds of this number lived in London (43,333 in 1880). The total population of England and Wales in 1881 was 25,974,105; thus, the Anglo-Jewish population, despite its tremendous increase of more than 125 percent since 1815, accounted for substantially less than 1 percent of the English population.⁵

Anglo-Jewish Occupations: 1850

The vast majority of early nineteenth-century English Jews were poor, although this would change somewhat as the century progressed. Occupationally, they were primarily street traders, hawkers, and, in the countryside, peddlers. Additionally, some were paupers, working infrequently, while others worked steadily but were still forced to rely upon periodic assistance. "Over them towered a thin, opulent stratum of great merchants and financiers. . . . [This stratum was composed of some Sephardim and a] class of industrious Ashkenazic merchants, Dutch and German by origin [whose] great opportunities came during the French

2 Lipman, "The Age of Emancipation," 70. See also Williams, "East and West," 17. Williams notes that Manchester's pattern of Jewish immigration differed from that of London (described above). "Eastern European settlement in Manchester [began] on a small scale . . . in the 1840s . . . and on a larger scale in the 1860s. . ." Manchester Jewry increased from 1,100 in 1851 to 7,000 in 1875. More than half of the 1875 population were from Eastern Europe" (Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry*, vii).

3 There was famine in Lithuania (1866–69), cholera in Poland (1869, 1870), and anti-Jewish riots in Odessa in 1871. Lipman, "The Age of Emancipation," 70.

4 Lipman, *Social History of the Jews*, 162. Lipman subsequently lowered his estimate to 60,000 for 1880–81 (Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain*, 14). See also Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics*, 11. Jacobs gives figures that are slightly higher, estimating London's Jewish population at 46,000 in 1882 (which would mean 69,000 Jews in England).

5 See census figures at *A Vision of Britain through Time*, accessed November 9, 2017, <http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/census/>. By 1911, the Jewish population of Britain had soared to around 300,000. This was still less than 1 percent of the total English and Welsh population of 36,075,269. Most of this increase can be attributed to post-1880 immigration from eastern Europe.

wars between 1793 and 1815, when first the Goldsmids and then Nathan Meyer Rothschild made fortunes in government finance.”⁶

By mid-century a number of the poorer Jews of the earlier decades had accumulated enough capital to become small shop owners and merchants, moving into the lower-middle classes. While they now operated from permanent premises, they frequently still dealt in the same goods they had sold while itinerant. Although the number of middle-class Jews increased considerably by the 1850’s (to about 30 percent of the Jewish population) the majority of London’s (and England’s) Jews still ranked among the poor. The following breakdown summarizes the class categories and percentages in each for London Jewry around 1850:

5% upper and upper middle class	1,000 [No. of people]
30% remainder of middle class	6,000
35–40% lower class not on relief	7–8,000
25–30% poor on occasional or regular relief	5–6,000 ⁷

Thus, by 1850, approximately one-third of London Jewry could be counted among the middle and upper classes, while two-thirds ranked in the lower classes. Although the Jewish middle class had grown significantly since the previous century, at least 25 percent of the Jewish population still required some form of relief during the year.

Income levels, both within and between these classes, varied quite widely, as they did within the general English population. As a general rule, those individuals who could claim an annual income of £1,000 or more were counted as upper-middle or upper class. Those who earned between £100 and £999 per annum were ranked in the middle classes. As with the population at large, those in the Jewish middle classes were members of the “servant-keeping classes,” expected to employ at least one servant.⁸ Those in the lower and pauper classes annually earned between £1 and £99. Obviously, there would have been considerable social and economic blending at the class margins. The upper-working class and the lower-middle class, therefore, would have been fairly close in income, possibly even residing in similar housing, albeit in different neighborhoods. It is likely, however, that a lower-middle-class family, unlike one of the working class, would have had a servant, at least part time, to assist in the home. The

6 Lloyd Gartner, “Emancipation, Social Change and Communal Reconstruction in Anglo-Jewry, 1789–1881,” *American Academy for Jewish Research, Proceedings* 54 (1987): 76.

7 Lipman, “Structure of London Jewry,” 258.

8 Lipman extrapolates these class-to-income figures from Booth’s survey of *London Life and Labour*. Lipman, “The Rise of Jewish Suburbia,” 79.

upper-middle class and the lower-upper class would also have been close in income, although potentially differentiated by residential location, family connections, and social status.

Within the middle classes there was also quite a bit of variation, between those who barely scraped by on one hundred pounds per year and those who were comfortably well off (particularly if they did not have many children) with upwards of five hundred pounds per year. As a general rule of thumb:

Mrs. Beeton in 1861 suggests that a widow or spinster with £100 per annum would have one servant; a family with £150 to £300 per annum one whole time cook-general; a family with £500 per annum a cook and a maid; with £750 a cook, a maid, and a boy; and with £1,000 a year a cook, two maids, and a man.⁹

This brief discussion has sketched the outlines of Jewish demographics and class membership in England in general. What follows are the particulars as they relate to Anglo-Jewish changes and developments in occupations and residential patterns from the 1840s to 1880.

One quick, although admittedly unscientific, method of determining areas of lower-upper-class and middle-class Jewish occupational concentration for the early part of this period is to count the Jewish surnames listed in the commercial section of the *London Post Office Directory* for 1841. However, it should be noted that the directory was neither exclusively upper-lower nor middle class. For example, all the following had entries in the directory: N. M. Rothschild & Sons, Merchants at 3 New Court, St. Swithin's Lane; L. N. de Rothschild, Austrian Consul General, 2 New Court, St. Swithin's Lane; Francis Henry Goldsmid, Barrister, 5 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn; and Aaron Goldsmid, Stockbroker, 10 Warnford Ct., Throgmorton Street.

The directory is of interest for two reasons. It provides a rough enumeration of London Jewish commercial activity for this year and also gives the addresses and specific occupations of each listed individual. The address list indicates that the majority of Jewish commercial activity was still centered in the east side of Westminster, in sections of the City of London, and in the near East End. Table 4.1 gives the occupations of Jews listed in the directory in order of numerical significance, and Table 4.1a provides a brief sample of entries by Jewish surname as they appear in the postal directory. Of the roughly twelve hundred Jewish surnames found therein, the largest single group consists of merchants, followed by watchmakers, jewelers, and those

9 Quoted in *ibid.*

involved in related trades. Fruiterers, warehousemen, and furriers also rank numerically. Also of note are the tailors, who account for a much smaller segment of Jewish commercial activity than they would toward the end of the nineteenth century. The tailors in this earlier period of bespoke clothing (that is, prior to the introduction of mass-produced ready-to-wear) were likely skilled, converting second-hand clothes into wearable garments, performing alterations, and, of course, creating new garments to order.¹⁰

Henry Mayhew provided a rather more scientific discussion of the commercial activities of mid-century London Jewry.¹¹ He noted that lower-class London Jewry had for the most part moved out of street trading by the early 1860s, displaced by Irish newcomers willing to work longer hours and expecting nothing in the way of creature comforts (such as shoes, socks, the occasional evening's entertainment, and so forth). This is not to say that the Irish were "not a more persevering or more skillful body of street-sellers, but simply . . . a more *starving* body."¹² As noted above, by this period many of the street-trading Jews (although certainly not all) had moved slightly higher on the economic ladder, into small premises from which they sold, wholesale and/or retail, the goods they formerly sold from street stalls or carried on their backs. Describing the activities in these small shops Mayhew wrote that

[t]he wholesale trades in foreign commodities which are now principally or solely in the hands of the Jews, often as importers and exporters are, watches and jewels, sponges—fruits, especially green fruits, such as oranges, lemons, grapes, walnuts, cocoa-nuts, & c., and dates among dried fruits—shells, tortoises, parrots and foreign birds, curiosities, ostrich feathers, snuffs, cigars, and pipes. . . .¹³

Those Jews who remained in the street trades were "now in sponges, spectacles, combs, pencils, accordions, cakes, sweetmeats, drugs, and fruits of

10 The late-century increase of Jews in the tailoring trades is due to several factors. With the introduction of the sewing machine in the 1860s, a vast new market for cheap ready-made clothes emerged. The move away from custom tailoring generated many low-paying jobs for unskilled immigrants at the same time that it signaled the end of the old clothes trade in all but a few, mostly rural, areas. Tailoring in this later period (from the 1880s) was one of the most notorious of the London sweated trades. For more on the later tailoring trades, see Lloyd P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England*, 81–93.

11 Mayhew, *London Labour*. *London Labour*, based on a series of newspaper articles first written by Mayhew in 1849 and 1850, was first issued in 1851.

12 *Ibid.*, 118.

13 *Ibid.* This is in full accord with the commercial information provided in the London postal directory for 1841.

all kinds; but, in all these trades, unless perhaps in drugs, they [were] a minority compared with the 'Christian' street-sellers."¹⁴

Most Jewish commercial activity took place in the East End, although it spilled over into sections of Westminster and the City. Shopkeepers, warehousemen, and manufacturers operated in Houndsditch, Aldgate, and the Minories. Wholesale fruiterers conducted business in Duke's Place and on Pudding Lane, while lower-status jewelers "(some of whom deal[t] with the first shops) [were] also at the East-end, about Whitechapel, Bevis-marks, and Houndsditch. . . . Hebrew dealers in second-hand wares generally, [were] located about Petticoat-lane. . . ."¹⁵ Jewish wholesalers of "foreign birds and shells, and . . . the many foreign things known as 'curiosities,'" were for the most part located in East Smithfield, Ratcliffe Highway, and the Shadwell High Street. These were the purveyors of the various gewgaws that crowded middle and upper class Victorian homes.¹⁶

London Jews manufactured cigars, pencils, and sealing wax, and were the "wholesale importers of sponge, bristles and toys, the dealers in quills and in 'looking-glasses.'" Many of these wholesalers operated out of "large private-looking houses . . . in such parts as Maunsell-street [sic], Great Prescott-street, Great Ailie-street [sic], Leman-street, and other parts of the eastern quarter known as Goodman's-fields." Jews also served as slopsellers, while "a few Jews [also kept] boarding-houses for sailors in Shadwell and Wapping."¹⁷ The slopsellers specialized in low-end new and second-hand clothing, and other goods of use to sailors, maintaining premises close by London's docks.

It should be noted that Mayhew, despite the preceding rational discussion of Jewish commercial activity, was still very much a man of his times. As part of his discussion of Jewish occupations, he noted that "Jews are perhaps the most money-loving people in all England," and that Jewish old

14 Ibid., 119.

15 Ibid., 118.

16 Ibid. See also Lipman, "Trends in Anglo-Jewish Occupations," 217n23 (referencing Paul Emden, *Jews of Britain*, 240). Lipman notes that Shell Oil has its origins in this trade. "Marcus Samuel founded in 1831 the firm dealing in shells, shell-covered boxes and painted shells from the Pacific and Indian Oceans. He was the father of the first Viscount Bearsted, who gave the name of the article in which his father dealt to the great oil combine which he founded."

17 Mayhew, *London Labour*, 118. See also James Elmes, *A Topographical Dictionary of London and Its Environs* (London: Whittaker, Treacher and Arnot, 1831), 214. "GOODMAN'S-FIELDS, *Whitechapel*, is a large district situated eastward of the Minories, westward of Church-lane, northward of Rosemary-lane, and southward of Whitechapel High-street. It derives its name from a farmer of that name, who held it under the nunnery of the Minoresses, whose convent gave name to the Minories, where it stood."

clothes men (whose numbers were dwindling as he wrote) had as “their principal characteristic . . . extreme love of money. . . .”¹⁸

The Anglo-Jewish middle class ran the gamut from the large manufacturers and merchants of the upper-middle class to the small lower-middle-class suppliers of the street traders, frequently a scant level above their clientele on the economic ladder. The larger manufacturers produced “sticks, umbrellas, shoes, pins and needles, carpets, macaroni and vermicelli, candles, cigars, sealing-wax, pencils, and gas fittings . . . [while the large] wholesale merchants and warehousemen, import[ed] oranges, lemons, nuts of all kinds, furs, jewelry, toys, sponges, shells, snuff and miscellaneous ‘curios’ from abroad.”¹⁹ Later, with the growth of the ready-made clothing trade, the upper-middle class also opened “ready-made clothing establishments, notably those of Moses & Co., and of Hyam. . . .”²⁰ Those in the upper-middle class also stocked items offered by their lower-status brethren, but generally of finer quality. Others proffered identical items, but from more attractive premises, or they kept considerably larger inventories on hand. Included among the upper-middle class who dealt in the same items as the lower-middle class and some street traders were “superior retail Jew [sic] fruiterers—some of whose shops [were] remarkable for the beauty of their fruit . . . in Cheapside, Oxford-street, Piccadilly, and most of all in Covent-garden market . . . [and also] the wealthier goldsmiths and watchmakers [who], like other tradesmen of the class, [had] their shops in the superior thoroughfares.”²¹

By mid-century, the upper-middle class, and some within the upper class as well, encompassed a rather small group of Jewish professionals including four barristers, a number of physicians, and dentists as well.²² Jewish physi-

18 Mayhew, *London Labour*, 120–21. Although Mayhew was describing the Jewish poor, his views confirm that at least some of the Jewish elites' concern over English society's perception of their "Englishness" was warranted.

19 Lipman, *Social History of the Jews*, 28.

20 Ibid. E. Moses and Son (High Street, Aldgate), advertised their inexpensive clothing through “booklets of doggerel verse; they [were] immortalized by Thackeray's poem which [noted that] ‘the poor are not done and the rich are not fleeced by E. Moses and Son’ and their ‘cloth was first-rate, and the fit such a one as only is furnished by Moses and Son.’” See also Lipman, “The Age of Emancipation,” 75. Benjamin Hyam began his extensive retail operations in Manchester. He moved his headquarters to London in the 1850s, where he already operated several West End clothing shops. And see Williams, *The Making of Manchester Jewry*, 115–16, 240. Hyam's stores were really proto-department stores.

21 Lipman, *Social History of the Jews*, 28.

22 This ad for dental services appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1864. “Mr. Murray Davis, Surgeon-Dentist, Licentiate in Dental Surgery, Royal College of Surgeons, England, 13, Piccadilly, has a principle entirely his own of fixing ARTIFICIAL TEETH, whereby

cians were not new to the profession, having practiced in England from the late seventeenth century.²³ Jewish solicitors, however, were of somewhat more recent origin, first practicing in the 1770s. There were, however, no Jewish barristers until the nineteenth century. In 1833 Francis Henry Goldsmid became the first professing Jew to become a barrister.²⁴ He was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn, one of the four London Inns of Court, after the members voted to allow him to omit, at his own request, the phrase "upon the true faith of a Christian" from the oath of admission. The next Jewish barrister was not called to the bar until 1842, when John Simon became a member of the Middle Temple.²⁵ Jacob Waley was also called to the bar that year.²⁶

without the slightest pain or the extraction of stumps, a single Tooth to a Complete Set, resembling accurately the natural teeth, can be adjusted with security and permanent comfort. Children's teeth regulated without causing any pain. Attendance ten till five." *JC*, 1 January 1864.

- 23 Their numbers included "Abraham de Mercado arrived c. 1655; Joseph Mendes Bravo arrived c. 1675; Ephraim Isaac Abendana, in Cambridge and Oxford (d. 1710), and his brother Jacob (1630–95); David Nieto, in London (c. 1710); Jacob de Castro Sarmento, in London (1692–1762); Fernando Mendez (d. 1724); Isaac de Sequera Samuda (b. 1721); Israel Lyons (1739–75); Samuel Nunez (c. 1750); Joseph Hart Myers (1758–1823); Abraham Nonski (c. 1785; writer on vaccination); the three Schombergs (Isaac, d. 1781; Meir Löw, d. 1761; and Ralph, d. 1792); Isaac Henriques Sequera (1738–1816); Abraham van Oven (d. 1778); Joshua van Oven (1766–1838); Solomon de Leon (c. 1775); George Gompertz Levisohn (d. 1797); Elias Friedberg; and a Doctor Jeremias (c. 1775)." *JE* (1906), s.v. "Medicine," accessed November 9, 2017, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com>.
- 24 See Phyllis S. Lachs, "A Study of a Professional Elite: Anglo-Jewish Barristers in the Nineteenth Century," *Jewish Social Studies* 44, no. 2 (Spring 1982). Lachs notes that university training was not required to become a barrister. Interested individuals applied for admission to an inn, attended a specified number of dinners over the course of three years and a series of lectures, or took a public exam in lieu of the lectures. For information on the growth of the small Anglo-Jewish professional class, 1800–80, see Pollins, *Economic History*, 114–15. For the period 1890–1990 see John Cooper, *Pride versus Prejudice*.
- 25 *The Times* reprinted the following note from the *Voice of Jacob*: "A few day ago a gentleman of the Jewish persuasion was called to the bar by the Hon. Society of the Middle Temple. The gentleman alluded to is Mr. J. Simon, LL.B . . . the new-made barrister had to be sworn on the Old Testament." *VJ*, 17 November 1842, 3. See also Alderman, *Jewish Community*, 31–33. Sir John Simon (1818–97) was born in Jamaica and came to England in the early 1830s. He was an advocate of emancipation, a member of the West London Synagogue of British Jews, and a Liberal MP for Dewsbury from 1868–88. He represented Jewish "interests" in Parliament and organized several Mansion House meetings to protest the mistreatment of Jews in Russia and elsewhere.
- 26 See *Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Waley, Jacob." Jacob Waley (1818–73) was related to Montefiore through marriage. He received his BA at London University in 1839. He was professor of political economics at University College, 1853–66, and first

Subsequently, George Jessel (1847) and Arthur Cohen (1857) became barristers.²⁷ Although the barriers to Jewish admission to the bar fell and their numbers grew during the nineteenth century, their “real arena of success was not England but British possessions abroad, where society was more fluid.”²⁸

Early in the nineteenth century the Jewish upper class mainly concerned itself with merchant and foreign banking, “raising loans for the British and foreign governments.”²⁹ Their numbers included Nathan Meyer Rothschild and Aaron and Benjamin Goldsmid. As the century progressed, the upper class diversified its financial interests, moving into deposit banking, insurance, and other areas of finance. They also continued to hold berths at the stock exchange and to work as brokers. Sir David Salomons, among his many other activities, was a founder of Westminster Bank. Moses Montefiore was a founder and director of the Provincial Bank of Ireland. With his brother-in-law, Nathan Meyer Rothschild, he also founded the Alliance Insurance Company.³⁰ Others, including Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, helped finance railway construction in England.³¹

Despite the commercial and occupational diversity exhibited by Anglo-Jewry, there were many English occupational areas in which they were not active. Few Jews were involved in agriculture, the largest occupational group

president of the Anglo-Jewish Association, founded in 1871. He was instrumental in the founding of the United Synagogue and active in the Board of Guardians.

- 27 Sir George Jessel (1824–83) became queen’s counsel in 1865. He was a Liberal MP for Dover, 1868–73, and was appointed solicitor-general in 1871. He had been knighted the previous year. In 1873, he was appointed master of the rolls, becoming England’s first Jewish high court judge. Like Jacob Waley he received his early education at Neumegen’s school in Kew. He was an early supporter of Jews’ College and contributed time as well as money to various communal institutions. For more on Jessel, see Israel Finestein, “Sir George Jessel, 1824–1833,” in *Jewish Society*. See also *Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. “Cohen, Arthur”; and Israel Finestein, “Arthur Cohen, Q. C.,” in *Remember the Days*. Arthur Cohen (1829–1914), a nephew of Sir Moses Montefiore, completed his education at Cambridge in 1853, but was prevented by the still required Christological oath from taking his degree. In 1857, he became the first professing Jew to receive a Cambridge degree. He became QC in 1874, and was a Liberal MP for Southwark, 1880–1887. He was vice-president of the Board of Deputies, 1874–1880; and president, 1880–1895.
- 28 Lachs, “Anglo-Jewish Barristers,” 132. It is estimated that there were fifty Jewish solicitors, and thirty barristers practicing in London as of 1880.
- 29 Lipman, “The Age of Emancipation,” 72.
- 30 Montefiore completed these and other business activities by the age of forty (in 1824), at which point he retired from active business involvements to spend the rest of his life in service to the Jewish community. He lived to be one hundred and worked on behalf of the community into his nineties.
- 31 This section is drawn from Lipman, “Trends in Anglo-Jewish Occupations,” 207–9.

in 1851. Nor did they work as miners, building craftsmen, seamen, smiths, ironworkers, railway men, fishermen, or boat builders.³² Jews tended to be drawn to occupations in which they could set their own hours, or ones that allowed them to have their Sabbaths free, could be worked around the Jewish holidays, and could be performed in areas where other Jews also resided. The Jewish concentration in various sales-related occupations was also due to the fact that little start-up capital was needed at the lowest levels, no particular skills were required, and newer immigrants could initially get by, again at the lowest levels (as peddlers or costermongers), with very little English. Another factor leading them to limit their occupational choices may have been their inability to gain a foothold in certain occupations as they were unofficially "closed."

Jewish Disabilities: A Place for Jews in the Political Nation?

The relatively late Jewish entry into certain of the professions, discussed above, as well as into London municipal politics and Parliament, was largely due to residual barriers, legal and/or attitudinal, that remained in place after the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts of 1828 and the passage of Catholic emancipation (1829). Jewish emancipation was delayed for several reasons. A legally required Christological oath kept professing Jews from Parliament until 1858.³³ However, most parliamentary opponents of emancipation based their refusal to allow changes in the oath on their moral understanding of the English constitution, rather than on strictly legal grounds. They believed that the constitution's essence was Christian and as such, Jews could not rightfully enter Parliament without fundamentally and irrevocably altering the nature of the constitution and of England. Thus, the oath had to be kept (and safeguarded) because the very nature of English identity was at stake.

In 1835, David Salomons was elected the first Jewish sheriff of London and the first Jewish alderman of Aldgate Ward. In response, Parliament

32 Chris Cook, *The Longman Companion to Britain in the Nineteenth Century, 1815–1914* (London: Longman, 1999), 149–50. These occupations are drawn from the census of 1851 and listed as "Principal Occupation Groups in Britain in 1851 in Order of Size." Obviously, the occasional Jew would have been drawn to these various occupations, but none attracted any measurable number of Jews.

33 Although they were barred from Parliament, Jews had been legally permitted to vote in Parliamentary elections since 1835 after 7 & 8 William III, cap. 27 (passed 1830) was amended. In reality, in many areas Jews, who were otherwise qualified as electors, had been voting in local and national elections for decades.

passed the Sheriff's Declaration Bill to permit professing Jews to hold the office of sheriff. However, it did not address the more general issue of the Christological oath required of municipal office holders. As a result, Salomons was unable to take up his aldermanic duties. In 1841, an effort was made to pass a Jews' declaration bill that would have allowed English Jews to hold municipal office without making the declaration "upon the true faith of a Christian." The bill failed to pass, but Salomons was undeterred. In essence, he made a decision to add standing for, and holding, political office to his many other "occupational" activities. He was elected alderman of Portsoken Ward in 1844, and of Cordwainer's Ward in 1847. However, he was not able to take office until 1847. He also stood as an unsuccessful candidate for Parliament from Old Shoreham in 1837, from Maidstone in 1841, and from Greenwich in 1847. It was not until 1851 that he was successful in his efforts, being returned as a Liberal MP for Greenwich. He presented himself at Parliament but refused to take the Christological oath:

Taking his seat in the House, he was ordered to withdraw after having been heard in defense of his unprecedented action, and was subsequently fined £500 for illegally voting. The Greenwich constituency . . . reelected him again and again; but it was not until the alteration of the Parliamentary oath in 1858 . . . that he was enabled to take his seat without further demur in 1859, one year after Baron Lionel de Rothschild had taken his oath and his seat as M. P. for the city of London.³⁴

The minute details of the struggle for emancipation are not the focus here. Of more interest is that the London electorate, in repeatedly returning Salomons and Rothschild to Parliament despite their inability to take their seats, demonstrated their growing acceptance of Jews as Englishmen and as legitimate representatives to the nation's highest political body.³⁵

34 For quote and additional information, see section "Salomons" in *JE* (1906), s.v. "Sir David Salomons, Bart.," by Joseph Jacobs, Goodman Lipkind, and Isidore Harris, accessed November 17, 2017, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com>.

35 Lionel de Rothschild (son of Nathan Meyer Rothschild) was first elected to Parliament in July 1847 as a Liberal MP for the City of London. He was elected again in 1849 (a by-election), 1852, 1854, and twice in 1857. All told, Rothschild was elected six times before finally being seated in Parliament in 1858. He was also a member of the Board of Deputies and a lifelong supporter of Jewish charities. See Gilam, *Emancipation of the Jews*, 96–123. For more on Rothschild, see *Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Rothschild, Lionel Nathan de (1808–1879)"; and section "Rothschilds" in *JE* (1906), s.v. "Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, Baron," accessed November 9, 2017, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com>.

Rothschild's and Salomons's repeated reelections also eventually forced a majority in the House of Commons to the realization that the only way to maintain an exclusively Christian Parliament was to steadfastly ignore the expressed wishes of segments of London's electorate, something the Commons was increasingly less comfortable doing. The willingness of the London electorate to choose Jewish representatives is an interesting development in light of the centuries-long hostility to Jewish commercial activity and interests exhibited by the City's commercial and financial groups. It should be remembered that the Freedom of the City had only been recently granted (1832) to professing Jews, and that their numbers had been limited on the stock exchange.

Of related interest are some of the statements made during the debate over the proposed Jews' Declaration Bill of 1841. L. Hodges stated that "[t]he Jews had been too long excluded from [civil] office . . . and he thought it would be no more than a tardy act of justice to remove the obstacle to their acceptance of municipal appointments. . . . The present time . . . was one in which it was only wise policy to unite all parties in one firm bond of attachment to our country and its institutions, by giving to all an equal interest in maintaining them."³⁶

Sir R. H. Ingles responded, expressing his concern that such an act would "unchristianiz[e] England by expunging from the statute book that declaration, which had . . . limited all offices in England to persons professing Christianity."³⁷ Continuing in this vein Ingles noted that he viewed Jews as Jews and not as Englishmen since "the Jew of Germany, of Portugal, and of England, derived his character not from the accidental spot on which he happened to be born, but from his parents and from his creed. He was a member not of the great German or English community, but of a people dispersed over every country on the face of the globe." Ingles further stated that he "considered this bill as a kindred step to the admission into the house of Parsees and of Brahmins." He believed the Jews, unlike the Huguenots, were unassimilable into "the great mass of the English community." The Jews had not been invited to reenter England yet had still enjoyed "Christian hospitality and Christian protection. . . . They were entitled at present to all the rights of property, but not to those of power."³⁸ He concluded his remarks by stating that "[o]ne of these two religions must be

36 *Times*, 11 March 1841, 3–4.

37 Ingles's remarks were reported in *ibid.*

38 Did he really mean to imply that property ownership and access to power in England were not integrally linked?

false,” and he questioned whether the House of Commons was prepared to admit that the false one was Christianity.

Next, Lord John Russell entered the fray. Russell noted that Ingles’s final point regarding the “true” religion was beyond the reach of this debate. If it were the issue, then “how could Catholics who did not subscribe to Protestant doctrine hold office?” He noted that for this reason discussions of the “true” religion had been deliberately left out of the debate over Catholic emancipation. In that instance opponents to emancipation claimed “Roman Catholics had another allegiance besides that which they professed to the Sovereign of this country. . . . That ground however was overruled.” In the case of the Jews, no such argument had been made.³⁹ Thus the only “ground upon which to base an objection [was] the bare and naked principle of intolerance.” Russell concluded his remarks by stating that “as regarded offices which were of a purely civil nature, he did not see what business or right the house had to inquire into the religious opinions of any person . . . provided such person . . . was duly qualified to perform the duties attached to the office. . . .”⁴⁰

The following month William Gladstone (then vice-president of the Board of Trade, and still a Tory) took up the cudgels in defense of the constitution. He announced to the Commons that he opposed the Jews’ Declaration Bill of 1841 because it was impossible to “draw a broad line of principle between a bill to admit Jews to municipal offices and one to permit them to hold other offices, including seats in Parliament.” He noted that “his reason for opposing the bill was this—that the profession of the Jews was of itself in the nature of a disqualification for legislative office in a country where Christianity was interwoven with the institutions of the state.” He went on to state that England’s constitution was a Christian constitution and that passage of this bill would “unchristianize” the constitution, thus, presumably, forever changing the nature of the British state and Englishness. Gladstone concluded his remarks, stating that the political emancipation of Catholics and English Dissenters had not presented as great a threat to the existence of the state because “a bond of common Christianity united them all together.” This was an interesting view, given long-held English

39 This is an interesting statement, particularly in light of the fact that later in the century Jews were increasingly to find themselves considered part of an alien nation, unassimilable where ever they lived.

40 *Times*, 11 March 1841, 3–4. Thomas Law Hodges was the parliamentary member from Kent West. For more on Law Hodges, see “The History of Parliament,” accessed November 9, 2017, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1820-1832/member/hodges-thomas-1776-1857>.

hostility to Catholicism and its adherents' supposed "loyalty" to the pope and to Catholic nations over the fealty they owed the British government. One wonders how strong this "bond of common Christianity" appeared to most Protestant Englishmen.

Gladstone's specific rationale for keeping Jews from Parliament was that, in the past, this body had been called upon to determine "the form of the state religion [and to regulate the] public worship of the whole nation." If such a need arose again where would Britain be with Jews in Parliament ruling on religious matters? Having already admitted Dissenters and Catholics, Parliament would be disqualified "from the performance of any duties connected with religion, and . . . by an easy transition . . . [it would be possible] to overturn the very principles upon which the national religion was based."⁴¹ Apparently, then, Jewish municipal emancipation would be the straw that broke the Church of England's back.

Responding to Gladstone, Thomas Macaulay gleefully waded into the fray, noting that he did not think Jews should be denied municipal office on the grounds that they might someday "obtain admission to the national Legislature." He then addressed Ingles's earlier concerns regarding the need to determine the "true" faith. He noted that "Catholics and Protestants were in direct opposition to each other—they could not both be right. The Unitarians and Trinitarians were opposed to each other, they could not both be right. He thought that it would be inferred that there was a great deal of false religion in that house."

Returning to Gladstone's remarks, Macaulay dismissed as absurd the notion that the admission of Jewish parliamentarians would irrevocably harm the Christian religious interests of the state. "Admitting, for argument's sake, that the Jews obtained seats in that house . . . [i]t was ridiculous to suppose that they would endeavour to abolish the Scotch national church and establish Judaism in its place." He also responded to a comment made earlier by Gladstone to the effect that "the Jews had no right to complain—that they laboured under no particular hardships." Macaulay said "[h]e would ask the hon. member . . . would he not consider that he was subjected to a very great practical grievance if he were excluded from, and

41 *Times*, 1 April 1841, 3. See also Gilam, *Emancipation of the Jews*, 96. By 1847, Gladstone's views had changed. "To the amazement of the House, Gladstone announced on December 16 that he had changed his mind and would support the admission of Jews to Parliament." His earlier stance was one of religious conviction. The cause of his change of heart is not clear. It is certainly possible that he had a religious epiphany on the road to Downing Street, but it is equally possible that his epiphany was political in nature.

considered incapable to hold, any civil office in consequence of his peculiar religious opinions?”⁴²

A final observation on Macaulay’s toleration of Jews within the political nation should be made. Keeping in mind the distinction drawn in chapter one, above, between the sub-rosa existence of either a “political contract” or a “social contract” of some sort, it is interesting to note that Macaulay clearly had no qualms about interacting with, and accepting, Jews at a high political level. However, he had earlier expressed (privately) strong reservations about socializing with them. In a letter to his sister in 1831, he described a ball he had attended at the Goldsmid’s, writing,

[y]esterday night I went to the Jews. . . . There was a little too much of St. Mary Axe’s (a predominantly Jewish area) about it. . . . Jewesses by dozens, and Jews by scores. . . . I walked home quietly, but it was some time before I could get sleep. The sound of fiddles was in mine ears, and gaudy dresses and black hairs, and Jewish noses were fluctuating up and down mine eyes.⁴³

Between 1830 and 1858, the Commons passed several measures granting varying degrees of political emancipation to English Jews. In every case, these measures died in the House of Lords. As *The Times* editorialized in 1852:

Within the experience of living statesmen the admissibility of Jews to Parliament has been debated no less than fourteen times, and on each occasion the House of Commons has decided in favour of the claim. . . . The question [for the Lords] is, on what ground we can exclude from Parliament, when duly returned, those who are held and treated in all other respects as the equals of those admitted, and who are allowed their own share in the election for this Parliament itself?⁴⁴

Each time the issue was raised it triggered heated debate, both for and against the removal of Jewish disabilities. The political ramifications of Jewish emancipation were of particular significance to the upper echelons of Anglo-Jewry, to later minority groups in England (including, obviously, the Jews), and, on some level, to English self-perceptions. In addition, Jewish emancipation was functionally related to Anglo-Jewish commercial

42 *Times*, 1 April 1841, 3.

43 T. B. Macaulay, June 8, 1831, in *The Letters of Thomas Babington Macaulay*, ed. Thomas Pinney (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 2:34–36. Quoted in Gilam, *Emancipation of the Jews*, 68–69n38. Ellipses in quote are given in Gilam.

44 *Times*, 29 April 1852, 5.

and economic development. Without the removal of Jewish disabilities, a ceiling barring further commercial and social progress would have been reached. This would have stunted the growth of Anglo-Jewry, disrupted (or even, perhaps, reversed) the anglicization of the Jewish community, and frozen the developing communal identity in a political amber. Thus, political emancipation should be viewed as a related part of the commercial, social, and economic growth and integration of the community, and its passage may be interpreted as a measure of success (particularly vis-à-vis the larger society) in these areas.

For some Christian Englishmen, questions regarding Anglo-Jewish identity, and particularly the relative strength of the "Anglo" component of this identity, did not end with the passage of emancipation. In the 1870s, Gladstone questioned Anglo-Jewish communal loyalty and patriotism when it became clear that most Jews opposed his stance on the Eastern Question and the Bulgarian Atrocities.⁴⁵ He questioned no other group's loyalties. Among other things, he stated that "Judaic sympathies beyond as well as within the circle of professed Judaism are now acting on the question of the East."⁴⁶ Obviously, his remarks were directed at Disraeli, as well as at the Jewish voting public.⁴⁷ The point is that his remarks should have been directed at the Tory government's official policy. Gladstone's remarks also make clear his continued view of the centrality of Christianity to Englishness—that is, the unchanged Christian nature of the English nation. It is a virtual certainty that if he publicly voiced this belief, there were others who held to it as well.

Also of note are the different approaches of Gladstone and Disraeli to the Eastern Question. Gladstone's perspective is colored by his notions of Christian morality and directed against a Muslim imperial state.⁴⁸ Disraeli's

45 On Gladstone, Disraeli, the Bulgarian issue, and the Eastern Question generally, see R. W. Seton-Watson, *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question* (London: Cass, 1962); Richard Shannon, *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation, 1876* (London: Nelson, 1963). See also Richard Shannon, *Gladstone*, vol. 2, 1865–1898 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 157–201.

46 *Times*, 14 October 1876, 11.

47 On Disraeli and his much-touted Jewish connection (both self-perceived and as perceived by the English), see the collected essays in Todd M. Endelman and Tony Kushner, eds., *Disraeli's Jewishness* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002). See also Todd M. Endelman, "A Hebrew to the End: The Emergence of Disraeli's Jewishness," in *The Self-Fashioning of Disraeli, 1818–1851*, ed. Charles Richmond and Paul Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 106–30.

48 On Gladstone's Christian beliefs and their connection to his political views, see David W. Bebbington, *William Ewart Gladstone: Faith and Politics in Victorian Britain* (Grand

views, on the other hand, represent a type of *realpolitik*, concerned primarily with his perception of British strategic interests at the time, which mandated defending the integrity of Turkey.⁴⁹ Of further note is the fact that Anglo-Jewish support of Ottoman treatment of the Turkish Jews, and dislike of tsarist policies toward Russian Jews, had no apparent effect on the Anglo-Jewish Liberal voting patterns of the time.

Social and Economic Changes, 1840–1880

The debates surrounding emancipation, particularly as they related to the place of Jews in the political nation at the parliamentary level, did not concern most Anglo-Jews at the time. Economic achievement was a concern of much greater immediacy. As sections of the community prospered they sought to bring the trappings of middle-class respectability into their lives. An indicator of this desire was reflected in the advertising pages of the Anglo-Jewish press from 1841 to 1880. The many ads seeking governesses, as well as those placed by women looking for such positions, are one sign of this change. These ads also demonstrate that there were occupations filled by Jews that did not show up in the general surveys of Jewish trades and occupations (see above) of the time.⁵⁰ The following ads for governesses, or those seeking employment as such, illustrate that a growing Jewish “servant-keeping class” had emerged:

A Governess of the Jewish Faith is wanted in a respectable Family, to take entire charge of Two young Gentlemen and superintend the preparation of their lessons for their Masters. Applications to be addressed M., at the Printers of the *Voice of Jacob*, stating qualifications and references.⁵¹

Daily Governess of the Jewish Persuasion.—Wanted, in a highly respectable family, a young lady possessing superior attainments, to instruct in all the rudimental branches of education; a partial knowledge of French and

Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1993); Peter John Jagger, *Gladstone: The Making of a Christian Politician* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1991); Perry Butler, *Gladstone, Church, State, and Tractarianism: A Study of His Religious Ideas and Attitudes, 1809–1859* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

49 See Edgar Feuchtwanger, “‘Jew Feelings’ and *Realpolitik*: Disraeli and the Making of Foreign and Imperial Policy,” in *Disraeli’s Jewishness*, 180–97.

50 There were even notices placed by Jewish publicans advertising their pubs to the Jewish trade, such as St. James’s Tavern, Duke Street, Aldgate, run by Mr. P. Raphael, after the return of his son to Australia. *JC*, 24 August 1860.

51 *VJ*, 15 October 1841.

Hebrew will be indispensable. Apply for further particulars, with name and address, at the Office of the *Voice of Jacob*, Camomile Street.⁵²

Wanted by a respectable young Woman of the Jewish persuasion, a situation as Preparatory Governess, Companion, Housekeeper, or Lady's Maid, and to make herself generally useful. Satisfactory reference can be given to the Lady whose service she is about leaving.

Apply (if by letter, post-paid,) to A, care of Mr. Varty, Printer, 27, Camomile-street, City.⁵³

As Governess. A Parisian Lady, of the Jewish Faith, wishes to obtain a situation in the family of one of her Co-religionists, either as a Resident or Daily Governess. She undertakes to teach her own Language in its utmost purity; the Rudiments of German; Useful and Ornamental Needle Work. She has, also, sufficient knowledge and practice of the English Language to superintend the preparation of Lessons for a Master in that branch of instruction.

The Lady whom she has recently quitted, and who conducts a Jewish Establishment of the first respectability, would testify satisfactorily to the foregoing, as also to her trustworthiness and desire to oblige.

Address (free) to A.B. 26, Newman-Street, Oxford-Street.⁵⁴

Notices also began to appear regularly soliciting work as maids and servants of all types, presumably another indication of increased ability and desire within the community to fill such positions. The wording of these ads, and those listed above, demonstrate that English class trappings were being adopted, yet specified a preference for placement within the Jewish community:

A Respectable Jewess, wishes for a Situation as Lady's Maid, Upper Nurse, or Needle Woman. Address (pre-paid) S.S., at the Printer's, Camomile-street.⁵⁵

Wanted by a respectable Jewess, a Situation as Lady's Maid, or Needle Woman: she understands Millinery and Dress-making. Direct to A.L., 25, Bermondsey New Road.⁵⁶

52 Ibid., 25 November 1842.

53 Ibid., 24 December 1841.

54 *JC*, 14 May 1847.

55 *VJ*, 10 December 1841.

56 Ibid., 24 December 1841.

A Respectable Jewess wishes for a situation as Housekeeper, Upper Nurse, or Needle Woman, in a regular family, in either of which capacities she feels fully competent to do her duty. Salary is no object, only a comfortable home; likewise understands Hebrew; has no objection to the country; can be well recommended by several of the Committee of the Jewish Ladies' Benevolent Loan and Visiting Society. Address (post-paid) H.D. Jewish Chronicle Office, 132, Houndsditch.⁵⁷

These ads were regularly supplemented by those placed by individuals seeking to employ companions, maids, general servants, and so on:

Wanted, a Servant Of All Work, in a Small Family, either a Jewess, or one who has lived in a Jewish family. Apply at Mr. Valentine's, 6, Shoreditch.⁵⁸

Wanted, a Respectable Jewess of lady-like manners, as Companion to a Lady, and to assist in the direction of household affairs. She must be clever at her needle and well-recommended. Apply at 7, Doughty-street, Mecklenburgh-square, W.C.⁵⁹

Wanted, A Respectable Woman, of the Jewish Persuasion, as General Servant. Must be a good Plain Cook. Age between 30 and 40, and of unexceptionable character. Apply at Mr. Abraham Solomon's, 59, Great Queen-street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.⁶⁰

To Resident Governesses.—Wanted, a Lady, as Companion and Instructress to a young lady just left school. An educated lady essential. Apply by letter in the first instance to O.M. 6., Messrs. Deacon's, Leadenhall-street.⁶¹

Unlike ads for female servants, notices seeking male servants appeared very infrequently.⁶² It may be that there was enough work readily available for young Jewish men—so that they did not need to go into service. It is also possible that there was some sort of Jewish cultural aversion to male service, or to employing male servants, although I have found no evidence to substantiate this theory. Much more common were advertisements seeking male apprentices, and sales help, or soliciting work in such positions:

57 *JC*, 3 January 1845.

58 *Ibid.*, 21 February 1845.

59 *Ibid.*, 22 February 1861.

60 *Ibid.*, 11 June 1852.

61 *Ibid.*, 25 April 1879.

62 By the latter part of the nineteenth century, leaders in the Jewish community considered female service safer and more respectable than factory work.

Wanted to Apprentice a Youth of respectable conexions to a Gentleman of the Jewish persuasion. Address A.M., Deacon's Coffee-house, Walbrook.⁶³

Respectable boys wanted, as apprentices to the Cigar-Making Business.—Apply at Schifs, Brothers, Cigar Warehouse, 6, Allsop's Buildings, Great Dover Road, Borough. No Premiums required.⁶⁴

Wanted, Several Respectable Young Men, as Salesmen. Apply, any Morning at 10 o'clock, to L. Hyam and Co., Merchant-Tailors, Clothiers, and Outfitters, 86, Oxford-street, London.⁶⁵

A Young Man (a native of Poland) wishes for an Engagement in a wholesale or retail business. Knows town well, and is willing to make himself useful. Is acquainted with German and English. Would also be willing to give instruction in Hebrew and German. Undeniable references can be given. Address M.H., Jewish Chronicle office.⁶⁶

Those soliciting work were also not above appealing to the religious sensibilities of their brethren:

A Respectable young married man, just left a City firm having had several offers from Christian Warehousemen, was obliged to decline same on account of Saturday. As his circumstances don't allow him to resist such proposals much longer, he takes this opportunity of applying to Jewish Gentlemen for a Situation as Clerk or Traveller. Thoroughly understands English, Bookkeeping, several foreign languages. Can produce the highest references, and requires a very moderate salary. Address M.T., Mr. Haes, 53, Mansell street.⁶⁷

Notices seeking to fill positions in the provincial Jewish communities also appeared. Since London contained the country's largest Jewish community, as well as its central religious and political organizations, it made sense to advertise in the *Jewish Chronicle*, which, although based in London, increasingly came to be viewed as Anglo-Jewry's newspaper of record:

Wanted for the Manchester Hebrew Congregation, a married man under forty years of age as שוחט (*shohet*) he will be required to officiate as קוּן

63 *VJ*, 7 January 1842.

64 *JC*, 19 September 1845.

65 *Ibid.*, 21 June 1850.

66 *Ibid.*, 21 June 1861.

67 *Ibid.*, 25 January 1867.

(*hazzan*, “cantor”) and שמש (*shamash*, “beadle”). Testimonials as to character and ability [with the salary required] to be forwarded to Mr. B. Hyam, President, Synagogue Chambers.⁶⁸

Wanted young Men of respectability, as Assistants, in a Tailoring and Outfitting Establishment in Liverpool. Apply by letter, pre-paid, stating particulars, & c. to Messrs. B. Hyam & Co. 63, Lord Street, Liverpool.⁶⁹

Wanted, A Respectable Young Man, as an Assistant, also a Youth, as an Apprentice, at L. Ahlborn and Co.’s Haberdashery, Toy, and Fancy Establishment, Liverpool.⁷⁰

Wanted, A Married or Single Man (of the Jewish faith), of first-rate abilities, to take the Management of a Bespoke and Ready-made Clothes’ Business, in a Country Town, where a Cutter is kept. None need apply who are not experienced Salesmen. Apply to Mr. Jones, 13, Paragon, New Kent-road, between 11 and 12 in the Morning, or 6 and 8 in the Evening.⁷¹

As the community grew and prospered the need for short-term and long-term lodgings for businessmen and travelers also increased. Some of these establishments provided for the holiday and dietary requirements of their Jewish guests, and they also appealed to their evolving class sensibilities. Of particular note in this area are the establishments that provided Passover accommodations. Such accommodations appealed to those men who commuted to the city from more suburban areas of London for work during the holiday. These accommodations also would have appealed to families with disposable income seeking to remain in London during the holiday and wishing to spare themselves the extensive work involved in religiously preparing a home for the Passover holidays, as well as preparing the religiously required elaborate holiday meals:

Mr. Levin’s Boarding and Lodging House and Dining Rooms, 24, Bury Street, St. Mary Axe. The best Accommodation and Convenience to Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jewish Persuasion continues to be afforded at Mr. Levin’s Boarding House. An Ordinary every Day at One and Two o’Clock. Dinners served till Six, at the house, and sent out at a moderate charge.

68 Ibid., 18 October 1844. Brackets are contained in the original; parenthetical notes are mine. This may well be the Benjamin Hyam of ready-made clothing fame.

69 Ibid., 8 November 1844.

70 Ibid., 21 June 1850.

71 Ibid., 18 June 1852.

Mr. Levin's terms for Dining and Boarding with him during the approaching Passover, will be found very reasonable.

N.B. There is also a separate Smoking Room.⁷²

Accommodation During פסח [Passover] at Hadkins' Boarding Establishment, 37, Mansell-street, Goodman's Fields. Gentlemen requiring Board during Passover, are requested to make early application, as a select number only will be accommodated. Terms moderate.⁷³

Brighton. Accommodation for פסח [Passover]. Mrs. Martin, 30, New Steine, Brighton, will be happy to accommodate ladies and gentlemen with Apartments and Board for the ensuing Passover.

Applications are requested to be made as soon as possible, when the terms and other particulars may be known. 30, New Steine, Brighton, March 6th, 1855.⁷⁴

Like the notices above, the regular appearance of ads for restaurants, higher-end boarding houses, and the like demonstrates that elements of the community increasingly possessed both the need, the means, and the desire to take advantage of the services offered by such establishments:

Board and Residence at the West End. The Misses Alexander beg to acquaint the Jewish Community, that Ladies and Gentlemen may be accommodated at their Establishment with every degree of comfort and domestic attention, either by joining their family circle, or occupying separate apartments exclusively. A party of Gentlemen, also, wishing to join in the occupation of separate apartments, may be accommodated with an elegant suite of rooms entirely to themselves. Ladies or gentlemen whose object is to combine economy with respectability, will please apply to the MISSES ALEXANDER, No. 10, Bedford Street, corner of Chandos Street, Strand. References exchanged.⁷⁵

72 Ibid., 4 April 1845.

73 Ibid., 16 March 1855.

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid., 19 March 1847. Variations on this ad were placed by the Misses Alexander over the years. It first appeared on July 25, 1845. In 1851, they opened Alexander & Co., Provision Depot, in Covent Garden close to their boarding house. The ad noted that a "well selected and directly-imported supply of Articles for the ensuing Passover, viz., Dutch Butter and Cheese, Cucumbers, Eggs, Smoked Beef and Tongues . . . [was available,] sanctioned by the Rev. Dr. Adler, chief rabbi. Available during the year (that is, not for Passover consumption) were Smoked Salmon, Pickles, Anchovies, Olives,

כשר [Kosher] Restaurant and Chop House. 15, Blomfield-street, Finsbury (three doors down from London-wall). D. Frankenstein begs to inform the Jewish public that he has recently opened the above Establishment, where Dinners and Luncheons, consisting of Soups, Poultry, &c., can be had at any time of the day. Tea, Coffee, and Suppers. Private Dining-rooms. Board and Lodging with good attendance, £1 1s. per week.⁷⁶

Further evidence of the growing prosperity of segments of the community, as well as a measure of continued religiosity across classes, emerges in the following ads for *mikvaot*, or Jewish ritual baths, in which married religious women were required to immerse themselves five to seven days after the end of their monthly menstrual cycle.⁷⁷ The first notice provides a West End address for the new baths, indicating at least some level of religious sentiment among women of the Jewish middle and upper classes who would have resided in this general area and frequented this establishment. The second notice proves that those who remained in the East End, as well as the newcomers who lived there, continued to avail themselves of ritual baths as well:

Jewish Baths—Mrs. Jacobson begs to inform the Ladies of the Jewish community that she has removed from Mitre-square, and has, under the sanction of the Rev. the Chief Rabbi, opened a new establishment at 9, St. Germain-terrace, Westbourne Park-Crescent, Harrow-road, near to the Bayswater Synagogue. The Baths have been erected at considerable expense, and are replete with every comfort and convenience. Mrs. J. hopes she may, by strict attention, deserve success, and meet with the support and patronage of her friends and the Jewish Public.⁷⁸

Jewish Baths, 2, Mitre Square, Aldgate. By permission of the Rev. Dr. Adler, Chief Rabbi. Mrs. Joseph Prince begs respectfully to inform Jewish ladies that she has purchased the above-named long-established Baths, and that she proposes to conduct them in such a way as to secure the comfort and convenience of her patrons. Mrs. Prince solicits, in the first instance, but

Spanish Beans and Peas, and many other articles for family use.” They also stocked “the celebrated Dutch Kimmel Cheese [and] British Wines of the finest quality and flavour.” *Ibid.*, 28 March 1851. See also *ibid.*, 26 February 1864. In 1864, they moved their boarding house to larger premises at 33 Montague Place, Russell Square.

76 *Ibid.*, 9 January 1863.

77 Immersion is done for reasons of ritual purity, not physical cleanliness.

78 *JC*, 5 October 1866.

one trial, being convinced that her efforts to give satisfaction will secure her thereafter a continuance of favours.⁷⁹

The increase in ads for hotel and boarding accommodations both in the provinces and on the Continent, and as far away as America and Australia, demonstrates that the middle and upper classes of the Anglo-Jewish community increasingly traveled for both business and pleasure, but remained religiously observant—more comfortable with other Jews, or sentimentally attached to the larger Jewish community, in that they chose to lodge in places run by or catering to Jewish travelers. The continued presence of these ads over the years 1842 to 1880 also indicates that the proprietors of these various establishments successfully attracted Jewish clientele. Otherwise, market forces would have dictated their disappearance from the pages of the *Jewish Chronicle*. Between 1842 and 1880 the number of ads for hotels in popular English vacation spots such as Brighton increases, as do notices for Continental hotels, particularly those in Paris:

Hotel de L'Europe.—Boulogne-Sur-Mer. Mrs. Moses, widow of the late Mr. Moses, many years a resident of this town, solicits the attention of Israelites visiting Boulogne, and begs leave to inform them, that she has opened the above Hotel, the only establishment where her patrons may depend on having a כשר [kosher] table: her charges are moderate. The situation of this large and beautiful hotel is pleasant and convenient, being opposite the custom house, packet-stations, passport office, and bathing establishment, and having a commanding view of the sea and surrounding country. Warm, sea, and fresh-water baths in the house: Fine gardens: Private apartments, English stabling, and lock-up coach houses.⁸⁰

Cafe Restaurant and Cigar Divan, 4, South Parade, Parsonage, Manchester. Mrs. Selig (Widow of the late Julius Selig, Strangeways.), in conjunction with Mrs. Benjamin, beg respectfully to acquaint their Friends, Commercial Gentlemen, and the Public generally, that they have taken extensive Premises situate[d] in a central and quiet locality, which will be furnished and arranged as a Cafe Boarding House, etc.

The house is within three minutes' walk of the Exchange and Post Office.

79 Ibid., 2 November 1866. This ad is immediately followed by a repeat of the "Jewish Baths" ad above.

80 VJ, 8 July 1842.

Every attention will be devoted to the comfort of the guests, by experienced persons and well-qualified assistants, which, together with moderate charges, will combine domestic comfort with commercial convenience, —a desideratum long required in Manchester.

Fish and Sandwiches always ready. Cigars, etc.

N.B.—The Establishment will be opened on Wednesday, the 1st of September, 1847. . . .⁸¹

Jewish Hotel, 41, Warren Street, New York. Established 1845. The Subscriber respectfully informs the Public that he has leased the above spacious Establishment for the accommodation of Jewish Families, either as permanent or transient Boarders.

The House has forty large cheerful rooms, handsomely furnished, and lighted throughout with gas. The situation being adjacent to the Rail-road and Steam-boat Depots, in the vicinity of the Business part of the City, and in a retired street; making it a desirable residence to men of business as well as families.

The Table will be supplied with all the delicacies of the season, and every attention paid to the comfort of the Boarders. Charles Levy, Proprietor.⁸²

Related to American accommodations ads, such as those noted immediately above, notices began to appear advertising passage to America. While earlier ads offered ship or freight passage, the following notice is the first expressly to advertise “emigration”:

Emigration to America. For New York, to sail the 15th June, the fine first-class fast-sailing American Packet-ship MASONIC, burden 1000 tons, coppered and copper fastened; DANIEL CONY, commander; lying in St. Katherine’s Docks. This splendid vessel, built and fitted up expressly for Passengers, has upwards eight feet height in the ‘tween decks, and offers therefore first-rate accommodation. It has been surveyed and approved of by the Government Emigration Commissioners, under whose regulations it will be dispatched. For terms of freight or passage (which are fixed at a low price), apply to S. Stiebel and Co., 23, Nicholas-lane, Lombard-street, London.⁸³

At this time, emigration to Australia was still far more usual (if the ads are any indication) than it was to America. In fact, male emigration to

81 *JC*, 3 September 1847.

82 *Ibid.*, 18 July 1851.

83 *Ibid.*, 4 June 1852.

Australia was so prevalent that on several occasions in the 1850s the paper's lead column called for "Jewish Female Emigration" in response to Jewish male emigration to the "gold fields" of Australia. By the 1870s, notices offering passage to North America and/or Australia had become the norm:

A. Myers, Passenger Agent, 13, Duke-street, Aldgate, London. Steerage and Cabin Passages secured by all lines of steamers to America, Canada and Australia. Inman and Cunard Line every Tuesday; National and Guion every Wednesday; White Star and Inman every Thursday.⁸⁴

At mid-century, another type of advertisement, for wedding and banquetting facilities, also appealing to varying class levels within the Jewish community, began to appear:

התחתונה [hatunot] Weddings. Willis's Rooms, 41, Brewer-street, Golden-square. This spacious Suite of Rooms may be engaged for the above purpose. The Dining and Ball Rooms are elegantly decorated, and capable of accommodating a large number. For particulars, apply to Mr. George Barnett, Teacher of Dancing, at the Rooms.⁸⁵

Weddings! Weddings! Weddings! The Saxonian Assembly and Wedding Rooms, 68, Great Prescott-street, offers every accommodation to respectable Wedding Parties, upon the most economical terms. Every attention is most cheerfully given to render the comfort and happiness of the festive party complete. Terms, £2 2s., or £1 11s. 6d., conditionally.

A [Jewish] New Year Festival Ball will take place on the last night of the Holidays, viz., Wednesday, October 6th inst. Dancing from 8 till 2 o'clock.

Quadrille Nights every Saturday, Admission, 6d. Dancing from 8 till 12 o'clock.⁸⁶

The Finsbury Square Rooms. These spacious and most elegantly fitted up Rooms are now completed. Having been built for the purpose of offering to large assemblies every desirable accommodation they are particularly suited for Meetings, Concerts, Anniversary and Charitable Dinners, private and subscription Balls, Weddings, & c.

84 Ibid., 3 April 1874.

85 Ibid., 28 May 1852.

86 Ibid., 1 October 1852.

The Proprietor invites parties to view them, in order to judge themselves of their eligibility for any of the above purposes.

For Terms apply at Seyd's Hotel, 39, Finsbury Square.⁸⁷

Seyd's Hotel was still running ads in 1880. In addition to Jewish businesses, there were also gentile establishments that occasionally advertised in the Anglo-Jewish press in the hope of attracting Jewish wedding and banquet clients. Radley's Hotel, Blackfriars, is one example. Radley's promised "[c]onvenient suites of rooms for Weddings, Dejeuners, Balls, Banquets, & c, . . . in the best style, on reasonable terms.—John Hart, Proprietor.—N.B. A Jewish Cook employed."⁸⁸ The Queen's Concert-Rooms, Hanover-square, informed the "Hebrew Persuasion" that the management was pleased to be able to offer "magnificent rooms . . . for the Marriage Celebrations of the Jews" sufficient to accommodate 500 guests.⁸⁹ The Masonic hall on Bedford Row also advertised its facilities, noting that it maintained "a separate kitchen for the members of the Jewish persuasion" with service for about 100 people.⁹⁰

Periodic notices advertising the little extras of life (available, of course, for a fee) provide another indication of the growth of disposable income within the Jewish community. Complete ads are given here to provide their full Victorian flavor:

Miniature Painting.—Miss Daniel, (from Oxford Street,) begs to announce to her friends and the public, that she receives sittings daily, between the hours of Eleven and Three; at No. 55, Church Street, Minories. The likeness warranted, at the following prices: —On Card, from 5s., On Ivory, from 12s., upwards.—N.B. Private sittings taken if required, on application by letter, post paid.⁹¹

The "Digitorium" Finger Exerciser, an instrument for strengthening the wrist and acquiring perfect execution on the Piano in an incredible short space of time; acknowledged to be the best invention of the kind. Price of instrument, packed free to any part of the kingdom, 11s. 6d.; including 76 exercises for the five fingers, adapted from the best modern composers. To be had only of the inventor, M. Marks, Pianoforte Tuner for the "Operatic

87 Ibid., 9 November 1855.

88 Ibid., 1 January 1864.

89 Ibid., 12 January 1866.

90 Ibid., 31 May 1867.

91 VJ, 28 October 1842.

Rehearsals," to Miss Heywood, Herr Formes, Herr Reichart, & c., 43, Hunter-street, Brunswick-square, W.C. Pianofortes Tuned and Repaired on most approved principles on exceedingly moderate terms.⁹²

Photography.—Having rebuilt my Studio, I am now Prepared to receive Sitters daily for Cartes, Vignettes and Cabinet Portraits. Miniatures for Jewellry or enlargements in oil colours, executed from Photographs taken here or elsewhere. Terms depending on size, and amount of finish. H. Davis, Photographer and Miniature Painter, 35, Burton-street, Berkeley-square.⁹³

Portraits. Private. תמונות. [*temunot*, "pictures"] The London Stereoscopic Company. (Photographers to the Royal Family.) Cartes, 12 for 10s. Cabinets, 8 for 20s. . . . 110 and 108, Regent Street, and 54, Cheapside. The Company have the honour of taking men of the highest eminence in the Jewish community. Cartes free by Post, 12 stamps each. Dr Adler [chief rabbi] Dr Artom [*hakham*].⁹⁴

Some notices in the Jewish press, while hinting at the accumulation of disposable capital, directly signaled the increased desire of some members of the community to publicly demonstrate their anglicization. Noteworthy examples of this process are given in this sampling of notices of name changes:

Notice is hereby Given, that I, the undersigned, lately called Isaac Moses, of 23, Kensington Palace Gardens, in the County of Middlesex, have on and from this day ASSUMED the SURNAME of MARSDEN in addition to the Surname of Moses, but as my last and principal Surname; and that I shall at all times hereafter, in all deeds and writings, and in all dealings and transactions, and on all occasions whatsoever, use such Surname of Marsden in addition to that of Moses, and as my last and principal surname; and I have declared my intention to assume such surname by deed to be enrolled in Her Majesty's High Court of Chancery.

Dated this fourth day of January, One thousand eight hundred and sixty-five.

Isaac Moses Marsden

Witness.—Salem C. Harris, Notary Public, 24, Royal Exchange, London⁹⁵

92 *JC*, 6 November 1863. M. Marks also regularly ran ads offering his pianoforte tuning and repair services.

93 *Ibid.*, 10 July 1874.

94 *Ibid.*, 29 October 1875.

95 *Ibid.*, 6 January 1865. Marsden appears to have been a popular "English" surname to adopt. Montague Montagu gave notice in the *JC* on January 18, 1867, that he would henceforth be known as Montague Montagu Marsden. For a brief discussion of the

I Morris Joseph of Hatchett's Hotel, Piccadilly, in the county of Middlesex, gentleman, hereby give notice, that from and after this 23rd day of December, 1864, I shall discontinue and abandon the use of my present surname, and, in lieu thereof, ASSUME and USE the SURNAME of MORICE, and the first names of HUBERT JAY, in addition to my present first name Morris, and that from henceforth I shall describe myself as, and be known by, the name of Morris Hubert Jay Morice . . . said deed to be enrolled in Her Majesty's High Court of Chancery in England. . . .

Witness—M.I. Abrahams, Solicitor, 17, Gresham-street.⁹⁶

Notice.—Mr. Harris Alabaster, Shouchet [sic] to the Ramsgate Congregation, usually called A. Harris, or Albaster [sic] Harris, hereby gives notice, that on and after this day and all times hereafter, in all writings and transactions, and in all occasions whatsoever, will require the validity of the signature of his name will be signed as here undersigned.

HARRIS ALABASTER

Ramsgate, 6th March, 1865—5625.⁹⁷

Communal Growth and Residential Relocation: London Jewry

As London's Jewish community grew, it also underwent residential changes, some of which were directly related to the sheer physical growth of the

anglicization of Jewish surnames and for a list of some of the most common given name changes adopted, see Bernard Susser, *The Jews of South-West England: The Rise and Decline of Their Medieval and Modern Communities* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1993), 230–32.

96 *JC*, 27 January 1865.

97 *Ibid.*, 10 March 1865. Rabbi Benzion Kaganoff includes the following highly amusing anecdote on the anglicization, or in this instance, Americanization, of Jewish surnames in his book on the origins of Jewish names: “There comes to mind the tale (perhaps apocryphal) of a New England Jewish family by the name of Kabakoff who petitioned to have their name changed to Cabot. After some initial difficulty, the court sustained the petition and the Kabakoffs officially became Cabots—whereupon the wags reported:

And this is good old Boston
The home of the bean and the cod
Where the Lowells speak only to Cabots
And the Cabots speak Yiddish—by God!”

From Benzion C. Kaganoff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Names and Their History* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978), 73. I have been unable to locate any significant analysis of the Jewish surname-changing phenomenon, although there is much anecdotal evidence to indicate this was an integral part of the anglicization/Americanization process for Jews and others.

community, while others were class based and connected to the increased anglicization of the community as a whole. The original communal base in the East End grew beyond its borders to the east and the south. There was also some early nineteenth-century movement westward toward Covent Garden. However, westward and northward movement and suburbanization of segments of the Jewish middle classes did not begin in earnest until the 1830s, following the introduction of omnibuses in London.⁹⁸ The availability of this new form of transport made it possible to commute daily from residences that were not within easy walking distance of places of business. Lipman believes that assimilationist urges also drove this trend toward suburbanization. This is, however, a somewhat questionable observation, as many of the newly "suburban" Jews consciously chose to locate their residences next to other Jews. Acculturationist urges—that is, the desire to become English while maintaining close Jewish connections, or adopting an Anglo-Jewish identity, as it were—more accurately describe their motivation for moving westward.

Between 1840 and the early 1880s middle-class Jews moved into such areas as Tyburnia (now Marble Arch), Bloomsbury, Bayswater, Hackney, St. John's Wood, Islington, and Barnsbury. They also moved south of the Thames, but in much smaller numbers. Table 4.2 tracks the movement of population through the formation of congregations and the opening of synagogues outside of the original area of Jewish settlement in the near East End. Congregational formation is a good indicator of the achievement of a Jewish population significant enough in size to warrant the founding of this most basic of Jewish communal institutions.

In the thirty years between 1850 and 1880 the Jewish population of London roughly doubled, from between 18,000 and 20,000, to approximately 40,000. For the same period the overall Anglo-Jewish population grew at a slightly slower rate, from 35,000 to 60,000. The most significant change for the period was the growth of the middle and upper classes from approximately 35 percent to slightly more than 50 percent of the Jewish community. Joseph Jacobs provides the following class and income figures for the Jewish population of London in 1882:

Upper (14.6% or 6,600 people)	£367 (average income)
Middle (42.2% or 19,400 people)	£54 (" ")
Lower (19.6% or 9,000 people)	£26
Pauper (23.6% or 11,000 people)	£12 ⁹⁹

98 Lipman, "The Rise of Jewish Suburbia," 82.

99 Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics*, 14. See pp. 119–29 above for occupational information on the London Jewish community in 1850.

The income levels Jacobs assigned for the various groups, particularly those of the middle and upper categories, raise questions regarding the economic progress of the Jewish community as a whole, and particularly of the “middle” segment. It should be noted, however, that these are averages. Also, by any standard (including that of income growth) there was considerable improvement in the economic and occupational status of many of London’s Jews over the century. The occupational structure also changed. By the early 1880s, roughly 5 percent of the Jewish population were “professional men compared with about 22 per cent who were manufacturers, 21 per cent merchants, 16 per cent brokers and 39 percent in retail trade.”¹⁰⁰

Beginning in 1881, the economic, social, and residential structure of the Jewish community discussed in this chapter changed more dramatically than it had during the course of the previous fifty years. The acculturated, mostly native-born (that is, greater than 50 percent of Anglo-Jewry), and increasingly middle-class Anglo-Jewish population of London was overwhelmed in a few short years by the influx of poor eastern European Jews—most traditional, some radical, many without occupational skills—who were not vested in England or Anglo-Jewish institutions, nor, at least initially, particularly interested in the concerns of the resident Jewish population that was. The Anglo-Jewish identity that had been adopted by the existing community was completely alien to them, as were the residential patterns that had developed in London. The newcomers crowded into the East End and began, with considerable pressure from the established community, of course, the process of forging an identity that would balance the dual components of Anglo-Jewish identity—Englishness and Jewishness.

100 Quoting Jacobs in Lipman “Trends in Anglo-Jewish Occupations,” 209. Lipman further noted that “[a]s manufacturers, the Jewish middle class was largely occupied with objects traditionally associated with Jews: textiles, clothing and footwear, with local adaptation such as cotton manufacture in Manchester, woolen goods in Bradford, lace-making in Nottingham, linen manufacture in Belfast and chemicals in Cheshire.”

Table 4.1

Summary of Occupations for Likely Jewish Surnames—extracted from W. Kelley's The Post Office London Directory, 1841

*Occupations (by rank)*¹⁰¹

1. Merchants (unspecified): 89
2. Watchmakers/Jewelers/Diamond/Gem Merchants/Goldsmiths: 40
3. Fruiterers/Grocers: 38
4. Warehouseurs (glass, toys, naval supplies, linen, etc.): 38
5. Furriers: 21
6. Tobacconists/Cigar manufacturers/importers/Snuff sellers: 21
7. Clothiers dealers/sellers/wholesalers: 20
8. Quill, Pen, Pencil, Lead, Sponge manufacturers/sellers: 17
9. Tailors: 16
10. Bookbinders/Booksellers/Printers/Engravers/Stationers: 13
11. Slopsellers: 12
12. Bootmakers/Shoemakers: 11
13. Stockbroker/Bill of Exchange Broker: 10
14. Butcher: 8
15. Surgeon/dentist: 6
16. Chemists: 4

¹⁰¹ Culled from a list of 662 Jewish surnames. Those in the directory conducted their activities at a fixed location. Occupations are undercounted because the following surnames, representing 537 additional individuals, were not counted: Davis, Hart, Harris, Phillips, Nathan, Angell, Hirsch, Jonah, Keyzer, Simons, Waag, Coshman, and Daniels. These surnames were used by both Jews and gentiles in England. Therefore, the total number of (possible) Jews, based on surnames, listed in the 1841 London postal directory was at least 1,199. There is no reason to believe that the rankings would change if the occupations of the additional 537 were given, but only that the numbers in each occupational category would be respectively larger. For comparison, the total (counting the same surnames) for B. Critchett's *Post Office London Directory for 1832, Being a List of 22,000 Merchants, Traders, & c. of London and Parts Adjacent* (London: Lowe and Harvey, 1832) was 549. Thus, the number of listed (potential) Jewish merchants, etc., more than doubled in nine years. For more on Jewish surnames, see Jacobs, *Studies in Jewish Statistics*; Kaganoff, *Dictionary of Jewish Names*; and "Surnames" in Michael Grandy, ed., *My Ancestor was Jewish: How Can I Find Out More about Him?* (London: Society of Genealogists, 1982).

Table 4.1a

Sample of Jewish Surnames in W. Kelley's The Post Office London Directory, 1841, Commercial Directory Section

[Punctuation and capitalization as in original]

Aaron Charlotte (Mrs.), pawnbroker, 16 Whitechapel road
 Aaron Michael, general salesman, 6 Princess st. Leicester sq.
 Aaron Rebecca (Mrs.), bookslr. 10 Goodman's stile, Lit. Alie st.
 Aarons & Alexander, tobacconists, 5 Russell ct. Drury lane
 Aarons Rachel & Son, who. furriers, 11 Bishopsgate without
 Aarons Solomon & Co. furriers, 55 Fleet street
 Aarons Benjn. whol. furrier, 3 Knowles st. Doctors commons
 Aarons Salomon, butcher, 122 Middlesex street, Aldgate
 Abecasis Solomon, merchant, 21 Leman st. Goodman's fields
 Abel Samuel & Co. chemists, & c. 116 Albany st. Regent's pk.
 Abraham & Gardiner, ready made linen & outfitting warehouse, 53
 Houndsditch
 Abraham Moses, solicitor, 36 Whitecross street, Cripplegate, & 10
 Liverpool street, King's cross
 Abrahams Abraham, fancy cabinet maker, 57 St. John sq.
 Abrahams Alexander, boot maker, 30 Well st. Wellclose sq.
 Abrahams Alfred, gold guard & neck chain manufacturer, 12 & 24
 Bevis marks
 Abrahams A. (Mrs.), watchmak. 9 Gt. Prescot st. Goodm. flds.
 Abrahams Hyam, goldsmith & jeweller, 15 Camomile street
 Abrahams Lewis, tailor, 22 King William street, Strand
 Abrahams Michael, oil & italian warehouse, 51 Mansell st.
 Abrahams Sam. S. & Benj. watch mfs. 23 Lit. Alie st. Goodm. fi.
 Abrahams Samuel, solicitor, 8 Clifford's inn, Fleet street
 Abrahams Sarah (Mrs.), coal merchant, 234 Oxford street
 Abrahams Soesman [sic], teadealer, 46 & 115 Middlesex street; & 128
 Borough High street
 Adler Samuel & Co. linendrapers, 19 Crown st. Finsbury
 Aflalo Isaac, Merchant, 49 Great Prescott st. Goodman's fields
 Alex & Jones, surgeon dentists, 26 New Bridge st. Blackfrs
 Alex Solomon, surgeon dentist, 11 Finsbury pl. Finsbury sq
 Alexander Alex. & Naphtali H. wh. jewellers, 3 Geo. st. Minori.
 Alexander & Cassels, comm. merchts. & gen. agts. 8 Lime st

Alexander Joshua, solicitor, 6 South street, Finsbury
 Alexander Moses, quill merchant, 11 Bury st. St. Mary axe
 Aloof, Abecasis, & Aloof, Merchts. 25 Tenter-ground, Goodman's fields
 Alt & Blogg, wholesale jewellers & pearl workers, 8 & 9 Chichester
 rents, Chancery Inne
 Altman Joseph, fancy basket manufr. 111 London wall
 Ash & Lewin, woollen drapers & mercers, 110 Regent st.
 Asher Adolphus, for. bookseller, 158 Fleet st. and at Berlin
 Asher Isaac Benjamin, Clothes salesman, 21 Minories
 Azemberg Francis, china manfrs' agent, 89 Hatton garden
 Azuelos, Judah & Co. merchant, 3 Gt. Prescott st. Goodman's fields
 Ballinger Hy. confectioner, 148½ High Holborn, & 14 Blackfrs. rd.
 Barnett (36 listed)
 Bengeman & Aaron, watch & cl. mks. 17 Bury st. St. Mary axe
 Benjamin, Harriet & Dinah, merchants, 1 Lime street square
 Benjamin Joel & Co. jewellers, 17A, Bury st. St. Mary Axe
 Benjamin Nathl. & John, mrchts. & agts. 3 George yd. Lmbd. st.
 Benjamin Benjamin, steel pen manufr. & c. 68 Houndsditch
 Benjamin David, who. stationr. 25 Lit. Alie st. Goodm. fields
 Benjamin Jacob, child bed linen wareh. 3 Jewry st. Aldgate
 Benjamin Joseph, cigar manfr. 98 Middlesex st. Whitechapel
 Benjamin Lewis, cap manufacturer, 6 Cree Church lane
 Benjamin Lewis, howard coffeehouse, 3 St. James' pl. Aldgate
 Benjamin Nathan, spirit mercht. 14 Charlotte st. Blakfrs. rd.
 Benjamin Philip, gloss lustre mak. 9 Stanhope st. Clare mrkt.
 Benjamin Simon, tobacconist, 1 Vinegar yard, Brydges st.
 Bensusan & Brandon, merchants, 2 Walbrook buildings
 Bensusan Manachen Levi [sic], & Co. merchants, 6 Magdalen row,
 Great Prescott street
 Bensusan Samuel Levi, jun. & Co. merchts. Finsbury chamb.

Table 4.2

*Dispersion of London Jewry—as Indicated by Formation of Congregations beyond the City and East End*¹⁰²

102 Information is drawn from the map in Lipman, *Social History of the Jews*, insert between pp. 158–59. Dates represent the years during which congregations were initially formed and synagogues built or refurbished.

Outside East End (beyond Houndsditch and Goodman's Fields)

<i>Congregation</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Date(s) Founded</i>
Western Synagogue	St Alban's Lane, S. W. London	1768–74
Maiden Lane Synagogue	Covent Garden, W. C. London	1810
W. London Synagogue of British Jews	Burton Street, W. London	1840–42
Central Synagogue ¹⁰³	Great Portland St., W. London	1848–55
Bayswater Synagogue	Chichester Pl., Harrow Rd, W. London	1860–63
North London Synagogue ¹⁰⁴	Thornhill Rd., Barnsbury, N. London	1861–68
St. John's Wood Synagogue	Abbey Rd, St. John's Wood, N. W. Ldn.	1872–82
New West End Synagogue	St. Petersburg Pl., Bayswater, W. London	1875–79
Hackney Synagogue	Devonshire Rd., N. London	1881–97
Dalston Synagogue	Poet's Rd., Canonbury, N. London	1884–85
Stoke–Newington Synagogue	Shacklewell Lane, N. London	1887–1903
Hammersmith & W. Kensington Syn.	S. W. London	1889–90

Continued

103 Initially known as the Branch Synagogue, it was opened on Great Portland Street in a former warehouse as an extension of the Great Synagogue. In 1866, it was decided to construct a purpose-built building on the site. The ground breaking was reported by *The Times* (19 March 1869, 12). Baron Lionel de Rothschild, Chief Rabbi Adler, Rev. Aaron L. Green, Sir Anthony de Rothschild, Lionel L. Cohen, and other communal notables officiated. *The Times* gave lengthy and detailed coverage of the consecration the following year (8 April 1870, 5).

104 *The Times* (27 December 1867, 4) reprinted an article from *The Globe* on the laying of the corner stone of the new synagogue by Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, accompanied by Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler, *Hakham* Dr. Artom of Bevis Marks, and others. They placed a time capsule inside the corner stone before sealing it. A few months later *The Times* carried a lengthy note on the consecration of the synagogue (31 March 1868, 11).

<i>Congregation</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Date(s) Founded</i>
Hampstead Synagogue	Dennington Park Rd., N. W. London	1889–92
Poplar Synagogue	E. London	c. 1890
Notting Hill Synagogue	W. London	c. 1895
West Ham Synagogue	N. E. London	1897–1900
Brondesbury Synagogue	Chevening Rd., N. W. London	1900–05
Finsbury Park Synagogue	N. London	1902
Walthamstow and Leyton Synagogue	N. London	1902
Golders Green Synagogue	N. W. London	1913–1922
New Synagogue	Stamford, N. London. (moved from Great St. Helen's, E.C London)	1913–15

South of the Thames

<i>Congregation</i>	<i>Date(s) Founded</i>
"Nathan Henry's" Synagogue	1763–99
Old Borough Synagogue	1823
New Borough Synagogue	1867
South East London Synagogue	1899
Brixton	1921

Chapter Five

London Jews and Education: On Becoming English and Remaining Jewish—by Class and Design

Traditional European Jewish Education

In the traditional Jewish communities of central and eastern Europe, “educational institutions served to promote . . . traditional values and to transmit them to the new generation . . . [introducing] the . . . young into the framework of social life. . . .”¹ As such, education took place both within and beyond the bounds of the school room. It was expected that the family and the synagogue, in addition to whatever formal schooling existed, would play a strong role in educating the young to their religious duties and to their places within the community. Particular emphasis was placed upon the father’s, and by extension, the synagogue’s and the community’s, duty to instruct sons in the Torah and the 613 commandments (*taryag mitzvot*), and if possible, in the more complicated aspects of Jewish law.² The same did not apply to

1 Katz, *Tradition and Crisis*, 156.

2 Deut. 6:7, “You shall teach them thoroughly to your children and you shall speak of them while you sit in your home, while you walk on the way, when you retire and when you arise.” Translation is from *Tanach*, Stone Edition. The Talmud further requires a father to teach his son a trade or craft. See Babylonian *Talmud*, *Bava Metzia* 30(b).

daughters, since women were expected to maintain the home and raise children and were therefore religiously exempt from fulfilling many of the commandments required of Jewish men. This traditionalist focus was the reason formal female religious education was not considered necessary, and generally discouraged. In particular, "the rabbis were critical of formal education for girls. Women were expected to learn only those laws relevant to them, and this within the confines of the home."³ Many women were, however, expected to deal with the daily business of running the home, including supplementing the family's income, when possible, through washing, cooking, selling of produce, and small home enterprise. The expectation was that they, although formally uneducated, would develop some commercial skills to deal with the world outside the home, and, in certain instances, outside the community.

Prior to the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, neither Jewish boys nor Jewish girls received secular or classical instruction. Traditional communities had no need for individuals with this type of education, there was no communal or *halakhic* value placed upon secular education, and in those rare instances when an individual left to study non-Jewish subjects he was almost always lost to the community and to Judaism. This position changed only once traditional Jewish communities began to open or disintegrate in the face of the pressures of modernity.

Traditionally, formal religious education for Jewish males began around the age of three. However, boys generally went with their fathers to the synagogue starting at a very young age, so as to be familiarized with the rhythms of group prayer and the communal religious environment. Education was not limited to the instruction received at home or from continued and regular attendance at the synagogue. Most traditional communities had a religious elementary school, or *heder*, at which more formal instruction was given. The *heder* was usually limited to one room, thus the name, and was staffed by a man who (it was hoped) was capable of inculcating his young charges in the basic elements of a Jewish religious education, including reading, prayer recitation, the Torah, with basic commentary, some simple *halakhah*, and occasionally, for the more advanced students, rudimentary Talmud. Lessons were usually conducted in Yiddish, the lingua franca of most of European Jewry.⁴ The level of instruction was frequently very basic and the instructor

3 See *Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, s.v. "Education."

4 This is significant as it meant that those who went on to higher education elsewhere were capable of studying and interacting with students from throughout the traditional (Ashkenazi) Jewish world, as all spoke Yiddish. See Eli Barnavi, ed., "The Ashkenazi Mosaic: 14th–18th Centuries," in *A Historical Atlas of the Jewish People: From the Time of the Patriarchs to the Present* (New York: Schocken Books, 1992), 122–23.

incompetent, or at the very least, untrained as a teacher. Attendance at the *heder* usually commenced at the age of three and continued until the age of thirteen. As noted above, Jewish law required fathers to educate their sons, thus even in the smallest communities a tutor was hired, and the *heder* was provided by the parents of boys of school age. The pay and status of the instructor were low and thus the frustration level of both the pupils and tutor could be quite high. Harsh punishment was not unknown to the students, but a solid religious education frequently was. The *kehilah's* involvement was generally limited to some supervision (frequently not much) of the instructor or tutor and funding for the poorest children whose parents could not afford the expense.⁵ The majority of students left *heder* after *bar mitzvah* able to read basic Hebrew, to make their way through the prayer book, and to follow along as the Torah was read in religious worship. Thus, *heder* education equipped boys, at a minimum, to participate in the religious life of their communities.

Generally, only those boys who demonstrated intellectual promise or those whose fathers could afford to spare them from work (that is, those with money and the inclination to do so), progressed beyond this basic level. Those few young men who continued their educations went on to attend *yeshivah* in a different community where it was expected they would eventually master the Talmud and other elements of Jewish law. *Yeshivot* were the high schools and also institutes of higher learning within religious Judaism, specializing in Talmudic mastery.⁶ Mostly located in cities or other areas with substantial Jewish population, they attracted talented students from throughout traditional Jewry. Some *yeshivah* students became rabbis, some remained to teach, while others moved on to different communities in need of rabbis or religious officials. Those who were truly gifted could spend their lives in study, supported by the community in which the *yeshivah* was located, or by a wealthy wife and/or family. The most gifted, over time (with luck, savvy, administrative ability, mastery of Jewish religious sources, and exceptional homiletic skills) could become heads of *yeshivot* in their own right.⁷

5 See Katz, *Tradition and Crisis*, 160.

6 Terminology is somewhat different today. In Europe and the US, religious boys generally attend *yeshivah* (elementary and middle school), then *mesivtah* (similar to high school) followed by *beis midrash*. In Israel, they attend *heder* then *yeshivah ketanah*, followed by *yeshivah gedolah*. A *beis midrash* or *yeshivah gedolah* is roughly equivalent to college, and young men generally graduate from them with expertise in Jewish law and, for some, rabbinical ordination (*semikhah*).

7 See *Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, s.v. "Yeshivah." Advancement in a *yeshivah* was not guaranteed and occurred over a number of years, as levels of scholarly achievement were attained (or not, as the case might be). Specific titles were awarded by communal

Most Jewish men (and women) spent their lives toiling to survive. They had little time for religious study or other endeavors. Nevertheless, there was substantial support within Jewry for those few who pursued higher religious study. This support was grounded in Judaic necessity. Traditional Jews needed to consult *halakhic* experts on various religious matters or questions. Also, regardless of their eventual roles, *yeshivah* students spent their days and nights engaged in fulfilling the commandment to study the Torah. Thus, by proxy, their efforts helped to redeem all those (that is, the bulk of European Jewry) who could not fulfill the biblical and Talmudic imperatives regarding Torah study.

The emergence of the modern nation-state, and the changes this process brought to Jewish communities coupled with emancipation and the new relationship between the state and its citizens (now viewed as individuals and not as members of government recognized groups) led to the gradual (and more infrequently, dramatic) breakdown of communal autonomy. Taken together this brought about increased individual Jewish interactions with, and awareness of, the larger world. This, in turn, raised the possibility of life beyond the community. For the first time, many Jews actively questioned their relationship to their religion and religious community, hitherto the touchstones of their existence, and made decisions (albeit unconsciously, at times) regarding the amount of time and space they were willing to allot to either or both. Some cleaved more closely than ever to their religion and community, distancing themselves from those who welcomed change. Some drifted on the waters of modernity with no particular goal in mind, neither renouncing nor embracing their religion or community. Some sought to reform the religion itself. Others studied Judaism and Jewish history critically, from a self-consciously rational perspective, hoping this would lead them to a useable past and a workable solution to their dilemma of identity and belonging. Still others considered these questions and sought to modernize Jewish existence through various accommodations that allowed secular study and achievement along with a continued connection to a less all-encompassing form of Judaism than that which was traditionally followed.

This last group, advocates of the *Haskalah*, sought to drive Jewish life and culture beyond the parameters set by the rabbis, traditional Jewish education, and Judaic religious practice. They advocated cultural and social emancipation for central and eastern European Jews, and also attempted to

rabbis to those who successfully completed particular levels of study in the *yeshivah*. Communal *takanot* generally fixed the number of years of study required to attain each title, as well as the rewards, such as special tax status, that came with it. See also Katz, *Tradition and Crisis*, 167–68.

create a modern Jewish culture that was neither assimilationist nor Orthodox in nature. They opened new schools in which secular subjects comprised an integral part of the education provided. Religious education was not excluded, but henceforth was to be only one component of a broader education, though in some instances it was left to the family and synagogue to provide. Reading and study of secular authors and writing on matters of Jewish cultural, as distinct from religious, interest were introduced, as was the use of Hebrew and local languages. Yiddish was deliberately dropped as the language of instruction and communication, as it was considered to be part of the unenlightened Jewish past. In the most extreme cases, religious instruction was jettisoned in favor of an exclusively secular education.⁸

Considerable inroads were made by the advocates of the *Haskalah*, particularly with urban Jews. However, many traditional communities, most of which were in eastern Europe, long continued to resist alterations to religious observance, synagogue practice, and the *heder/yeshivah* “system,” regarding deliberate changes such as the secular use of Hebrew (known to traditional Jews as *lashon kodesh*, “the sacred tongue”) as abominations.

Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish Education: Design and Happenstance

No home-grown *Haskalah* movement ever emerged in England, nor did the Continental movement have much effect. No rationalist scholarly efforts designed critically to reassess Judaism or Jewish history were undertaken, although the Jewish Historical Society of England was founded in 1893. The effort to reform English Judaic practice and worship, begun in London in 1840, was lackluster and limited in its goals, particularly when contrasted with Continental developments. In fact, in many ways Jewish life in England developed differently from the pattern in nineteenth-century Europe. This alternate development can be attributed, among other things, to the different course of Jewish history in England, including the late re-arrival of Jews, and the relative social, religious, and ultimately political openness of English society as it moved through the nineteenth century.

The pace of Jewish social and cultural emancipation, elements of which already existed in the eighteenth century, accelerated as the nineteenth

8 It can be argued that even in these more extreme cases religion was not entirely absent but rather present in a different guise, as fervent adherence to and belief in socialism, communism, Zionism, and other quasi-religious movements substituted for older traditional religious attachments.

century progressed. English society was generally more accepting of religious differences than were Continental societies, a result of the various compromises that began emerging after the civil war and Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell. Anglicans, Dissenters, Jews, and Catholics all became, more or less, part of an emerging religious pluralism in England.⁹ Thus Anglo-Jewry was not directly pressured to make the adjustments many European Jewish communal modernizers felt compelled to make. Yet even without external compulsion, the Jewish community in England, to continue as a community, had to make choices regarding the form and purpose of various communal institutions. Adopting some form of communal education, or at least arriving at a tacit agreement on educational content for the children of communal adherents, was vital to maintaining the community as well as to shaping its future direction and form.

Generally, there was not much interest expressed in establishing traditional religious educational institutions, with their exclusive focus on the study of the Torah and Talmud.¹⁰ Between 1840 and 1880 Anglo-Jewry, for the most part, adopted a pragmatic approach to education similar to the one taken by their English countrymen, along with some of their anti-intellectualism, as well. English Jews picked and chose elements of traditional Jewish religious education to include in their curricula, including Hebrew language instruction and basic Torah knowledge. The schools they founded and attended also made a point of observing the Jewish holidays.

At least in general form, nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewish education in many ways mirrored English educational forms. Similar to their British counterparts, Jewish schools were largely class based, voluntary, and religious in orientation, although unlike their gentile counterparts, Jewish schools had to carefully make decisions regarding the level of religiosity they wished to include in the curriculum.¹¹ The Jewish schools that emerged mostly had English equivalents. Jewish infant and free schools could be loosely compared to certain of the schools operated by the Church of England or the Dissenters,¹²

9 This qualification is used as it was clear, well into the nineteenth century, that Catholicism continued to be viewed as something of a threat to "Englishness," and, despite increased political, social, and cultural rights for non-Anglicans, the Church of England remained the country's established church.

10 During this period, barring the occasional small privately held study group, the London *Beit HaMidrash* (Talmudic school) was the only place where traditional study of Jewish religious subjects was undertaken several evenings a week. Chief Rabbi N. M. Alder was a regular participant in these sessions, which were for adult students only.

11 See Singer, "Jewish Education."

12 There do not appear to have been any Jewish "Dame Schools" or "ragged" schools. The Anglican schools, known as the National Schools, were founded in 1811, and the

while Jewish middle-class day and boarding schools had direct gentile equivalents. There were also Jewish Sabbath schools, roughly equivalent to gentile Sunday schools.¹³ Jewish access to public schools was denied before the 1870s, as no religious accommodations were made. However, Anglo-Jewry did establish a small number of select private schools to which the Jewish upper and upper-middle classes could send their sons and daughters. Those with money, whether Jewish or gentile, also had the options of employing private tutors or of sending their children to Continental schools.

Voluntary Schools: Educating the Children of the Jewish Poor¹⁴

In the period between 1840 and 1880, quite a number of the children of the Jewish poor received very little formal education. This was due, in large part, to the fact that the Jewish poor, ignoring religious imperatives (and traditional precedent) to provide their (male) children with basic religious instruction, perceived education as a hindrance to their primary goal of supporting their families. A child in school was a child not making a contribution to the family's meager earnings, something many could not afford. Those poor children who did attend school were educated at the Jews' Infant Schools (1841), the National and Infant Schools (1839), the Stepney Jewish Schools (1867), the Gates of Hope School for Boys (circa 1664), the Villareal School for Girls (1730),¹⁵ and the various free schools including the Jews' Free School (1817),¹⁶ the Westminster Jews' Free School (1820),

Dissenting Schools, under the British and Foreign School Society (initially known as the Royal Lancastrian Society), were established in 1808. See generally W. B. Stephens, *Education in Britain, 1750–1914*, Social History in Perspective, ed. Jeremy Black (London: Macmillan Press, 1998), 1–20.

- 13 The Sunday-school movement in England began in the 1780s, while Jewish Sabbath schools were not instituted until the 1860s. Jewish Sabbath schools included the Sabbath and Sunday evening schools run in conjunction with the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge (1860) and the West End Sabbath School (1867).
- 14 Please see Appendices 1 and 2 for additional information about the schools and charitable institutions discussed here.
- 15 The school, also known as the Bevis Marks School, “was founded in the year 1731, by Isaac da Costa Villa Real, a Portuguese Jew, who also endowed it with the sum of £80 a year for clothing and educating 20 Jewish girls of his nation.” Elmes, *Topographical Dictionary*, 59.
- 16 Originally opened as the Talmud Torah of the Great Synagogue of London (1732), it became the Jews' Free School in 1817 and opened on Bell Lane, Spitalfields, in 1822. For a general history of the school see Gerry Black, *JFS: A History of the Jews' Free School, London since 1732* (London: Tynsder Publishing, 1998). See also Rev. Isidore

and the West Metropolitan Jewish Schools (1845).¹⁷ Instruction was also offered to the inmates of the Jews' Hospital (1807)¹⁸ and the Jews' Orphan Asylum (1831).

Although the focus here is on the schools created and attended by London's Jewish community, which represented the vast majority of the country's Jewish population, it should be noted that Jewish free schools were also operated in provincial areas with sizeable Jewish populations. While London's Jewish poor would not have attended these schools, it is clear the London Jewish community empathized with their activities and was viewed by them as a potential source of funds and personnel. The following note from the *Voice of Jacob* illustrates this point: "We have received a very interesting letter . . . describing the Jewish National School recently established in [Birmingham] . . . under the superintendence of Mr. M.J. Raphall; Mr. D. Asher acting as second master. Our space does not, at present, permit any lengthy notice of this important undertaking, which is highly honourable to the right spirit and enterprise of our Birmingham Brethren."¹⁹ The next year an advertisement appeared in the paper seeking a "competent Teacher of the Hebrew and English languages" for the Free School run by the Manchester Hebrew Association.²⁰

Of the London schools listed here, the Jews' Free School was by far the largest, educating thousands of poor Jewish children over the years. A primary school, its enrollment grew steadily from its founding in 1817. By 1840, 900 children were enrolled; in 1858, more than 1,800 (1,000 boys and

Harris, ed., *The Jewish Year Book; An Annual Record of Matters Jewish*, 5666 (London, 1905), 73.

17 The Gates of Hope School, the National and Infant Schools, and the Villareal School were affiliated with Bevis Marks, the others listed here were Ashkenazi. By 1870, the West Metropolitan Jewish School, run by London's Reform congregation, no longer served the Jewish poor and was renamed the Jewish Middle Class School. For more information, see Curtis E. Cassell, "The West Metropolitan Jewish School, 1845–1897," *Transactions (Jewish Historical Society of England)* 19 (1955–59): 115–28.

18 This was also an orphanage.

19 *VJ*, 16 September 1841. The school was actually called the Hebrew National School. Several lengthy articles on the festivities that surrounded the laying the cornerstone for the school's permanent quarters (August 1843) appeared in *The Occident and American Jewish Advocate*, which noted the attendance of Moses Montefiore, local Jewish notables, local Christian dignitaries, and "a great many more of the most respectable gentlemen of the town." In his remarks, Montefiore observed that the school was "to be dedicated to the instruction of our youth in the principles of our most holy religion, and in all the sciences and arts fitted to render them useful members of society, good citizens, and loyal subjects." *The Occident* 1, no. 7 (October 1843); *The Occident* 1, no. 8 (November 1843); *The Occident* 1, no. 9 (December 1843).

20 *VJ*, 7 January 1842.

800 girls); in 1868, 1,440 boys and 1,028 girls were in attendance; and by 1870, the school had 2,643 students (1,600 boys and 1,043 girls).²¹ The Jews' Free School was quite successful and elicited positive notice in the English press. It became a favorite charitable cause for many in the London Jewish establishment. As *The Times* noted in 1840:

The examination of the children (600 boys and 300 girls) educated at the Jews' Free School, Spitalfields, took place on the 12th inst. It is gratifying to witness the daily progress made by our Hebrew brethren in the education of their poor. The children rendered Hebrew into English with unaccountable [sic] facility. The neat appearance of the children called forth the admiration of all present; and it appears that they are indebted for this chiefly to their liberal benefactress, Mrs. Rothschild, who annually clothes all the children of the establishment.²²

In 1853, the Jews' Free School began receiving government funds and undergoing an annual review by an inspector from the government's Committee of Council on Education.²³ As *The Times* noted in its coverage of the schools' 1862 annual dinner and fundraiser: "1,000 boys and 800 girls now receive[] a moral and practical education within the walls of the institution, to the complete satisfaction of the Government inspector . . . the school [is] probably the largest in England."²⁴

The paper later noted that the founders of the Jews' Free School believed that

21 These numbers are extracted from articles in *The Times*: 16 July 1840, 5; 27 May 1858, 7; 24 June 1868, 5; and 14 June 1870, 12, respectively. By the turn of the century, the school had a combined enrollment of more than 4,000 students. The Jews' Free School is still in operation. Now located in Kenton, London, it has been renamed JFS and is now a modern Orthodox secondary school. For more on JFS today, see <http://www.jfs.brent.sch.uk>.

22 *Times*, 16 July 1840, 5.

23 The government also solicited the chief rabbi's assistance to aid in the collection of information on the education of the Jewish poor. On September 13, 1858, Chief Rabbi Adler sent a request to Jewish schools throughout England to fill out the "enclosed Circular . . . with full information reflecting the State of Education of the Jewish Poor in this Kingdom, together with statistics and other facts which bear upon that subject." The circular was provided by "[t]he Commissioners appointed by Her Majesty to inquire into the state of popular Education in England." CR, copy letter book, beginning May 1858, ACC/2805/1/1/5, LMA.

24 *Times*, 12 July 1862, 5.

[m]any children [of the Jewish poor] . . . who would have wandered idly about the streets, devoid alike of religion and knowledge, and who might easily have been ensnared into courses of vice and infamy, have by means of the institution been instructed in their religious duties and the elementary branches of knowledge, and been thus trained to become respectable and useful members of society.²⁵

As noted above, this is not the traditional role or purpose of Jewish education, but rather an adoption of Anglo-Victorian educational and vocational sensibilities.

The school's curriculum fused the rudiments of a Jewish religious education, including knowledge of the Hebrew alphabet and a rote ability to recite prayers, with Victorian notions of educating the poor to their proper station in life, emphasizing character and respectable behavior.²⁶ Anglicization of the student body was also a primary goal, and the school actively sought to "inculcate at the earliest age in the minds of the children a pride in their English nationality."²⁷ Instruction, initially conducted by the monitorial system and later by instructors and pupil-teachers, combined secular and religious subjects, to the apparent satisfaction of the government inspectors and the Jewish establishment. The question of whether it satisfied the Jewish poor did not seem to matter, and certainly was never publicly raised. In keeping with English (and Jewish) practice of the time, boys and girls were taught in separate classes, and the subjects taught were based on the gender of the students. The following excerpt from an article in *The Times* nicely summarizes the curriculum:

In the boys' school Hebrew grammar, composition, &c., were studied—the sacred language engrossing its proper degree of attention. In English, besides reading, writing, and arithmetic, Euclid, mensuration, algebra, natural science, history, geography, and grammar entered into the curriculum. Social economy, too, formed an integral portion of the system of the school, and physiology, as applied to health, was also taught. In the girls' school less attention was of necessity devoted to the higher branches of intellectual cultivation, in order to afford time for instruction in duties more especially

25 Ibid., 3 June 1864, 11.

26 Singer, "Jewish Education," 168.

27 Statement made by Miss Miriam Harris, superintendent of the Jews' Infant School, a subsidiary of JFS. From W. Gilbert, "The London Jews," *Good Words* 5 (1864): 923–24. Reprinted in David Englander, ed. and comp., *A Documentary History of Jewish Immigrants in Britain, 1840–1920* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1994), 216.

useful to females. Needlework in all its applications to domestic and ornamental purposes, washing, ironing, and other household economies were sedulously inculcated, while the greatest attention was paid to religious instruction. The assistant and pupil teachers in both schools were conducted through a course of study to fit them for annual inspection by Her Majesty's inspectors. . . .²⁸

There is no way to assess accurately how effective the religious education was, but it should be noted that the general course of study continued to meet with government approval throughout the period. At the annual dinner in 1868, 82 percent of the boys and 72 percent of the girls “were pronounced by Her Majesty’s inspector to have been taught successfully.” It was further noted that this is “a result which is the more satisfactory because . . . two languages—English and Hebrew—are taught. . . .” The chair of the evening, Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, commented that “several of the pupil-teachers lately employed in the school had entered the London University and highly distinguished themselves. Several had obtained Scholarships, while others had taken the degrees of B.A. and M.A.”²⁹ This would certainly indicate that at least some students benefited from the general instruction offered by the Jews’ Free School. Continuing in this vein, the following year, the paper noted that “[t]he institution, in its two-fold character of an elementary and a normal school, has continued its career of usefulness with increasing success.”³⁰

Most of the other Jewish free schools in London were conducted along lines similar to those of the Jews’ Free School. The exception was the West Metropolitan Jewish Schools, connected to the West London Synagogue of British Jews, and thus Reform Judaism. The schools opened their boys’ school in 1845, their girls’ school in 1847, and an infant school in 1858–59. The West Metropolitan schools were also open to non-Jewish students, something that would not have been countenanced by the Jews’ Free School (or the chief rabbinate).³¹ At a dinner at Willis’s Rooms for the West Metropolitan Schools it was noted proudly that

28 *Times*, 20 June 1867, 7.

29 *Ibid.*, 24 June 1868, 5.

30 *Ibid.*, 14 June 1870, 12.

31 As noted previously, there were other things the chief rabbi was unwilling to countenance. Although traditionally the synagogue performed an educational role in Jewish communities, the chief rabbi foreclosed that role in England. Children under the age of four were strictly prohibited from attending synagogue services by his “Laws and Regulations of 1847.” He also forbade the discussion, interaction, and instruction that traditionally

[b]esides the usual course of secular education, the children were taught to read and understand the Sacred volume and the Daily Prayers, and were instructed in the grammatical rules of the Hebrew language. In consequence of the high character of the instruction given[,] the children of Christian parents were admitted to the secular classes with highly beneficial results. The schools were not, properly speaking, charities, as the parents were required to pay a sum not exceeding 4s. per month for the education of each child, which defrayed about one-fifth part of the expense of the establishment.³²

At another dinner for the West Metropolitan Jewish Schools, the reporter noted that “[o]n this occasion ladies were for the first time at these Jewish festivals introduced and accommodated with seats at the tables, partaking of the dinner with their husbands, brothers, and friends.” Of even more significance was the fact that during the evening “the company were addressed on various interesting topics bearing more or less on the subject of education in connexion with religious and political freedom, by Mr. F. D. Mocatta, the Rev. A. Lowy, Sir F. Goldsmid, M.P., Sir Benjamin Phillips, and others.”³³

As mentioned above, instruction was also provided to the young inmates of the Jews’ Orphan Asylum and the Jews’ Hospital. Shortly after assuming his duties as chief rabbi, N. M. Adler visited the Jews’ Orphan Asylum, where he

examined the children at considerable length as to the progress of their religious studies and scholastic studies, [and] was pleased to express the great satisfaction which their attainments, as well as their appearance, had afforded him. The doctor, who is a native of Germany, emphatically addressed the children in English, exhorting them to acts of obedience

took place during communal prayer. Such interaction was also discouraged by the decorous tone adopted in most English synagogues before 1881. See United Synagogue, “Chief Rabbinate, Chief Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler’s Proposed Laws & Regulations, 1847, for Ashkenazi Congregations in the British Empire,” ACC/2712/15/1963, LMA. The lack of formal religious education and synagogue attendance sometimes led to the adoption of peculiar worship practices. As, for example, those of Sir Basil Henriques (1890–1961) who was taught by his mother to pray on his knees, which he did throughout his life. Endelman, “Communal Solidarity,” 500.

32 *Times*, 2 April 1859, 9. The total enrollment was 140 (80 boys, 60 girls). The evening was chaired by F. D. Goldsmid.

33 *Times*, 10 June 1868, 7. The school, located on Red Lion Square, now had a total enrollment of 190 (80 boys, 110 girls). The connection drawn by some members of the Jewish community between education of the Jewish poor and political emancipation will be discussed below in the section on Sussex Hall.

to their teachers, and attention to their duties, as a grateful return for the benefits conferred on them. . . .³⁴

The chief rabbi was apparently so impressed with his visit that he became a patron of the charity on the spot. He was not the only prominent person to be impressed with the standards of the asylum. In 1859, speaking at a dinner for the asylum, Lord Mayor John Carter stated that he

had that day in company with the Lady Mayoress, visited the asylum and [admitted that he] had never seen more decent, orderly, and well-clad children, nor any whose looks so well testified to the care taken of them. The education given to the children, as far as he could judge, was one of a sound, moral, and religious character, and he was pleased to observe the cleanliness, economy, and comfort that prevailed throughout the asylum.³⁵

Instruction at the Jews' Orphan Asylum, as at the Jews' Free School, combined encouragement of cardinal Victorian virtues—character, usefulness, and knowing one's station in life—with a basic Jewish education. Describing the course of instruction given at the asylum *The Times* noted that

[t]he inmates of the asylum are admitted between the ages of two and 11. They are maintained, and receive a sound elementary Hebrew and English education, until they arrive at an age for being put out in the world, when they are apprenticed and provided with an outfit at the cost of the asylum. Even then they are not lost sight of, but are considered as in some sort under the guardianship of the asylum until the termination of their apprenticeship. In this way very many children have been trained into useful and valuable members of society.³⁶

Unlike the instruction provided at the other educational institutions for the Jewish poor, training at the Jews' Hospital principally involved the mastering of a skill or trade. It was believed that this training provided the Jewish poor with the skills they would need to successfully compete with the respectable English poor. As F. H. Goldsmid noted at the hospital's annual dinner in 1849:

34 Ibid., 9 September 1845, 5.

35 Ibid., 9 March 1859, 5. The lord mayor served as chair of the evening. At this time, the asylum had 36 inmates (20 boys, 16 girls).

36 *Times*, 7 March 1867, 12. The number of inmates was now 48 (23 boys, 25 girls).

[there were] disadvantages to which the humbler classes of his people were exposed by the observance of their Sabbath. . . . [He] showed the beneficial operation of the Hospital in teaching them trades from which they were thereby excluded. As a strong practical illustration of his observations, the children and young men of the institution were paraded around the room, many of them bearing samples of their skill as shoemakers, cabinetmakers, &c., and all exhibiting by their appearance the benefits which the charity provided.³⁷

The hospital's strategy was apparently an effective one, as *The Times* noted nearly twenty years later that "[d]uring the past year the hospital, in addition to the aged pensioners, has supported, educated, and clothed 90 children, of whom one-third were orphans; and 25 having attained the age prescribed by the laws have been apprenticed or placed in domestic situations."³⁸

Communal Education for the Adult Jewish Poor

London's Jewish community also concerned itself with the adult Jewish poor, although no comparable educational infrastructure was established to assist them.³⁹ Instead, the Jewish community generally adapted the institutions and practices increasingly popular within the greater English society, such as mechanics' institutes and lecture series for the poor. The instruction or "improvement" of the adult Jewish poor served to do more than just "improve" them. There was a perception among some members of the Jewish community (such as David Salomons, F. D. Mocatta, Francis Henry Goldsmid, Benjamin Phillips, and Isaac Lyon Goldsmid) that education of the Jewish poor, whether children or adults, was integrally connected to proving the community worthy of political emancipation. This belief was not universally held within the Jewish community. As but one example, Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler strongly supported Jewish education (under his supervision and control, of course) for religious reasons, but did not view it as a step toward winning emancipation. As previously noted, neither the chief rabbi nor Moses Montefiore were strong advocates of emancipation. It may well be that the chief rabbi and the president of the Board of Deputies

37 Ibid., 5 June 1849, 5. The number of inmates as of the previous year had been 87 (12 elderly, 55 boys, 20 girls.) The article further noted that "[a]mong the toasts of the evening there was one dedicated to civil and religious liberty."

38 Ibid., 22 April 1869, 11.

39 See chapter three above for more on non-educational assistance for the adult poor of Anglo-Jewry.

saw no need to obtain the highest political rights of the land for the Jewish community. It is also possible that they feared Jewish entry into Parliament would create a Jewish voice in political matters beyond the reach of the Board of Deputies and the other institutions controlled by the communal elite. The end run around the Board of Deputies and the chief rabbi made by the West London Synagogue in 1856 (when it acquired the right to appoint its own marriage registrar) may well have confirmed them in this view.⁴⁰

Those who did believe that instructing and improving the adult Jewish poor was the road to emancipation trod a fine line, seeking both to educate and anglicize the Jewish poor, while not depriving them of their Judaism but at the same time not making it too great a part of their identities. The ardent proponents of Jewish emancipation were not alone in their hopes. A reporter for *The Times*, writing about a public ball for the Western Jews' Free School for Boys held at Willis's Rooms in 1848, took the opportunity to tease the government and praise Anglo-Jewry's spirit of generosity, noting that "[f]ortunately no act of Parliament is required to enable our Jewish fellow-citizens to exercise those charitable feelings by which they are so honourably distinguished. . . ."⁴¹ Returning to the topic several years later, a reporter writing on the dinner held in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of the Jews' Hospital, chaired by the then Lord Mayor David Salomons, noted that the toast to

[t]he "corporation of London" was responded to by Mr. B.S. Phillips, the first Jew admitted to that court from which the intolerant spirit, except in a few wretched instances, has been since completely banished. He took the opportunity to state that the corporation were desirous by every means in their power to promote the moral, social, and political interests of their fellow-citizens, irrespective of creed or colour.⁴²

40 See Geoffrey Alderman, "English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry," in *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship*, ed. Pierre Birnbaum and Ira Katznelson (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

41 *Times*, 6 January 1848, 4. At this time the school had an enrollment of 60 boys. Curiously, the reporter viewed the company as quite exotic, noting that the "brilliant eyes of the Hebrew maidens furnish the nearest approach to our ideas of Eastern houris which, perhaps, our northern clime can present, and we have rarely witnessed a more unaffected spirit of enjoyment at a similar entertainment than that which prevailed last night." (A houri is "one of the beautiful maidens that in Muslim belief live with the blessed in paradise." *Merriam Webster*, s.v. "Houris," accessed July 4, 2017, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/houris>.) As the majority of the attendees would have been Ashkenazi Jews, this observation is odd. Obviously, the reporter's preconceptions of "Hebrew maidens" colored his views of the evening.

42 *Ibid.*, 18 February 1856, 7. Phillips went on to serve as lord mayor of London in 1865.

The tension in the community between those who hoped education of the Jewish poor would further the cause of emancipation, and those who believed it should simply serve to mold anglicized Jews, was also reflected in the creation of the Jews' and General Literary and Scientific Institution, which opened January 19, 1845. Sussex Hall, as it was more generally known, was modeled after the mechanics' institutes popularized by George Birkbeck and founded to raise the cultural caliber of the Anglo-Jewish working classes.⁴³ It provided a library, lectures, classes, concerts, and other enrichment activities for an annual subscription of thirty shillings, with a possible reduction to twelve shillings for the "poorer classes."⁴⁴ The mechanics' institutes, like Sussex Hall, were open to all creeds. Yet poor Jews tended to stay away from the gentile mechanics' institutes. It was felt that they would be more likely to take advantage of Sussex Hall's offerings as it was founded by their brethren.

"The opening ceremony was an outstanding success, its main theme being the raising of Jewish prestige in the eyes of their Gentile neighbors, and the promotion of cultural understanding among the Jewish masses themselves."⁴⁵ Chief Rabbi Adler visited in August 1845, became a subscriber, and donated a "complete set of the works of Moses Mendelssohn."⁴⁶ By 1848, 118 lectures had been given and 40,000 books borrowed. As Chief Rabbi Adler "pointed out . . . [Sussex Hall] was a living refutation of the popular reproach that the Jew had no interest in general culture."⁴⁷ The programming was quite varied, but always geared to raising the cultural level of the Jewish poor. The following programs are typical of the musical fare offered by the institution:

Sussex Hall, Leadenhall Street. Mr. I Cohan has the honour to announce to his Friends and the Public that his first Vocal and Instrumental Concert will take place at the above Institution, on Monday Evening, March 10th, 1845.—

43 Much of the discussion that follows is drawn from the article by Barnett. See Barnett, "Sussex Hall," 65–79. Sussex Hall was the new name given to the premises formerly known as Bricklayer's Hall. In 1860 the hall was occupied by the Metropolitan Evening Classes for Young Men. Renamed the City of London College (a precursor of the London Guildhall University) in 1861, it occupied the premises until 1881.

44 Ibid., 69.

45 Ibid., 70.

46 Ibid. This was a somewhat odd donation, both from a religious standpoint, and in light of the expected users of the institute's library.

47 Ibid., 72.

To commence at Eight o'Clock. . . . [There follows a list of "Artistes," the instruments they play and the pieces they will perform.]

Tickets—for the Body of the Hall, 2s. 6d.; Gallery, 3s. 6d.; Reserved Seats, 5s.—to be had of Mr. I. Cohan, at his Residence, 26, Soho-square; of the Librarian, at the Institution; also of all the principal Music-sellers.

Sussex Hall [Jews' and General Literary and Scientific Institution], No. 52, Leadenhall Street. Mr. Braham and Mr. C. Braham have been engaged to give Vocal Entertainment at the above Hall, on Saturday, March the 8th, 1845.

Doors open at Half-past Seven, commence at Eight.

Pit, 1s.; Reserved Seats, 1s. 6d.; Stage, 2s. 6d. Tickets to be had of Mr. Somers, Stationer, 67, Houndsditch; at the principal Music-sellers; and at Sussex Hall.⁴⁸

Lectures and book discussions, such as the one noted here, were also regularly included as part of the general "improving" instructional programs offered:

**Jews' and General Literary and Scientific
Institution,**

SUSSEX HALL, LEADENHALL-STREET.

LECTURES.

THURSDAY EVENING next, March 3rd, at half-past 8 o'clock,
Mr. GEORGE DAWSON (of Birmingham), on Old Books, their Uses,
Beauties, and Peculiarities:

Admission: Members' Friends, 6d.; Non-Members, 1s.

FRIDAY Evening next, March 4th, at 8 o'clock,

A LECTURE

Admission Free, by Tickets to be had in the Library.

SUBSCRIPTION TO THE INSTITUTION 20s. and 30s. PER
ANNUM.

MORRIS S. OPPENHEIM, Secretary.⁴⁹

48 Both notices appeared in the *JC*, 7 March 1845. Mr. Braham was most likely John Braham (1774–1856), the famous English (and Jewish) tenor, composer, and theater producer. The surname was likely changed from Abrams or Abraham.

49 *JC*, 25 February 1853. This ad looks somewhat different as it was apparently printed to look like an invitation. Punctuation is as given in the original. Note that the Friday evening event, in keeping with traditional Judaism's stricture against using money on the Sabbath, is free. Note also that the yearly subscription ranged from £1 to £1 10s., not easy to manage on the working poor's budget.

Unfortunately, the undertaking soon found itself in financial difficulty. At no point were workers' subscriptions sufficient to maintain the institution. Thus, the institution required supplementary contributions from wealthier Jewish patrons. Additionally, attendance at its functions, once the initial novelty wore off, was somewhat lackluster. Workers were frequently too tired to attend evening lectures or performances, or unwilling to use their meager disposable income for these programs. Additionally, the growing availability of cheaper newspapers made their use of the hall's reading room, one of the draws for membership, less necessary.⁵⁰ Also of concern was the general (that is, largely secular) content of most of the programs on offer. Some, such as the chief rabbi, felt a more Jewish element should be injected, while others were insistent on allowing only offerings of general interest. This latter insistence was in response to the fact that some proponents of emancipation, such as Isaac Lyon Goldsmid and David Salomons, had been initially reluctant to support a supplementary educational institution such as Sussex Hall. They feared it would increase Jewish separatism among the lower classes by promoting traditional religiosity rather than

50 As T. R. Nevett notes, "In 1853 the advertisement duty was abolished, and 1855 saw the end of the newspaper stamp. The result was a tremendous expansion of the press, coinciding with a vast increase in advertising." Nevett, *Advertising in Britain: A History* (London: Heinemann, 1982), 67. More particularly the taxes were as follows:

Newspaper Taxation from 1800.

The Newspaper Stamp Duty

From 1797	3½ d
1815	4d (effectively 3d net)
1836	1d (½d extra for supplements)
1855	abolished

The Advertisement Duty

(levied at a flat rate on each advertisement)

From 1797	3s0d
1815	3s6d
1833	1s6d
1853	abolished

leading to greater understanding (read “anglicization”) and integration with the general English population.⁵¹

Sussex Hall was forced to close its doors at the end of 1859, fairly soon after the passage of political emancipation. Efforts were made to the end to keep it financially viable, as the following notice from *The Times* indicates, but they were ultimately unsuccessful:

Yesterday evening a grand ball . . . took place at the London Tavern, in celebration of the removal of the Jewish disabilities and in aid of the funds of the **Jews’ and General Literary and Scientific Institution** [Sussex Hall]. . . .

The object of the institution is the diffusion of useful and entertaining knowledge, and, party politics and theology being alike excluded, it is supported almost equally by Jews and Christians. The working class lectures during the winter months have been one of the most successful features of the institution.⁵²

Arthur Barnett argues that the institute lost the wealthy patrons it needed to survive principally because the attainment of emancipation convinced them their support of such an institution was no longer essential. They believed the need to raise the Jewish poor in the esteem of the gentile Anglo world was now of less immediacy. As Barnett succinctly phrases it, “Emancipation was born, so Sussex Hall was dead.”⁵³ This seems a plausible explanation. However, it should be noted that while many of the upper-class (and upper-middle-class) supporters of Sussex Hall believed that raising the general cultural level of working class Jews (or at least appearing to do so) was a necessary step toward meriting emancipation, there is nothing

The Paper Duty

(per lb.)

1803	3d
1836	1½d
1861	abolished

In Nevett, *Advertising in Britain*, 25. Source given as A. P. Wadsworth, *Newspaper Circulations, 1800–1954* (Manchester: Manchester Statistical Society, 1955).

51 This again is indicative of the disagreement between the emancipationists and the traditionalists within the communal elite over the public face they wished to present to the larger society. When the idea for the institution was initially raised Isaac Lyon Goldsmid objected to the use of the word “Jew” in its title. Obviously, he was unsuccessful in having the offending word removed.

52 *Times*, 4 February 1859, 12.

53 Barnett, “Sussex Hall,” 79.

in the many and varied parliamentary debates over Jewish disabilities to indicate that this was ever a consideration.

The demise of Sussex Hall marked the end of large-scale organized cultural enrichment activities geared to the adult Jewish poor during this period. However, occasional programs continued to be offered by organizations within the community, as the following notice indicates:

Free Lectures to Jewish Working Men and Their Families. The Managers have the pleasure of announcing that Ellis A. Davidson, Esq., has kindly consented to give the Third and Last Lecture of the course at the Jews' Infant School, on Sunday Evening, 30th inst.

Subject: "Man as compared with other Animals."

Chair to be taken at Eight o'clock.⁵⁴

Note that although a Jew delivered this lecture in a Jewish venue, the topic was non-denominational. As such, it continued in the general pattern of the offerings of Sussex Hall and was typical of many educational programs offered to working-class Victorians at the time.

Private Education: Children of the Anglo-Jewish Middle and Upper Classes

Thus far, the focus has been on educational arrangements made for (not by) the Jewish poor. Now let us consider the educational needs and arrangements of the Jewish middle classes.

For social and curricular reasons, wealthy and middle-class Jews could not bring themselves to send their children to any of the Jewish free schools. Most obviously, they were not poor and sought to avoid the social stigma connected with enrolling their children in schools principally attended by those who were. Additionally, the secular and religious curricula of the free schools were clearly not up to the standards they deemed necessary for the education of their children. Unlike the Jewish poor, who frequently required direct communal assistance and thus fell under the rubric of Anglo-Jewish (that is, emerging Victorian Jewish) paternalism, the other classes were capable of providing for themselves and were therefore left to make their own arrangements for the education of their children. Before 1855 and the opening of the Jews' College School under the auspices of the chief rabbi, their options were largely limited to private Jewish boarding or day schools,

54 *JC*, 28 May 1869.

home tutoring, Continental education, or the University College (1833) and City of London (1837) Schools, both of which were non-denominational day schools.⁵⁵ The country's established private schools, as well as the public schools, were denominationally Christian and therefore not an option.

Extensive information about many of the private schools attended by the Jewish middle and upper classes between 1841 and 1880, as well as information on other available educational arrangements, can be gleaned from the advertising sections of the Anglo-Jewish press.⁵⁶ Many of these schools regularly advertised in the pages of the *Jewish Chronicle*, the *Voice of Jacob*, the *Jewish World*, and similar papers, providing addresses, descriptions of their curricula, fees, and other germane facts.

The first ad for a Jewish private school appeared in May 1842. The school, billed as a "Hebrew and English Seminary," was located at Fore Hamlet, Saint Clements, Ipswich, and was run by Harris Isaacs, who promised "that his best . . . efforts will be urged to forward [his charges'] Improvement; direct their minds to Religion and Morality. . . ." The terms were listed as follows: "Board, Hebrew & English Tuition from 6 to 8 years old, Working included, £20 0s. from 8 to 10 years of age, £24 0s. Each Pupil to bring six towels. . . . Vacation only during Passover holidays. Accounts to be settled quarterly."⁵⁷ Although the seminary was located outside London, Isaacs clearly expected that students from the capital would enroll. Several of the Jewish private schools were based in the provinces and most advertised in the London Jewish press, as this was where their principal potential clientele resided.

The first listing for private tutorials also appeared in May 1842, noting that

55 For a discussion of differing middle- and upper-class Anglo-Jewish attitudes toward middle-class Jewish day schools, see Israel Finstein, "Anglo-Jewish Attitudes to Jewish Day-School Education 1850–1950," in his collection of essays, *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002), 52–95.

56 1841 is given as the starting date because it marks the first time Anglo-Jewish newspapers appeared with any regularity. Both the *Jewish Chronicle* and the *Voice of Jacob* began publication this year. For more on the *JC*, see David Cesarani, *The Jewish Chronicle*; William Frankel, ed., *Friday Nights: A Jewish Chronicle Anthology, 1841–1971*, comp. A. B. Levy (London: *Jewish Chronicle* Publications, 1973); Cecil Roth, *The Jewish Chronicle, 1841–1941: A Century of Newspaper History* (London: *Jewish Chronicle*, 1949). There has not yet been any monograph-length treatment of the *VJ*.

57 *JC*, 6 May 1842. The ad appears again in the May 13 issue but now states "washing [not 'working'] included."

Mr. D. Asher, having returned from Birmingham, respectfully begs to inform his Friends and the Jewish Public in general, that he intends giving Instruction in the Hebrew and German languages to private Pupils, either at their, or, at his own residence. Testimonials may be seen and further particulars obtained, at 15 Leicester Place, Leicester Square, from 8 'till 12 every Morning.⁵⁸

This was fairly typical of the advertisements offering tutorial services. Most established the credentials of the tutor, sometimes provided named references, and offered a variety of instruction in secular and religious subjects. They frequently highlighted the linguistic abilities of the tutor, as many considered some facility with Continental tongues the mark of an educated individual. Another notice typical of these types of ads appeared earlier the same year in the *Voice of Jacob*:

A Jewish Theologian in Germany, well versed in Ancient and Modern Languages, is desirous of obtaining a situation as Tutor in a private family, or as master in a public school, either in England or France. He has had the entire management, including the education, of several youths (chiefly English) at Mannheim and at Frankfurt. He can be recommended by gentlemen of great eminence, and has testimonials from the Gymnasium, the University, and also from several Rev. Gentlemen. Letters addressed to: M.S., care of the editor of the *Voice of Jacob*, will be immediately attended to.⁵⁹

Although these ads were always directed at the Jewish middle (or upper) classes with school-age children, not all those offering their services, as this next ad indicates, were of the "Hebrew persuasion":

I. I. O'Grady, A.B. M.D., Professor of the Latin and French languages, Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, in the "New Jewish Seminary," begs leave to apprise his friends and the public, that he intends opening Morning and Evening PRIVATE CLASSES, for a select and limited number of young gentlemen, whom he proposes to instruct in the Latin and French languages, composition and polite literature. He has also been induced, by the earnest solicitation of a few immediate friends, to devote Three Hours each week to the convenience of gentlemen, who may feel desirous of perfecting

58 *JC*, 13 May 1842.

59 *VJ*, 18 February 1842.

themselves in a course of Italian Literature and Science. Dr. O'G. trusts, that from his long residence in Italy, and an intimate acquaintance with the principles of languages and science, he will be enabled to accelerate the progress of his pupils, beyond even their most sanguine expectations.

The classes are now being formed, and every information relative to Terms, Hours of Attendance, & c. can be known by personal application at his chambers, 1, Hanover Place, Hanover Square, Minories. March 14, 1843.⁶⁰

Families seeking private tutors for their children, as the following note illustrates, also ran ads:

Wanted, in a small Family, a Jewish Tutor competent to conduct young Gentlemen through all the branches of a general classical education. His time will be occupied from 10 A.M., until 8 P.M., during which hours he will take meals with his Pupils. Apply, post-paid, stating full particulars, addressed E., at the Printers of the *Voice of Jacob*.⁶¹

Of the many private schools that advertised in the Jewish press over the years, the most famous was probably Gloucester House Academy. Founded around 1799 by Hyman Hurwitz, it was originally located in Highgate. When Hurwitz retired in 1822, he sold the school to Leopold Neumegen.⁶² Neumegen operated the school in Highgate until 1842, retired briefly, and then, following a series of ill-advised investments, returned to operating the school. He reopened at Gloucester House in Kew in 1842, at which time he placed the following lengthy ad:

Gloucester House Academy. Mr. Neumegen, having removed his Establishment from Highgate to Gloucester House, Kew; where he has taken spacious premises, delightfully situated, surrounded by four acres of ground and in every respect admirable adapted for a first rate Establishment; solicits the patronage of his friends, and assures them, that in addition to the well known salubrity of the situation, he is determined that, as far as regards the solidity of the instruction, the domestic arrangements, and

60 Ibid., 17 March 1843.

61 Ibid., 15 October 1841.

62 See Leonard Hyman, "Hyman Hurwitz: The First Anglo-Jewish Professor," *TJHSE* 21 (1968). Hurwitz went on to become professor of Hebrew at University College London in 1828.

parental attention, for promoting the general happiness of the Pupils, his Establishment shall not be excelled by any in the Country.

Mr. Neumegen flatters himself, that his long experience in the scholastic profession, and the proficiency of the numerous pupils that have been educated under his care, will entitle him to the same encouragement and patronage, which he had the honor of enjoying for twenty years, at Highgate.

The pupils are instructed in the Hebrew Language grammatically, and gradually made acquainted with its sublime Literature, now so generally and so justly admitted as being most essential for the education of our youth.

To meet the wishes of some of Mr. N.'s friends, he has established a separate class for instruction in the Talmud, under his immediate superintendence, for such pupils whose parents should particularly desire them to be acquainted with the knowledge of that erudite study.

Terms.—Including English in all its branches, Hebrew, French, Writing, Book keeping, Arithmetic, Algebra, Geometry, & c. Geography, and the Use of the Globes: —Thirty-six Guineas per Annum; Washing included. Latin and Greek, One Guinea per Quarter each. Music, Dancing, Drawing, & c., on the usual terms. Each Pupil to bring six towels and a dessert spoon and fork. Pupils under eight years of age, are admitted at Thirty Guineas per Annum, without any extra charge whatever.

The two Vacations, at the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles, one Month each; but any pupil is at liberty to remain at those times, without any additional expense, except during the week of Passover.⁶³

Gloucester House's offerings were quite extensive, even when compared with other Jewish private schools of the period. Neumegen's school, at thirty to thirty-six guineas per year, plus extra for dancing lessons and other activities, clearly catered exclusively to the upper-middle and upper classes. Instruction encompassed both secular and religious subjects, with additional religious classes for those whose families were more traditional. Obviously, not all private schools were as expensive or exclusive as Neumegen's establishment, nor were their instructional offerings nearly as extensive. In contrast, the Aspen Boarding House Academy for Young Ladies and Young Gentlemen in Milton, Next Gravesend, only charged nineteen pounds per year including dancing (music lessons extra). Run by D. N. Martin from 1835, the school instructed students in "English Reading, Writing, Arithmetic; Portuguese and German.

63 VJ, 1 April 1842.

Hebrew [was] taught Grammatically, with the Interpretations. . . . [Also taught were] Domestic and Ornamental Needle Work, Embroidery, etc.”⁶⁴

Gloucester House Academy remained open under Neumegen’s personal supervision until his death in 1875, at which time an obituary in the *Jewish Chronicle* noted that

Leopold Neumegen has been for half a century a household word. There is scarcely a family of any position whose members have not received a portion of their education at the school which he conducted many years successfully. . . . Mr. Neumegen was born in Posen in 1787 . . . he removed about 1816 to this country, where he became Principal of a boarding house at Highgate. His pupils were numerous. After many years of labour he retired from the profession, but having made some unfortunate investments he found it necessary to re-open a school. He established his school at Gloucester House, Kew. But in this second act on his life’s drama, he had the good fortune of the sympathy and co-operation of a wife—an amiable lady, justly beloved.⁶⁵

Beginning in 1856, Gloucester House also offered a program for young ladies under the supervision of Neumegen’s wife, who, “having been solicited to undertake the Education of a few Young Ladies, begs to acquaint her Friends that she has apportioned a part of the extensive Premises of Gloucester House, quite unconnected with the department for Young Gentlemen, exclusively for the reception of a limited number of Young Ladies, who will have the advantage of a superior Education combined with every domestic comfort.”⁶⁶ Five years after Neumegen’s death, his wife was still operating the young ladies’ component of the school:

Gloucester House, Kew. High-class Establishment for Young Ladies, conducted by Mrs. Neumegen.

Certified English, French, and German Resident Governesses and visiting Professors.

Piano and Harmony, Singing, Drawing and Painting, Hebrew, Dancing and Calisthenics by efficient Masters.

Pupils prepared for the University Examinations.

Prospectuses on application.⁶⁷

64 *JC*, 5 February 1847.

65 *Ibid.*, 16 April 1875.

66 *Ibid.*, 16 May 1856.

67 *Ibid.*, 2 January 1880.

As the preparation for university exams and calisthenics indicate, expectations regarding young Jewish women's education had clearly changed since 1856 when she first opened the young ladies' division.⁶⁸ Gloucester House remained open until 1928, first under the supervision of Neumegen's wife, and later under their daughter.

Neumegen's Gloucester House Academy was the longest running establishment of its type to advertise in the Jewish press, but there were many other private Jewish schools that made repeated appearances in its advertising pages over the years. Of particular note were the various schools run by the Moss sisters under their maiden name, and later under their married names of Hartog, Leo, and Levetus.⁶⁹ Marion Hartog operated several successful incarnations of a school for Jewish young ladies, first with her sister Celia Levetus and later with her sister Mrs. Leo. "Mrs. Hartog and Miss Moss's Select School for Young Ladies" first inserted an ad in the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1846, although the ad made clear that the school had been in operation for some time. The school, located at 58 Mansell Street, Goodman's Fields, charged tuition of five guineas per annum.⁷⁰ In 1851, Hartog opened a new school with her husband, Alphonse Hartog, "a native of Paris and Professor of Languages." This school greatly expanded the scale of her operation:

Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies, and a Preparatory School for Little Boys. The Course of Instruction will comprise English, in all its branches; Hebrew, according to the German and Portuguese pronunciation; French and German, Music, and Plain and Ornamental Needlework. Drawing and Dancing, if required.

68 This change is in keeping with W. B. Stephens's observation that before the late nineteenth century, middle- and upper-class English girls' education "tended to concentrate on decorative 'accomplishments' rather than academic instruction." Stephens, *Education in Britain*, 45. Women were first admitted to the University of London in 1869, to Girton College at Cambridge in 1869, and to Oxford in 1878. However, they could not take degrees at Oxford until 1920 or at Cambridge until 1921.

69 Hartog and Levetus were also authors of several Jewish romantic novels, and Hartog was the "editress" of the *Jewish Sabbath Journal*, published weekly from February to April 1855. The journal contained poems, stories, biblical parables, historical anecdotes, and religious readings for children. Hartog was the mother of Numa Hartog (1846–1871), the first Jewish senior wrangler (1869) at Trinity College Cambridge, who tragically died of smallpox in 1871. For more on the Moss sisters' novels, see Zatlin, *Anglo-Jewish Novel*, 30–33. For more on Hartog and the *Sabbath Journal*, see entry "Marion Hartog" by Michael Galchinsky in the Jewish Women's Archive at <https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/hartog-marion>.

70 *JC*, 16 April 1846.

Conscious that she will bring to her task many years' experience, both as a public and private teacher, Mrs. Hartog trusts that she will meet with encouragement from her co-religionists; and by strict attention to her duties she will endeavour to merit their support. The year will be divided into three equal terms of four months each, the first commencing on the 1st of January, 1852. (Each term to be paid in advance.) As the number of Boarders will be strictly limited to Twelve, Mrs. Hartog will receive them into her family circle, where they will enjoy the same advantages as if educated in Paris, French being constantly spoken in the Establishment.

Writing and Languages taught by Masters. Holidays, three weeks at Passover, and the week of Tabernacles. 6, Finsbury Place South. For Terms, apply at 8, Magdalen Row, Great Prescott Street.⁷¹

By 1858, the school had moved to Camden Road and become a "Preparatory Boarding School for Young Gentlemen." The school was now under the direction of Mrs. Hartog and her sister Mrs. Leo, although "Mons. Alphonse Hartog, Professor of Music, [would continue to] attend schools and private families as usual."⁷² An ad appearing the following year noted that the number of pupils was strictly limited and that "French is constantly spoken, and forms part of the daily routine."⁷³

In 1866, the school was again revamped, moving to Belsize Park, Hampstead, and once again becoming a school for young ladies:

Mesdames Hartog and Leo beg to announce their intention of Removing to a larger and more commodious residence situate [sic] at Belsize Park, Hampstead, where, assisted by an efficient staff of Masters and a resident German Governess, they will early in October, open a first-class Boarding and Day School for young Ladies, in which all the advantages of a Continental education will be combined with the comforts and moral training of an English home. Terms on application—300 Camden-road, W.⁷⁴

In 1869, the sisters went their separate ways. Hartog maintained the Laurel House School at Belsize Square in Hampstead, while Leo opened her own school, Merton House, in South Hampstead. Unfortunately (albeit,

71 Ibid., 12 December 1851.

72 Ibid., 8 January 1858.

73 Ibid., 8 April 1859.

74 Ibid., 21 September 1866. Another ad that ran on November 2, 1866, indicated that the school was now called "Laurel House Collegiate Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies" and was located at 15 Belsize Square, Hampstead.

obviously), the ads are silent about the reasons for the breakup and Leo fades from the advertising pages of the *Jewish Chronicle*.

By 1875, Hartog had again moved her school to a different location (or possibly closed Laurel House and opened a new school; the newspaper is silent on the matter). The final ad in this "series" noted that the school was now situated in Maida Vale and known as the "Lorne House Collegiate Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies." Lorne House was "conducted by Madame Alphonse Hartog, assisted by resident English and German governesses and an efficient staff of highly qualified professors. Special classes [were now offered] for young ladies wishing to pass University examinations."⁷⁵ Thus, like Gloucester House, the Hartog-run schools underwent substantial curricular change from the opening of the first one in 1846, with its offering of "plain and ornamental needlework" for young ladies, in addition to other subjects.⁷⁶

Another interesting "series" of ads was run between 1852 and 1860 by a married couple named Stern. They began in Liverpool in 1852, operating a "Hebrew, English, French, and German Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies."⁷⁷ Tuition was four guineas per year, and boarders were assured they would be treated like family. By 1856, the Sterns had moved their establishment to London and placed the following ad:

Continental Education in London. Madame Stern, a Parisian, late Governess of the Scottish Ladies' Institution, Edinburgh, and for five years Proprietress of a Ladies' Establishment, receives into her Family a very limited number of Young Ladies, to be educated privately, with the assistance of Herr Stern and competent English Teachers. French and German exclusively spoken.

Herr Stern, Member of the Phil. Sem., University, Heidelberg, and Hebrew and German Teacher at the Jewish College School, instructs in Hebrew, German, and French, and General Subjects of Education, in Schools, Families, and his own Residence, by the medium of French or German if preferred.

Morning and Evening Classes for Ladies and Gentlemen, separately.

75 Ibid., 1 January 1875. The ad also noted that "Mons. Alphonse Hartog continues to give private lessons in French and German."

76 Hartog died in 1907. Her obituary noted, among other things, that she began her school at the age of 16 and came from a prominent Jewish family in Portsea. Ibid., 1 November 1907. A copy of the obituary is also located in MS 160 (old AJ 167/1–2), AJA, Southampton.

77 Ibid., 2 April 1852.

19, Hanover-street, River-terrace, Islington⁷⁸

Three years later, they had moved to Kentish Town, where Madame Stern still educated a small number of young ladies in the bosom of her family, while Herr Stern accepted male pupils for private instruction in Hebrew, German, and French.⁷⁹

By 1860, the couple had quit England for the Continent and had again opened a boarding school:

Education in Stuttgart, Capital of the Kingdom of Wurtemberg. Mr. M. Stern, late Teacher of Hebrew and German at the London Jewish College School, has opened at Stuttgart a Boarding School for Young Gentlemen, who attend the celebrated Royal Schools for mercantile studies and sciences. The home instruction includes religious subjects, as well as modern and ancient Languages. It may be observed that Mrs. Stern is a native of Paris; the Pupils will thus have great facilities in acquiring a practical knowledge of the French Language. Mr. Stern can refer to numerous friends, whose confidence he enjoyed during the fifteen years of residence in England.⁸⁰

This may well have marked the end of their travels (and possibly their educational activities), as their ads stopped running in the *Jewish Chronicle*.

As noted above, there were a number of provincial Jewish private schools that regularly solicited the patronage of the London Jewish community. The most prominent among them was Tivoli House Academy, Gravesend, run by Henry Berkowitz. The academy opened sometime in the late 1840s. One of its earliest ads noted that an “Establishment for Young Gentlemen” located at Oak Villas, Windmill Hill, Gravesend, was accepting new students. Tuition was twenty-five guineas per year, and instruction included “a complete English Commercial Education” as well as “Hebrew, French, German, and other accomplishments.”⁸¹

In 1857, Berkowitz greatly expanded the scope of his operations after he acquired the “extensive premises formerly known as the Tivoli, containing no less than forty-three rooms, among which there are spacious bedrooms, diningrooms [sic], &c.; situated in a most salubrious part of the town . . . all calculated to promote the good health . . . of the children entrusted to his

78 Ibid., 6 June 1856.

79 Ibid., 8 July 1859.

80 Ibid., 6 April 1860.

81 Ibid., 2 April 1852.

care."⁸² This same year he informed the public that the Tivoli's premises "are eminently calculated to answer the purpose of a BOARDING ACADEMY, combining the advantages of a most salubrious air, and the easy access from London throughout the day." Berkowitz invited "parents and guardians to pay a visit to his establishment, in order to convince themselves of its excellent adaptation to all the purposes and requirements of a Superior Boarding Academy, trusting that the numerous advantages it affords will be duly appreciated." He also now opened a girls' school, noting that "[t]here will also be a *Distinct Establishment* for Young Ladies, under the superintendence of Mrs. Berkowitz and efficient resident governesses" established at Tivoli House.⁸³

By 1880, Tivoli House Academy had lived up to the promise of its extensive premises. The boarding school offered instruction for Jewish students of both sexes on a wide array of subjects both intellectual and physical. A new dormitory had been added along with a high school for young ladies. Religious instruction was given, and access to a synagogue was provided as well. Also of interest was the addition of drilling and swimming to the boys' curriculum. This is clearly a variant of the English public school fitness and games programs propounded earlier in the century by Thomas Arnold and others:

Tivoli House Academy, Gravesend. Established over 30 Years. Principal.—Mr. H. Berkowitz. Assisted by a staff of qualified Masters.

The situation of the above establishment is acknowledged as the most salubrious in the country, standing in its own grounds of three acres, overlooking Windmill Hill, Swanscombe Woods, and miles of the finest scenery in Kent.

The course of Education is one which has been attended with most successful results in preparing pupils for their Confirmation and the Local Examination.

Subjects taught: Hebrew (in all its branches), Preliminaries, Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Spelling, Composition, Elocution, English Grammar, English History and Geography, French and German, conversationally and grammatically (both by native masters), Latin, Mathematics, Painting, Drawing, Music, Singing, Drilling, and Swimming.

82 Ibid., 2 January 1857. A "salubrious" location or situation appears to have been a hallmark of these institutions.

83 Ibid., 24 April 1857.

The course of Education is divided into three classes, viz.: 1st. Preparatory (boys under nine, taught by ladies); 2nd. Commercial; 3rd. Classical.

The salutary arrangements are of the latest improvements. The comfort and health of the pupils are deemed considerations of primary importance, and every effort is made to promote them. The ample testimony of many parents will show to how great an extent these efforts have been successful.

The Principal (in order to accommodate an increased number of pupils) has, in addition to the 42 rooms belonging to the establishment, built a spacious and well ventilated dormitory, new school-rooms, bath-room, lavatories, &c.

Terms moderate and inclusive. Holidays once a year.

In connection with the above there is a High School for Young Ladies, conducted on the most approved principles and methods.

Terms on application as above. Quarter commences from day of entrance.

A Synagogue is attached to the establishment.⁸⁴

In addition to Anglo-Jewish private schools already discussed, there were a number of Continental Jewish schools (note, not *yeshivot*) that regularly advertised in the press in the hope of attracting those in the upper-middle and upper classes of London Jewry willing to send their children abroad for education. These schools invariably offered secular and religious subjects in a home environment in which the young charges, it was promised, would receive the affection and care they were accustomed to receiving from their own parents. Continental schools generally listed a European rabbi, the British chief rabbi, or a known Anglo-Jewish personage as their reference. Their curricula were virtually identical to those offered by Anglo-Jewish private schools, so the draw, presumably, was the cachet attached to a “Continental education.” The earliest of the ads for this type of private establishment appeared in March 1845:

Madame Marix’ Establishment for Young Ladies, at Paris (formerly of Rue Grenier-St.-Lazare), now 4, Rue du Grand Chantier.

84 Ibid., 2 January 1880. Alderman Henry Berkowitz, who served as mayor of Gravesend, 1887-1888, passed away in 1891. His obituary and related information are in MS 116/32 (old AJ 102), AJA, Southampton. The school, headed by his son Isidore Berkowitz, was still in operation in 1911, appearing in a census list for that year. In 1915, the school was bombed in a Zeppelin attack and relocated to Harrow. It closed there in 1919. See british-jewry.org.uk/tivolihouse.php for the census list. See also Malcolm Brown, “The Jews of Gravesend before 1915,” 35 *Jewish Historical Studies* (1996-1998): 119-139.

In consequence of the increase of Boarders, Madame Marix has removed her Establishment to a new situation, which offers every desirable advantage: it is spacious, airy, encloses fine terraces, and affords a good view of the beautiful gardens surrounding the school.

It has been Madame Marix' study for the last fourteen years, during which she conducted the establishment, independent of an excellent education, to provide also for the comfort of the young ladies entrusted to her care like a mother. Every branch of knowledge requisite for a sound education, reading, writing, grammar, literature, mythology, arithmetic, ancient and modern history, geography, German and Hebrew. A course of religious instructions under the auspices of the Chief Rabbi.

Plain and Ornamental needlework is also taught. Extra charges only for English, Drawing, Music, and Dancing.

Application to be made to Madame Bernard, 24, Bury Street, St. Mary Axe, where further particulars may be obtained.⁸⁵

A fairly similar ad, this time for an establishment for young men, appeared a couple of months later under the heading "Continental Education":

Hebrew Finishing Academy, Rue de Berlin, Faubourg de Namur, Brussels. This Establishment is situated in the most salubrious part of the town, surrounded by the most picturesque views. The plan adopted comprises the most extensive instruction, united with the strictest attention to moral and religious principles.

The education comprehends the study of the Holy Scriptures, combined with a Grammatical knowledge of the Hebrew, Latin, German, French, and English Languages, History, Geography, and Mathematics; these branches are taught by the first professors, and under the immediate surveillance of the Rev. Dr. H. Loeb, Chief Rabbi of the Kingdom of Belgium.

For terms and further information, application to be made (if by letter post paid) to Mr. I. Lyon, 26 and 27, Duke-street, Aldgate; H. Harris, 22, Leman-street, Goodman's Fields; to the Rev. Dr. H. Loeb, Chief Rabbi, at Brussels; or to the Director of the Institution, Professor Lewis Jackson, No. 2, Rue de Berlin, Faubourg de Namur, at Brussels.⁸⁶

85 Ibid., 21 March 1845.

86 Ibid., 2 May 1845. While neither of these ads listed tuition and board prices, many others did. Fees generally began around forty pounds per year and climbed from there.

The number of ads for Jewish private schools increased steadily from 1841. By 1880, the *Jewish Chronicle* generally contained more than twenty-five private school ads per issue. As the profusion of Jewish private schools indicates, there were no communal Jewish schools for the children of middle- and upper-class Jews.⁸⁷ Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler spearheaded efforts to remedy this situation in the 1850s with the opening of the Jews' College School. The school, affiliated with Jews' College, opened in 1855 as a day school, to which the Jewish middle classes (particularly the traditionalists among them) could send their children for a class-appropriate religious and secular education.

Jews' College, also founded in 1855, enrolled its first students the following year.⁸⁸ It was opened as a training school for Torah readers, religious teachers, and Anglo-Jewish ministers—that is, English sermonizers under the control of the chief rabbi and the various synagogal laities, not rabbis trained as experts in Jewish law. The college offered instruction in “Hebrew in all its branches, English Reading and Writing, English Grammar, Composition and Literature, Ancient and Modern History, Geography Physical and Political, Arithmetic and Bookkeeping, the Elements of Mathematics, Physical Sciences, and the Latin, French, and German Languages.” Parents were assured that pupils would receive a “good collegiate and commercial education combined with the acquisition of knowledge of the sacred language, and the tenets of our holy faith.”⁸⁹ Jews' College School operated from 1855 to 1879, at which time declining enrollment forced its closure. The drop in enrollment was caused by a number of factors, including a gradual decrease in middle-class Jewish religiosity; residential changes as London's middle-class Jewish population shifted westward from the City; and the opening of a Jewish house (Polack's House) at Clifton College in 1879, enabling Jews, as Jews, to board at a Public School. Jews' College continues to operate. Renamed the London School of Jewish Studies in 1999, it trains and ordains traditional rabbis and produces teachers and others with Judaic expertise.⁹⁰

87 By 1880, educational advertisement rates in the *JC* were 3s. 6d. for up to five lines, and 6d. for each additional line. An annual subscription to the paper could be had for 8s. 8d., while individual issues cost two pence.

88 Alphonse Hartog taught French at Jews' College, and Dr. Louis Loewe—secretary and confidante to Sir Moses Montefiore, polyglot, and principal of a Jewish private school in Brighton—was the first headmaster. See Hyamson, *Jews' College*.

89 *JC*, 1 October 1858.

90 For more on the London School of Jewish Studies, see <https://www.lsjjs.ac.uk>.

The more progressive elements within Anglo-Jewry opposed the establishment of communal Jewish schools for the middle classes, including the Jews' College School, believing these schools would hinder anglicization and emancipation by fostering Jewish separatism. While they admitted that most English schools had a "Christian religious character, the growth of secular institutions, such as the University College School, provided an [adequate] alternative for Jewish parents" and negated the need for opening specifically Jewish schools. Also, as English Jews did not have to cope with the overt antisemitism present on much of the Continent, progressives simply did not believe a separate Jewish school system was necessary.⁹¹ Interestingly, they did not oppose Jews' College, which they viewed as a mechanism for creating an anglicized Jewish clergy—something they ardently desired.

The secular University College School (1833) and the City of London School (1837) accepted Jewish students from the outset, but neither provided any Jewish instruction. Thus, parents who sought to add a religious component to their children's education were compelled to look for ways to supplement the schools' offerings. Before 1860, they were able to do so through private boarding and tutorial arrangements, such as those offered in the following ads:

Establishment for Resident Pupils, At No. 2, Southampton Street, Fitzroy Square. The Rev. A. Loewy receives into his Family a small number of Young Gentlemen, who attend at the UNIVERSITY COLLEGE SCHOOL, and have at the same time every advantage of a careful superintendence, and a suitable instruction in subjects connected with the Religion and the History of the Jews. Several Modern Languages are taught at Mr. Loewy's Establishment, and German is the medium of conversation in his Family.

For Prospectuses and further particulars, apply to Mr. Lindenthal, New Synagogue, Great St. Helen's, Crosby Square, or to Mr. Loewy, at his residence.⁹²

Superior Establishment for Young Jewish Gentlemen, In Connection with the University College School, London, Dr. Heimann, Professor of German in University College, receives a limited number of Boarders at his residence, 57, Gordon-square, which lies a very short distance from the School.

91 For a discussion of the traditionalist and progressive positions see Singer, "Jewish Education," 172–75.

92 *JC*, 29 December 1854.

Dr. Heimann superintends the scholastic studies of the young gentlemen, who are specially instructed in the Hebrew language, and in matters connected with religion.

For terms, and particulars in reference to domestic comfort and plan of instruction, apply to

Dr. Heimann, 57, Gordon-Square, London.⁹³

After 1860, it became somewhat easier to make provisions for supplemental Jewish education. In that year, the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge was established to provide religious instructional material, although it was not until 1876 that the association directed itself to the extracurricular instruction of those students enrolled in English schools who desired it.⁹⁴

Supplemental Education: Instruction in Class-Appropriate Skills

Those in the community with higher social aspirations for themselves or their children regularly supplemented formal education with the niceties of instruction in dance, deportment, music, and general etiquette. Most of the Jewish private schools offered some form of instruction in these areas, and additional private instruction was regularly offered in London rounded out by formal dances and evening musicales or soirees. These evenings provided an opportunity for the more “cultured” to meet and mingle with other like-minded and “accomplished” Jews and ensured exclusivity by setting admission fees or subscription rates, sometimes at high rates, as did the organization in the following ad:

Musical Society of London.—Seventh Season, 1865—The members are hereby informed, that a *Conversazione*, on the scale of former seasons, will be held at St. James’s Hall on Wednesday Evening, January 25th, 1865. Admission from half-past Eight o’clock. Evening Dress indispensable. Members will not be admitted without their tickets for 1865, which are now ready for delivery at Cramer & Co. (Limited), 201 Regent Street. The Annual Subscription (One Guinea) is due on the 1st of January in each year. Those who desire to be admitted as Associates, Lady Associates, & c. should

93 Ibid., 28 November 1856. These types of arrangements were still being advertised in the *JC* in 1880.

94 Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain*, 29.

apply to the Fellows, to Cramer & Co., or to the Honorary Secretary. Charles Salaman,

36, Baker Street, Portman Square, W.⁹⁵

Achieving both skill and grace in the art of social dancing, as well as keeping up to date with the latest Continental dances, required instruction and practice. The following ads are representative of the fare offered by academies offering supplemental "social" education:

Dancing. Miss Isaacs (Pupil of Mons. E. Coulon) has the honour to announce to the Nobility, Gentry, and to her Friends in particular, that she has re-opened her Academy for Dancing, where she continues to receive Adult Pupils either privately or in Class, for lessons in *La Polka*, *Valse la Cellarius*, *Mazourka*, and *Valse a deux Temps*, either of which, Miss I. teaches in four lessons for One Guinea. The *Minuet de la Cour*, *Gavotte*, and every department of fashionable Dancing, combined with strict attention to the improvement of the Figure, Walking, and general Department.

Private lessons at any hour of the day at her residence, 22, Bury Street, Leadenhall Street. Juvenile Academy, Monday and Wednesday, 4 o'Clock. Schools and Families attended, in and out of town.

Persons wishing to become Subscribers to Miss Isaacs' Assemblies, are requested to favour her with their names, the first of which will take place on Tuesday, November 12th.

The rooms may be engaged for parties.⁹⁶

Dancing.—Bayswater Academy, 33, Hereford-road, Leinster-square, Westbourne-grove.—Monsieur Henry Dacunha, with Lady assistants, gives Lessons in all the fashionable dances at any hour. Juvenile classes for dancing and deportment every Monday and Thursday, at half-past two. Assemblées for ladies and gentlemen at eight in the evening. A Select Soiree Dansante (by subscription only) every Saturday evening at eight o'clock. Schools and families attended.⁹⁷

95 *JC*, 6 January 1865.

96 *Ibid.*, 31 October 1845. It is, of course, highly unlikely that any of the "Nobility" or "Gentry" ever graced her classes or dances.

97 *Ibid.*, 5 October 1866. "Professor," and later, "Monsieur," Dacunha had been offering lessons to the "Nobility and Gentry among his co-religionists" since at least the early 1860s at the rate of 1 guinea for 6 private lessons, or 1 guinea per quarter, at his "ACADEMY for DANCING" in Holborn. *Ibid.*, 16 September 1864. By late 1866, his academy relocated to "7, Percy-street, Tottenham-court-road, Oxford street" and

1870 and beyond

School arrangements for middle- and upper-class Jews did not change that dramatically between 1840 and 1880. However, “[o]nly recently has the enormous significance of middle-class private schooling, especially in urban areas, been acknowledged. Not until the latter half of the century did the slow reform of the grammar schools and the expansion of the Public Schools . . . result in a relative decline in private schooling and even than it remained significant.”⁹⁸ In the case of private Jewish middle-class schools, the decline came even later as enrollment changes did not begin to take effect until after 1878. This year marked the opening of the Jewish boys’ boarding house (Polacks) at Clifton College, a public school that had opened in 1862.

On the other hand, school arrangements for the Jewish poor underwent a fairly dramatic change in the decade after the enactment of the Education Act of 1870. The act created a dual system of religious and public board schools. More specifically it

provided for a public system of universal but not free or compulsory education . . . divid[ing] the nation into school districts which were to provide each child between the ages of five and thirteen with a place in an elementary school. Church-affiliated voluntary schools [this included the various Jewish free schools] could continue to function if they met the conditions of the Act, but if the voluntary system could not provide an adequate number of places, a School Board, charged with building non-denominational Board Schools, was to be elected by all rate-payers (including women) in the district. Both Board and voluntary schools received government grants, but the Board Schools . . . [were] able to draw upon the rates, and were therefore more financially secure.⁹⁹

The response of the National Schools of the Anglican Church and of the Dissenters’ British and Foreign School System was immediate. They embarked on ambitious school building programs as they sought to compete with the new board schools by providing sufficient educational institutions of the “proper” sort.

offered “Select Soiree Dansante (by subscription only) every Saturday evening at eight o’clock.” *Ibid.*, 9 November 1866.

98 Stephens, *Education in Britain*, 42.

99 Greenberg, “Anglicization and the Education,” 113.

The Jewish community responded in a completely different manner. After 1870, it never built another voluntary Jewish school. The new board schools, religiously neutral and at ratepayers' expense, suited the anglicizing components among the Jewish middle and upper classes just fine. They were happy to pass along the financial burden for educating the majority of the Jewish poor, and comfortable supplementing the poor's religious education through the auspices of the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge (later the Jewish Religious Education Board). Many among the Jewish poor, however, were reluctant to commit their children to the new board schools and simply refused to enroll them. It is reasonable to assume they feared that the non-sectarian promise of the schools was a sham. In an effort to overcome this reluctance, Abraham Levy, formerly of the Jews' Free School, was appointed headmaster of the Old Castle Street Board School in 1874. He, in turn, hired a significant number of Jewish teachers. The effort was a resounding success and Castle Street became the first "Jewish" board school. The school's Jewish pupils regularly stayed after the end of the normal school day to receive religious instruction. In fact, this initial effort at assuaging the concerns of the Jewish poor was so successful that by the early twentieth century more than a dozen so-called "Jewish Board Schools" existed in London.

The inception of the board schools did not mark the end of the Jews' Free School, but it did bring some much welcomed assistance to the community at a time when it was really needed. The post-1880 influx of poor Jewish immigrants overwhelmed the resources of the established Anglo-Jewish community (or, at least, the resources they were willing to allocate in support of the Jewish poor). Board schools enabled the communal elite to ensure that the children of the new immigrants were quickly anglicized, while still receiving at least a modicum of Jewish religious instruction. Or, as Suzanne Greenberg, quoting the *Jewish Chronicle* of February 3, 1893, so nicely phrased it: "To produce 'good Jews and civilized, self-reliant Englishmen'—this was the definition of Anglicization, the ambition of Anglo-Jewry and the task of English [Jewish] public [and private] education."¹⁰⁰

100 *JC*, 3 February 1893, as cited by Greenberg, "Anglicization and the Education," 124.

Conclusion

The Making of an Anglo-Jewish Identity, 1840–1880

This volume has detailed the development of a particular modern Jewish identity. It has traced the combining and reconciling of Jewish and English beliefs, social expectations, and activities through the development of Jewish communal institutions, schools, charities, and charitable activities. More specifically, it has explored changes and developments in London's Jewish community in the years between 1840 and 1880 as it strove to maintain the religious connection and identity of its members while also endeavoring to join the greater English society. As part of this process, England's Jews had to make decisions regarding what to retain, what to alter, and what to let go of in their religious and cultural practices to create this new identity for themselves and for their community. The focus here has been on the institutions the community created and adapted to help them in this process. Departing from earlier treatments of Anglo-Jewish identity, this volume has explored, largely through advertisements in the Anglo-Jewish press, details of the crucial years during the Victorian period in which a majority of the community was, for the first time, native born.

This book has traced the melding of English and Jewish social, educational, institutional, and economic elements to create a new hybrid, Anglo-Jewry. The examination of this identity-formation process has been fleshed out through detailed canvassing of relevant period newspapers, both Jewish and English, as well as other archival material. As noted, particular emphasis has been placed on advertising material from the Anglo-Jewish press during these years, something not done in previous scholarly work. Use of

this material has enabled the tracking of social and cultural developments as well as economic changes within this emerging Anglo-Jewish community over a forty-year period. Developments covered include changes in Jewish charity organization, in the chief rabbinate and its interactions with London Jewry, and in the economic, social, and political status of the community. Also discussed are accommodative changes in education—exploring, in effect, the ability of the Jewish community to maintain and adapt its Jewish practices and identity while creating an acceptable English persona for itself and its members, thus transforming most English Jews into Jewish Englishmen in the process.

In 1871, the following item from the *Jewish Chronicle* appeared in the *Times of London* perfectly encapsulating evolving Anglo-Jewish sentiment as well as self-awareness:

JEWISH ENGLISHMEN.—The *Jewish Chronicle* of yesterday, taking a review of the closing year, thus refers to the position of the community it represents as English citizens: —“. . . In every national joy; in every national danger, in every national anxiety and national hope, we Jews of England bear our part. We are not only in England—we are of England. We are not only English Jews—we are Jewish Englishmen. It is our boast and our pleasure and pride that we can claim and fulfil the duties of Britons without sacrificing our Judaism, without neglecting its observances, without abandoning its sacred claims, its sacred privileges, its sacred hopes. The realization of those hopes lies in a far future—perhaps in a future not of the present social, worldly system. For that future we must patiently await, always striving to deserve it. But our love for our faith does not in any way check or weaken our love for the land of our birth. Her interests are ours.”¹

Jewish life in England in the mid-nineteenth century was generally comfortable, particularly when compared to life on the Continent. England's Jews were welcome to practice their religion as they saw fit, educate their children, pursue a fairly wide range of occupations, and live where they chose, free from virtually any outside interference. In short, they were able to live their lives. This level of comfort did not, however, in any way lessen their need to carve out a place for themselves in the larger society—a society that was Christian and, though relatively tolerant, uncertain about the precise limits, if any, it desired to place on the tolerance it extended to the Jews in its midst. As the century progressed and the Jewish community became

1. *Times*, 30 December 1871, 8.

even more aware and concerned with English social norms, it found itself in the position of having to achieve a balance between Jewish practice and tradition and English life (that is, to communally and individually become English while remaining Jewish). In short, it was crucial to shape a functional and sustainable Anglo-Jewish identity.

In this regard, there was no question about the religious affiliation of Anglo-Jews; they were Jewish, although, clearly, this Jewishness was not necessarily reflected by regular Sabbath attendance at synagogue, or in the assiduous following of the many other traditional religious dictates. For many Jews at this time it was necessary to determine what being a Jew in England—one who adhered to more or less modified traditional practices, or at least believed in the need for communal institutions that would safeguard these same modified traditional Jewish religious practices—entailed.

By way of an answer, it has been necessary to deal with the manner worked out by the Jewish community and the Jewish individual in accommodating Jewishness to the surrounding English milieu. At all levels, measures were taken to address this. Even to the simple step of adding courses in Hebrew to a curriculum for Jewish students that in other respects was not markedly different from the curriculum offered at comparable gentile English schools. More complex measures were taken also, such as the gradual establishment of the chief rabbinate and the Board of Deputies of British Jews as the community's religious and institutional arms, respectively, and, in the case of the chief rabbinate, as the Jewish equivalent to the established church.

For much of the period under consideration, the vexatious question as to whether one could be English though not Christian was addressed in various fashions by the communal organizations through the institutions they developed and administered. They, in effect, finessed the question as to the constituents of English identity by working their way to a hybrid Anglo-Jewish organizational and individual identity. Those who fashioned and adopted this identity, based on modified Jewish tradition and coupled with pragmatic English cultural adherence, struggled for acceptance. And though their course was uphill, step by step they won political acceptance and, later still, grudging yet incomplete social acceptance and even inclusion.

By the eve of the great migration from eastern Europe in the 1880s, Anglo-Jews had gained a tentative acceptance in the larger society both as Jews and Englishmen and had become Jewish Englishmen.

Appendix 1

Sampling of Charities and Charitable Institutions Advertising or Soliciting Subscribers in the *Jewish Chronicle*, 1841–1859

- Five Shillings' Sabbath Society** (*Hevrat Ezrat Avyonim l'Zorkhei Shabbat*), founded 1798
- Hand-in-Hand Benevolent Institution for Clothing, Maintaining, and Providing an Asylum for Aged and Decayed Tradesmen** (*Yad b'Yad*), founded 1840
- Institution for the Relief of the Indigent Blind of the Jewish Persuasion** (*Hevrat Mahaseh l'Ivrim*), established 1819
- Jewish Female Clothing Society**, first ad May 14, 1858
- Jews' Free School**, Bell Lane, Spitalfields, founded 1817
- Jews' Hospital**, Mile End, for the Support of the Aged, and for the Education and Employment of Youth (*Neveh Zedek*), founded 1807
- Jews' Infant Schools** 22, Leman Street, Goodman's Fields (later Tenter Ground, Goodman's Field), founded 1841
- Jews' Orphan Asylum** (*Hevrat Avot l'Yitomim*), Leman Street, founded 1831
- Linusarian Benevolent Loan Society**, Instituted for granting Loans to the Industrious Poor of all Classes, free of Interest or other Charges, established 1845¹

1 The meaning of the term Linusarian is unknown or has been lost. As Henry Mayhew noted in 1862, "why [it was] called Linusarian a learned Hebrew scholar could not

- Orphan Charity for Maintaining, Clothing, Educating, and Apprenticing Fatherless Children** (*Hevrat Honen l'Yitomim*), established c. 1818
- Philanthropic Society for the Relief of Distressed Widows and Families of the Jewish Religion**, established 1825
- Society for allowing Marriage Fees and a Portion to Young Men and Virtuous Girls of the Jewish Persuasion**, established 1850
- Society for Helping the Fallen** (*Hevrat Somech Nophlim*)
- Society for Relieving Fanny's Orphans**
- Society for Relieving the Jewish Poor in Confined Mourning**, established 1845
- Society to Supply Bread, Meat, Coals, and Grocery to Poor Jewish Married Females during their Accouchements** (*Hevrat Gilat ha'Yoldut*), established 1845
- Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor**, founded 1854
- Spanish and Portuguese Beth Holim Hospital for Sick Poor, Lying-in-Women, and Asylum for the Aged** (*Beth Holim*), established 1747
- Widows' Home** (*Hevrat Mishkan Almanot*), Asylum for Destitute Aged Jewish Widows, established 1843, merged with Hand-in-Hand (above) in 1876
- Youth's Benevolent Society**, To provide Indigent Jewish Youths with means to obtain an honest livelihood, by Apprenticeship and otherwise, established 1843

inform me, although he has asked the question of others." Mayhew, *London Labour*, 129. Transliterations in this appendix are given as they appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle*.

Appendix 2

Sampling of Charitable Institutions, Friendly Societies, and So Forth, 1874¹

Charitable Institutions

- Beth Holim Hospital** (בית חולים-Beth *Holim*), Mile End Road, E., founded 1747 by Bevis Marks.
- Convalescent Home for Infants**, 9 and 10, Arnold Road, Lower Tooting, founded 1870. Under the management of Miss Caroline Goldsmid, Lynwood, Upper Tooting, and Miss Miriam Harris, Head Mistress of the Jews' Infant School. Female children are received into the Home only on the recommendation of Miss Miriam Harris. Female children are admitted from 3 to 10 years of age; male children from 3 to 7 years of age. Children are allowed to remain in the home three weeks.
- Jewish Convalescent Home**, Portland Road, South Norwood, founded 1869 in memory of Judith, Lady Montefiore. To afford a Home, Proper Diet, and Medical Attendance, during Recovery from Illness, to Jewish Convalescent Patients.
- Jews' Deaf and Dumb Home**, 44, Burton Crescent, W.C., founded 1863. For Maintaining and Educating Indigent Jewish Deaf and Dumb Children.
- Jews' Hospital** (נוה צדק-*Neveh Zedek*), Lower Norwood, founded at Mile End, E., founded 1795, opened 1807. Removed to Lower Norwood, 1863. For the support of the Aged, and the Education, Maintenance, and Apprenticeship of Youth.

1 Almost all information in this appendix is excerpted from Myers, *Jewish Directory*. Hebrew names are given in Myers's original. Transliterations are mine. This list is **NOT** inclusive. Where incorrect or missing in the original, the founding dates have been corrected or added (when known).

- Jews' Orphan Asylum**, St. Mark Street, Goodman's Fields. Established 1831, enlarged 1866. For Maintaining, Clothing, Educating and Apprenticing Jewish Orphan Children.
- Jewish Workhouse**, 123 and 124, Wentworth Street, Whitechapel, E., founded April 1871.
- Spanish and Portuguese Orphan Society**, Bevis Marks, E.C. Founded 1703. For Maintaining, Clothing, Housing, Educating, and Apprenticing Fatherless Children of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation.
- Widows' Home Asylum**, 70, Great Prescott Street, Goodman's Fields, founded 1843. For maintaining, clothing and providing an Asylum for aged widows of the Jewish persuasion.

Hospitals having Special Needs Jewish Wards

- Evelina Hospital**, for children, Southwark Bridge Road. 12 Jewish children admitted as in-patients in 1873. Founded in 1866 by Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild in memory of his wife Evelina, who died in childbirth. [Hospital still exists, but at a different location.]
- [Royal] **London Hospital**, Whitechapel Road, E., Jewish Wards first provided 1841. [Hospital is still functioning at this site today, 2003.]
- Metropolitan Free Hospital**, Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate, founded 1836. [The hospital began charging a nominal fee/subscription in 1885 and was closed in 1977.] Jewish Wards [were] founded in 1862 in memory of the late Mr. Jonas Defries. Eight beds are specially appropriated to Jewish patients. The number of Jewish patients treated during 1873 are returned by the secretary as follows:-
 - In-patients 37
 - Out-patients 9,660

Almshouses

- Almshouses of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregation**, Heneage Lane, E.C., founded 1703. To provide asylum for 24 poor women. Maintained from the Synagogue Funds.
- Barrow's Almshouses**, Devonshire Street, Mile End, E., founded 1816, to provide an Asylum for Ten Poor Families. Founded by the late Joseph Barrow.
- Joel Emanuel's Almshouses**, Wellclose Square, E., founded 1840. To provide an Asylum for aged indigent persons of the Jewish faith. Allowance to Inmates-21s. per month, and an allowance of fuel, to married inmates; 14s. per month, and fuel, to single inmates. 38 inmates elected by trustees.
- Montefiore Almshouses**, Jewry Street, Aldgate, E.C. To provide Asylum for 4 poor families. Founded 1823 by Sir Moses Montefiore, Bart.
- Jacob Henry Moses' Almshouses**, Lincoln Street, Bow, E. For the purposes of providing an asylum for life for poor widows of the Jewish faith (with or without children) and single women of the Jewish faith (not being under 50 years of age), by Jacob Henry Moses, in memory of Rebecca Marianna, his wife. Allowance to inmates, 20s. per month and fuel. 10 inmates, elected by trustees. Founded 1862.

- Lyon Moses’ Almshouses**, Devonshire Street, Mile End, E., founded 1838, by Lyon Moses. To be occupied and used by such poor persons, being of the Jewish nation, or professing the Jewish faith, as the managers shall elect. Number of inmates, 32, elected by the trustees.
- Pacifico Almshouses**, London Fields, Hackney, E. To provide Asylum for 4 poor families. Founded by the late Emanuel Pacifico.
- Salomons’ Almshouses**. North street, Mile End, E., founded 1862. For Jewish indigent of both sexes.

Charitable Societies

- Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor**, 13, Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate, E., founded 1859.
- Bread, Meat, and Coal Charity** (חברת משיבת נפש -*Hevrat Mashebat Naphesh*), established 1780, for the purpose of distributing Bread, Meat, and Coals, amongst the Jewish Poor, during the Winter Season.
- Charity for the Relief of the Aged Destitute**, for allowing a monthly stipend of sixteen shillings (for life) to the indigent of the Jewish Persuasion above 60 years of age. Located at 70, Great Prescott Street, Goodman’s Fields, E.
- City of London Benevolent Society**, founded October, 1871. Held at the “Sir Walter Raleigh,” New Street, Houndsditch, E., for assisting the Necessitous Poor during the Winter Months.
- City of London Benevolent Society for Assisting Widows in Distress**, founded May 1867, for granting pensions to Indigent Jewish Widows.
- Destitute Jewish Children’s Dinner Society**, founded 1869, object of this Society is to secure to every Jewish child who attends a school the opportunity of having a meat dinner, for the charge of one penny, once or twice a week. 13,304 dinners were distributed during 1873; this number includes 2,292 free dinners.
- Excelsior Relief Fund**, founded 1860.
- Five Shilling Sabbath Charity** (חברת עזרת לאביונים לצרכי שבת -*Hevrat Ezrat l’Avyonim l’Zorkhei Shabbat*), to distribute money tickets (five shillings each) to Jewish poor during winter. Founded 1798.
- “Good Intent” Benevolent Society**. Held at the “Nag’s Head” Tavern, Houndsditch, E., for distributing bread, meat, and coals to the poor during the winter season.
- “Helping Hand” Pension Society**, founded 1870, for granting 5/ weekly to persons whose affliction deprives them of getting their livelihood, 17, Palmer Street, Spitalfields, E.
- Holy Land Relief Fund**, founded 1805, the collection of funds for the relief of the distressed poor of the Holy Land.
- “Honen Dalim, Menahem Abelim, Hebrat Yetomot, and Hebrat Moalim”** [sic], founded 1724, to grant pecuniary aid to poor lying-in women; to grant an allowance to persons in *Abel* [mourning]; and to grant a marriage portion annually to one or more fatherless girls, [and to grant assistance in paying for circumcision]. For Sephardim.

- “**Independent Friends” Bread and Coal Society**, established 1843. Held at the “Red Lion” Tavern, Leaman Street, Whitechapel, E., for distributing bread and coals to poor during the winter season. . . . Annual income (about) £110-. Annual expenditure (about) £105.
- Institution for Relieving the Indigent Blind of the Jewish Persuasion**, founded 1819, to grant pensions to the Jewish blind.
- Jewish Ladies’ Benevolent Loan Society**, offices located at: Jews’ Infant School, Commercial street, E., founded 1844 to grant loans and to otherwise assist Jewish poor persons.
- Jewish Ladies’ West End Charity**, established 1842, to relieve indigent Jewish persons residing in the Western Districts of London.
- Jews’ Emigration Society**, 16, Duke Street, Aldgate, E. Founded 1852.
- Ladies’ Benevolent Institution**, for clothing and otherwise relieving Jewish lying-in married women at their own houses. Founded 1812.
- Passover Relief Fund** (in connection with the Soup Kitchen), for distributing groceries and potatoes at Passover.
- Philanthropic Society for Relieving Distressed Widows**, founded 1825, to relieve Jewish widows by granting a pension of £13 per annum.
- “**Sir Paul Pindar” Benevolent Society**, founded 1844, for distributing Bread and Coals to the Poor during the Winter Season, 13, Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate, E.
- Society for Allowing Marriage Fees and a Portion to Young Men and Virtuous Girls of the Jewish Persuasion**, founded 1850, allowing a dowry (£20) and payment of marriage fees.
- Society for Cheering the Needy at the Festivals of Passover and Tabernacles**, founded 1829. Income-Averages about £50, which is distributed prior to the Festivals of Passover and Tabernacles by means of cash tickets of 10s. each.
- Society for Initiating the Children of the Poor into the Covenant of Abraham** (הברת ברית הכנסת ה־*Hevrat Hakhmasat B’rit*), for affording gratuitous circumcision. The society also trained *mohelim* [those trained to perform circumcisions].
- Society for Providing Strangers with Meals on Sabbaths and Festivals** (הברת הכנסת אורחים לשבת ויום טוב)-*Hevrat Hakhmasat O’rhim l’Shabbat v’Yom Tov*), founded 1868, providing meals to necessitous Jewish foreigners on Sabbaths and Festivals.
- Society for Relieving the Aged Needy**, founded 1829, for the pensioning of indigent members of the Jewish Faith who shall have attained the age of sixty by making them an allowance of five shillings weekly.
- Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor**, founded 1854, to distribute Soup and Bread to Jewish Poor during the Winter Months. 5, Fashion Street, Spitalfields, E.
- Spanish and Portuguese Loan Society** (מעסימ טובים)-*Maasim Tovim*), founded 1749.
- Spanish and Portuguese Marriage Portion Society** (מעיל צדקה)-*Me’il Zedakah*), founded 1736, for granting (annually) marriage portions, of £80 or upwards, to poor fatherless girls of the Spanish and Portuguese Congregations.
- Stepney Jewish Benevolent Society**, founded 1869, 71, Stepney Green, E.
- Surrey Jewish Philanthropic Society**, founded 1840, relief of destitute Jewish persons residing in the Southern District of London.

- Western Jewish Philanthropic Society**, founded 1827, to relieve Jewish poor resident west of Temple Bar; also to grant loans, without interest (to the extent of £20), to assist the industrious poor to obtain a livelihood.

Schools

- Bayswater Jewish School**, 1, Westborne Park Villas, W., founded 1866. Present building opened November 16th, 1873.
- Gates of Hope School for Boys** (*Shaare Shamayim*), founded c. 1664, by Spanish and Portuguese congregation.
- Jews' Free School**, Bell Lane, Spitalfields, E., founded 1817; 1,226 boys, 830 girls.
- Jews' Infant Schools**, founded 1841. Originally founded for the instruction of 50 boys and 50 girls in religious and secular education. Gratuitous instruction is afforded those children whose parents are unable to pay for their education. Children are admitted whose parents can afford to pay for their education upon terms agreed upon by the Committee at their monthly meetings, which are held on the last Sunday in every month. [Children ranged in age from 3 to 8 and frequently went on to the Jews' Free School after completing the course.]
- National and Infant Schools**, Heneage Lane, founded 1839 by Bevis Marks.
- Sabbath and Sunday Evening Schools**. In connection with, and supported by, the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge. Held at Jews' Infant Schools, Commercial Street, Whitechapel, E. The Sabbath School is held every Saturday from 12 to 2. The Sunday Evening School (for Jewish Work-girls) is held every Sunday evening (Jewish Festivals excepted) from 6 to 8.
- Stepney Jewish Schools**, founded 1867, provided vocational education to the Jews of London's East End.
- Villareal School for Girls**, Heneage Lane, founded 1730 by Bevis Marks.
- West End Sabbath School**, founded 1867, held at the Westminster Jews' Free School. Was originally held at Birkbeck Institution, and afterwards at the Portland Street British Schools, Little Titchfield Street.
- West Metropolitan Jewish School**, 26, Red Lion Square, W.C., founded 1845.
- Westminster Jews' Free School**, founded 1820 as Western Jews' Free School. Girls' school (6 Richmond Buildings, Dean St., Soho Square) opened 1846. The boys' and girls' schools merged and were treated as one entity after 1853 [at which time they were located on Greek Street].

Miscellaneous Associations and Societies

- Association for Providing Free Lectures to Jewish Working Men and Their Families**, founded 1869. The Lectures are given at the School-room, Heneage Lane, Bevis Marks, E.C., on alternate Sundays during the Winter season.

- Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge** (חברת מרביצי תורה-*Hevrat Marbizei Torah*), founded 1860. The object of this association is the diffusion of religious knowledge among all classes of the Jewish community, with the view of promoting moral and religious improvement. . . . Founded by, in connexion with, and under control of Jewish Association for Diffusion of Religious Knowledge.
- Morocco Relief Fund**. In 1859 a fund was raised by the Board of Deputies to relieve the distress of the Jews in Morocco. The unappropriated balance of the Fund was invested, and the interest is now annually distributed among the Jewish Schools at Mogador, Tangier, and Tetuan.
- Netherlands Choral Society**. "Good Intent," founded August nineteenth, 1869, for training Choristers, and for giving Entertainments in Aid of Charitable Institutions, Zetland Hall, Mansell Street, E.
- Roumanian Committee**. Formed 1872, for the purposes of affording relief to the sufferers from the persecutions to which the Jews of Roumania were subjected; of acting in concert with foreign bodies in their behalf; and of promoting the social and intellectual condition of the Roumanian Jews by the establishment of schools, & c.

Friendly Societies

- Court "Shield of David." No. 4684 Branch of the Ancient Order of Foresters**. Established 1865. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at the "Bell" Tavern, Church Row, Aldgate, E.
- Court "Sons of Abraham." No. 4765 Branch of the Ancient Order of Foresters**. Established 1863. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at "Garrick" Tavern, Leman Street, Whitechapel, E.
- Court "Sons of Israel." No. 4231 Branch of the Ancient Order of Foresters**. Established 1863. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow and orphans; relief to distressed members & c.
- Hevra Kedisha Mariv b'zmanah O'hev Shalom** [sic]. Founded about 1790. Objects-Providing Minyan, and Relief of Members during Week of Mourning. Held at 9, Sandy's Row, Bishopsgate, E.
- "Holy Calling & Support of Jerusalem" Friendly Society** (חברת ביקור חולים ועוזר ירושלים-*Hevrat Bikur Holim v'O'zair Yerushalayim*). Established 1858. Objects-Relief during sickness and week of mourning, held at 16, New Court, Fashion street, Spitalfields, E.
- Jewish Females' Confined Mourners Society**. Object-For relief of members (female) during Week of Confined Mourning. Held at the "Coach and Horses" Tavern, Middlesex street, Whitechapel, E.
- Jewish Medical Aid Society**. Object-Providing Medicine and Medical Attendance to members during sickness. Held at the "Coach and Horses" Tavern, Middlesex street, Whitechapel, E.

- Jewish Mutual Benefit Fund** (חברת מנחם אבלים-*Hevrat Menaḥem Aveylim*). Founded 1862. For allowing benefit in confined mourning. Held at the “Gun and Star” Tavern, Middlesex street, Aldgate.
- Jewish Mutual “Birmingham” Benefit Society**. Established 1862. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; medical attendance; pension in old age; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at “The Green Man” Tavern, Mansell street, Goodman’s fields, E.
- Jewish National Friendly Matzo Association**. Established 1840. Object-The supply of Passover Bread to members.
- Loyal Independent Lodge of Good Fellows**. Established 1810. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age, or continued sickness; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, & c. Held at “Sir Walter Raleigh” Tavern, New street, Houndsditch, E.
- Loyal United Lodge “Sons of Israel.”** Established 1820. Objects-Relief of Members during sickness, Week of Mourning, payment of funeral expenses, allowance to widow; pension in old age, &c., &c. Held at “Nag’s Head” Tavern, 137, Houndsditch E.
- Metropolitan Jewish Confined Mourning and Burial Society**. Objects-Relief of Members during Week of Mourning, payment of Funeral Expenses, &c.
- Path of Peace**. Established 1782. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at the “Black Lion” Tavern, Middlesex Street, Whitechapel, E.
- Path of Rectitude**. Established 1816. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age or continued sickness; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at Joseph’s Coffee House, St. James’ place, Aldgate, E.C.
- Path of Righteousness**. Established about 1790. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age or continued sickness; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at Joseph’s Coffee House, St. James’ place, Aldgate, E.C.
- Pursuers of Peace**. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at Joseph’s Coffee House, St. James’ place, Aldgate, E.C.
- Righteous Path**. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at Joseph’s Coffee House, St. James’ place, Aldgate, E.
- Sisterhood Society** (*Hevrat Agadat Nashim*). Established 1856. Objects-Relief during week of mourning; payment of funeral expenses; allowance at death of husband of member. Number of members, 620. Held at Zetland Hall, Mansell street, Goodman’s fields, E.
- Social Union**. Objects-Relief during sickness and Week of Mourning; pension in old age; payment of funeral expenses; allowance to widow, &c. Held at the “Roebuck” Tavern, Duke Street, Aldgate, E.C.
- Society “Charity Escapeth an Evil Death”** (*Hevrat Zedakah Ta’zil Mimavet*). Founded 1830. Objects-Relief of Members during Week of Mourning; Allowance to Widow; providing watchers for the dying, &c. The Society also relieves indigent persons (non-

members) during Week of Mourning. Contributions 4s. 4d. per annum. Held at the "Green Man" Tavern, Mansell Street, Goodman's Fields, E.

-**Spanish and Portuguese Provident Burial Society.** Established 1872. Objects-Payment of all expenses attending the funerals of members, providing tombstones, &c.

-**United Brethren.** Established 1856. Objects-Relief in sickness and Week of mourning; payment of funeral expenses, & c.

Bibliography

Primary Sources: List of Archives/Archival Sources Consulted

Anglo-Jewish Archives, University of Southampton

- Archives of Jewish Care, including the papers of the Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor; the Association for the Protection of Girls, Women and Children; and the Jewish Blind Society, 1837–89, MS 173.
- Jewish Naval Agents in the Nineteenth Century, MS 116/20.
- Minute book, General Committee, Jews' Free School, April 1846–July 1860, MS 153.
- Norwood Archives, Jews' Hospital and Orphan Asylum, 1811–81, MS 127.
- Obituary of Mme Alphonse Hartog, MS 160.
- Rules and Regulations of the *Hevrat Ozair Ivrim* Institution, for the Relief of the Indigent Blind of the Jewish Persuasion, MS 116/178.

British Library

- printed nineteenth-century sources, various.

British Library Newspaper Library

- Jewish Chronicle*, microfilm, various.

Jewish Museum, Sternberg Centre, London

- files on nineteenth- and early twentieth-century British Jews, various.

London Metropolitan Archives

- Board of Deputies of British Jews, minute books and correspondence, 1838–81, ACC/3121.
- Federation of Synagogues, 1887, ACC/2893.
- Jewish Bread Meat and Coal Society [*Mashebat Naphesh*] for the Relief of the Poor, 1797–1881, ACC/2944.
- Jews' Free School, Camden Rd., 1823–81, LMA/4046.
- London Bet Din, Court of the Chief Rabbi, 1855–84, ACC/3400.

- Office of the Chief Rabbi, correspondence with communities in Australia, South Africa, and England, 1870–80.
- Office of the Chief Rabbi, letter books, 1840–81, ACC/2805.
- Office of the Chief Rabbi, *Shechita* Board, 1868–1904.
- Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor, ACC/2942, 1872–89.
- United Synagogue, 1842–1914, ACC/2712. (Some materials contained here predate the 1870 founding of the United Synagogue.)
- United Synagogue, Chief Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler's Proposed Laws & Regulations for Ashkenazi Congregations in the British Empire, 1847.
- United Synagogue, partial records of Great, Bayswater, Central, Dalston, Borough, East London, Hambro', St. John's Wood, and North London Synagogues.
- West London Synagogue of British Jews, 1840–1911, ACC/2886.
- Westminster Jew's Free School, 1846–82, LMA/4047.

London School of Jewish Studies

- Jewish Chronicle*, bound volumes, 1841–81.
- Jewish commercial directories, various.

Offices of the Jewish Chronicle

- Jewish Chronicle*, bound volumes, various, 1841–81.
- Jewish Record*, bound volumes, various.

Tower Hamlets Local History Library and Archives, Bancroft Library

- Bethnal Green Times and East London Advertiser*, 1867–69.
- Bevis Marks, Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, various printed records.
- East End News and Advertiser*, 1869–71, 1880.
- East London Observer and Tower Hamlets and Borough Chronicle*, 1881.
- Eastern Times and Tower Hamlets Gazette*, 1862–64.
- Various commercial directories.

University College London, Archive and Manuscript Collections; Jewish Studies Library including Mocatta Collection

- Board of Deputies of British Jews, some annual reports and correspondence, 1854–85.
- Goldsmid, Sir Isaac Lyon (1778–1859), letters, various, 1828–34.
- Montefiore, Nathaniel (1819–83), letters to his family, 1850–83.
- Montefiore, Sir Moses Haim, 1st Bt (1784–1885), letters, correspondence, 1827–84.
- Soup Kitchen for the Jewish Poor, Spitalfields, minutes of meetings of donors, 1854–72.
- Jewish Historical Society of England, transactions, 1893–1914.
- Wolf, Lucien (1857–1930), genealogical materials by surname and notes on Anglo-Jewish history.

Primary Sources: Newspapers

- Hebrew Observer: A Weekly Journal, Religious, Literary and General (Ha'Tzofeh)*, London, 1853–54.
- Illustrated London News*, 1842–80.
- Jewish Chronicle*, London, 1841–81.
- Jewish Record*, London, 1868–71.
- Jewish Sabbath Journal*, London, 1855.
- Jewish World*, London, 1873–80.
- The Occident and American Jewish Advocate*, Philadelphia, 1843–50 [Available at: <http://www.jewish-history.com/Occident/>. Publication ceased 1869.]
- The Times*, London, 1840–80.
- Voice of Jacob*, London, 1841–46/8.

Primary Sources: Printed

- Barnett, Lionel D., ed. *Abstracts of the Ketubot or Marriage-Contracts and of the Civil Marriage Registers of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews Congregation for the Period 1837–1901*. Part 3 of *Bevis Marks Records*. Oxford: Alden and Mowbray, 1973.
- Benjamin Disraeli. *Earl of Beaconsfield, K. G. In Upwards of 100 Cartoons from the Collection of Mr. Punch*. London: Punch Office, 1878.
- Blunt, John Elijah. *A History of the Establishment and Residence of the Jews in England; With an Enquiry into their Civil Disabilities*. London: Saunders and Benning, 1830.
- Burton, Sir Richard F. *The Jew The Gypsy and El Islam*. Forward by W. H. Wilkins. London: Hutchinson, 1898.
- Critchett, B. *The Post Office London Directory for 1832, Being a List of 22,000 Merchants, Traders, & c. of London and Parts Adjacent*. London: Lowe and Harvey, 1832.
- . *The Post Office London Directory for 1835, Being a List of the Merchants, Traders, & c. of London and Parts Adjacent*. London: Lowe, 1835.
- Elmes, James. *A Topographical Dictionary of London and Its Environs*. London: Whittaker, Treacher and Arnot, 1831.
- Emanuel, Charles H. L. *A Century and a Half of Jewish History: Extracted from the Minute Books of the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews*. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1910.
- Filipowski, H., trans. "Prayer for the Queen and the Royal Family." In *Tefilot Yisrael: Hebrew and English Prayer Book with an Improved Translation*, 93. 2nd ed. London: Solomon, 1872.
- Greenwood, James. *Unsentimental Journeys: Or, Byways of the Modern Babylon*. London: Ward, Lock and Tyler, 1872.
- Jacobs, Joseph. *Studies in Jewish Statistics, Social, Vital and Anthropometric*. London: D. Nutt, 1891.

- Kelley, W. *The Post Office London Directory, 1841*. London: W. Kelley, 1841.
- Laws of the Hebrew Congregation of Cheltenham*. Cheltenham, UK: L. Dight, 1840.
- Loewe, Dr. Louis. *The Damascus Affair: Diary of Dr. Louis Loewe, July–November 1840*. Ramsgate, UK: Montefiore Theological College, 1940.
- . *A Discourse delivered [. . .] on the Day of the Funeral of H. R. H. Prince Augustus Frederick Duke of Sussex*. London: Wertheimer, 1843.
- Macaulay, Lord. *Essay and Speech on Jewish Disabilities*. Edited with introduction and notes by Israel Abrahams and Rev. S. Levy. Edinburgh: Ballantyne, Hanson, 1910. [Essay first published in 1829; speech delivered in 1833.]
- Maimon, Rabbi Moshe ben [Maimonides]. *The Laws of the Hebrews, relating to the Poor and the Stranger from the “Mishna-Hatora” of the Rabbi Maimonides*. Translated by James Watts Peppercorne. London: Pelham Richardson, 1840.
- Manasseh ben Israel. *To His Highness the Lord Protector of the Common-wealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland: the humble addresses of Menasseh ben Israel, a divine, and doctor of physick, in behalfe of the Jewish nation*. London: 1641. Microform.
- Marks, Rev. D. W. *Discourse delivered in the West London Synagogue of British Jews, Burton Street, Burton Crescent, on the Day of Its Consecration [. . .] 27th January 1842*. London: Duncan and Malcolm, 1842.
- Marks, Rev. D. W., and Rev. A. Löwy, eds. *Seder Ha'tefilot Forms of Prayer used in the West London Synagogue of British Jews*. Vol. 1, *Daily and Sabbath Prayers*, and Vol. 2, *Prayers for the Festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles*. 2nd ed. London: Wertheimer, 1856. [First edition published in 1841.]
- Mayhew, Henry. *London Characters: Illustrations of the Humour, Pathos, and Peculiarities of London Life*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1874.
- . *London Labour and the London Poor; A Cyclopaedia of the Condition and Earnings of Those That Will Work, Those That Cannot Work, and Those That Will Not Work. The London Street-Folk*. Vol. 2. London: Griffin, Bohn, 1861.
- Meldola, Raphael. *The Way of Faith: A Moral and Religious Catechism of the Principles of the Jewish Faith*. London: Meldola and Berlandina, 1848.
- Mendes, Rev. A. P., trans. “Prayer for the Queen and the Royal Family. In *Ha'tefilot M'kol Hashanah: The Daily Prayers, comprehending the Order of Service for Every Day in the Year, according to the Custom of the German and Polish Jews* [. . .], 158–59. London: P. Vallentine, 1864.
- , trans. “Prayer for the Queen and the Royal Family.” In *The Student's Prayer Book. A New Interlineary Translation of the Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers* [. . .]. London: P. Vallentine, 1874.
- Mills, Rev. John. *The British Jews*. London: Houlston and Stoneman, 1853.
- Myers, Asher I., comp. *The Jewish Directory for 1874: Containing a Complete List of Metropolitan and Provincial Synagogues, Jewish Schools, Associations, Charitable and Other Institutions, Societies* [. . .]. London: Vallentine, 1874.
- Nott, Josiah C. “The Physical History of the Jewish Race.” *Southern Quarterly Review* (1850).

- Piccioletto, James. *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*. 1875. Reprinted, edited by Israel Finestein. London: Soncino Press, 1956.
- Potter, Beatrice. "The Jewish Community (East London)." In *Blocks of Buildings, Schools, and Immigration*, 166–92. Vol. 3 of *Life and Labour of the People of London*, edited by Charles Booth. London: Macmillan, 1892.
- Rodriguez-Pereira, Miriam, and Chloe Loewe, eds. *The Birth Register (1767–1881) of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation, London*. In Part 5 of *Bevis Marks Records*. London: Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation, 1993.
- , eds. *The Burial Register (1733–1918) of the Novo (New) Cemetery of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation, London*. In Part 6 of *Bevis Marks Records*. London: Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Congregation, 1997.
- Roth, Cecil, ed. "Nineteenth Century." In *Anglo-Jewish Letters (1158–1917)*, 281–86. London: Soncino Press, 1938.
- Salaman, Charles Kensington. *Jews as They Are*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1882.
- Schlesinger, Max. *Saunterings in and about London*. Edited by Otto Wenckstern. London: Nathaniel Cooke, 1853.
- Service of Prayer and Thanksgiving to be used in All the Synagogues of the British Empire, at the Celebration of the Jubilee of Her Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria [. . .]*. London: Wertheimer, Lea, 1887.
- Simpson, R. R. *Simpson & Co.'s Bow, Stratford and Mile End Road Directory, including Old Ford, and Part of Bromley, 1866*. London: Robert E. Simpson, 1866.
- Sims, George R., ed. *Living London: Its Work and Its Play, Humour and Its Pathos, Its Sights and Its Scenes*. London: Cassell, 1902.
- Smiles, Samuel. *Self-Help: With Illustrations of Conduct and Perseverance*. 1866. Reprinted. London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit, 1996. [First edition published in 1859.]
- Tanach*. Stone Edition, ArtScroll Series. Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, 1996.
- Thompson J., and Adolphe Smith. *Street Life in London*. 1877. Reprinted. Yorkshire, England: E. P. Publishers, 1973.

Reference Sources

- Barnavi, Eli, ed. *A Historical Atlas of the Jewish People: From the Time of the Patriarchs to the Present*. New York: Schocken Books, 1992.
- Cook, Chris. *The Longman Companion to the Nineteenth Century, 1815–1914*. London: Longman, 1999.
- Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, various editions, nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
- Englander, David, ed. and comp. *A Documentary History of Jewish Immigrants in Britain, 1840–1920*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1994.
- Fraenkel, Josef. *Exhibition of the Jewish Press in Great Britain, 1823–1963*. London: British Section of the World Jewish Congress, 1963.

- Grandy, Michael, ed. *My Ancestor Was Jewish: How Can I Find Out More about Him?* London: Society of Genealogists, 1982.
- Haigh, Christopher, ed. *The Cambridge Historical Encyclopedia of Great Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. [Originally published in 1985.]
- Jacobs, Joseph, and Lucien Wolf, comps. *Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica: A Bibliographical Guide to Anglo-Jewish History*. London: Office of the *Jewish Chronicle*, 1888.
- , comps. *Catalogue of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, Royal Albert Hall, London, 1887*. London: Wm. Clowes and Sons, 1888.
- Jewish Encyclopedia*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906. Accessed November 23, 2017. <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com>.
- Kaganoff, Benzion C. *A Dictionary of Jewish Names and Their History*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Lehmann, Ruth P. *Nova Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica: A Bibliographical Guide to Anglo-Jewish History, 1937–1960*. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1961.
- Morgan, Kenneth O., ed. *The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. [Originally published in 1984.]
- Telushkin, Rabbi Joseph. *Jewish Literacy: The Most Important Things to Know about the Jewish Religion, Its People, and Its History*. New York: William Morrow, 1991.
- Werblowsky, R. J. Zwi, and Geoffrey Wigoder, eds. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Secondary Sources, Printed

- Adler, Rev. Dr. H. "The Baal Shem of London." *TJHSE* 26 (1902–5): 148–73.
- . "The Chief Rabbis of England." In *Papers Read at the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, Royal Albert Hall, 1887*. London: Office of the *Jewish Chronicle*, 1888.
- Alderman, Geoffrey. "The British Chief Rabbinate: A Most Peculiar Practice." *European Judaism* 23, no. 2 (Autumn 1990): 45–58.
- . *Controversy and Crisis: Studies in the History of the Jews in Modern Britain*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2008.
- . "English Jews or Jews of the English Persuasion? Reflections on the Emancipation of Anglo-Jewry." In *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship*, edited by Pierre Birnbaum and Ira Katznelson, 128–56. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- . *The Jewish Community in British Politics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- . *London Jewry and London Politics, 1889–1986*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- . *Modern British Jewry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- . "Power, Authority and Status in British Jewry: The Chief Rabbinate and Shechita." In *Outsiders and Outcasts: Essays in Honour of William Fishman*, edited by Geoffrey Alderman and Colin Holmes, 12–31. London: Duckworth, 1993.
- . "The Young Cecil Roth, 1899–1924." *Jewish Historical Studies* 34 (1994–96): 1–16.

- Apple, Raymond. "Nathan Marcus Adler's Installation as Chief Rabbi in 1845." *Jewish Review* 21, no. 6 (1967): 9.
- Arnstein, Walter L. "The Myth of the Triumphant Victorian Middle Class." *The Historian* 37, no. 2 (February 1975): 205–21.
- Aronsfeld, C. C. "German Jews in Victorian England." *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 7 (1962): 312–29.
- Barnett, Rev. Arthur. "Sussex Hall—the First Anglo-Jewish Venture in Popular Education." *TJHSE* 19 (1960): 65–79.
- Baron, Salo W. *The Russian Jew under Tsars and Soviets*. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1964.
- Bebbington, David W. *William Ewart Gladstone: Faith and Politics in Victorian Britain*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1993.
- Berger, Doreen. *The Jewish Victorian: Genealogical Information from the Jewish Newspapers, 1871–1880*. Oxfordshire: Robert Boyd Publishers, 1999.
- Berkowitz, Michael. *The Jewish Self-Image in the West*. New York: NYU Press, 2000.
- Bermant, Chaim. *The Cousinhood: The Anglo-Jewish Gentry*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1971.
- Besant, Sir Walter. "East London Types." *Century Magazine* 60 (1900): 905–19.
- Biale, David. "Historical Heresies and Modern Jewish Identity." In *Jewish Identities: Narratives and Counternarratives—a Roundtable*, special issue, *Jewish Social Studies* 8, no. 2/3 (Winter/Spring 2002): 112–32.
- Billington, Louis. "The Religious Periodical and Newspaper Press, 1770–1870." In *The Press in English Society from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Centuries*, edited by Michael Harris and Alan Lee, 113–32. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1986.
- Black, Eugene C. "The Anglicization of Orthodoxy: The Adlers, Father and Son." In *Profiles in Diversity: Jews in a Changing Europe, 1750–1870*, edited by Frances Malino and David Sorkin, 295–325. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998. [Book originally published as *From East and West: Jews in a Changing Europe, 1750–1870*. 1990.]
- . *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1920*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Black, Gerry. *JFS: A History of the Jews' Free School, London since 1732*. London: Tymsder Publishing, 1998.
- Brake, Laurel, Bill Bell, and David Finkelstein, eds. *Nineteenth-Century Media and the Construction of Identities*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Briggs, Asa. "The Language of 'Class' in Early Nineteenth-Century England." In *Essays in Social History*, edited by M. W. Flinn and T. C. Smout, 154–77. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974. [Originally appeared in *Essays in Labour History*, edited by A. Briggs and J. Saville. London: Macmillan, 1960.]
- . "Middle-Class Consciousness in English Politics, 1780–1846." *Past and Present*, no. 9 (April 1956): 65–74.
- Brown, Lucy. *Victorian News and Newspapers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

- Brown, Malcolm. "The Jews of Gravesend before 1915," 35 *Jewish Historical Studies* (1996-1998): 119-139.
- Burman, Rickie. "Middle-Class Anglo-Jewish Lady Philanthropists and Eastern European Jewish Women: The First National Conference of Jewish Women, 1902." In *Women, Migration and Empire*, edited by Joan Grant, 123-49. London: Trentham Books, 1996.
- Butler, Perry. *Gladstone, Church, State, and Tractarianism: A Study of His Religious Ideas and Attitudes, 1809-1859*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Cannadine, David, and David Reeder, eds. *Exploring the Urban Past: Essays in Urban History by H. J. Dyos*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Cantor, Norman. *The Sacred Chain: The History of the Jews*. New York: Harper Collins, 1994.
- Cesarani, David. *The Jewish Chronicle and Anglo-Jewry, 1841-1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Cheyette, Bryan. *Constructions of "The Jew" in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Neither Black nor White: The Figure of 'The Jew' in Imperial British Literature." In *The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity*, edited by Linda Nochlin and Tamar Garb, 3-41. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995.
- Clapsaddle, Carol. *Tracing Your Jewish Roots in London: A Personal Experience*. Jerusalem: World Zionist Organization, 1986.
- Cohen, Lawrence. *Care and Conflict: The Story of the Jewish Orphanage at Norwood*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Cohen, Rev. Dr. Abraham. *An Anglo-Jewish Scrapbook, 1600-1840*. London: ML Cailingold, 1943.
- Cohen, Stuart. *English Zionists and British Jews: The Communal Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1895-1920*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- . "Sources in Israel for the Study of Anglo-Jewish History—an Interim Report." *TJHSE* 27 (1978-1980): 129-47.
- Cohen-Steiner, Olivier. "Jews and Jewesses in Victorian Fiction: From Religious Stereotype to Ethnic Hazard." *Patterns of Prejudice* 21, no. 2 (1987): 25-34.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- . "Whose Nation? Class and National Consciousness in Britain, 1750-1830." *Past and Present*, no. 113 (November 1986): 97-117.
- Conway, Edward S. "The Origins of the Jewish Orphanage." *TJHSE* 22 (1968-69): 53-66.
- Cooper, John. *Pride versus Prejudice: Jewish Doctors and Lawyers in England, 1890-1990*. Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2003.
- Couper, Rev. W. J. *The Jew in Britain*. Edinburgh: United Free Church of Scotland Publications Office, 1924.
- Cowen, Anne, and Roger Cowen, eds. *Victorian Jews through British Eyes*. Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

- Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Dawidowicz, Lucy S. *What Is the Use of Jewish History? Essays by Lucy S. Dawidowicz*. Edited by Neal Kozodoy. New York: Schocken Books, 1992.
- de Maré, Eric. *The London Doré Saw: A Victorian Evocation*. London: Penguin Press, 1973.
- Duschinsky, Dr. C. *The Rabbinate of the Great Synagogue, London, from 1756–1842*. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Elazar, Daniel J. *British Jewry*. Jewish Community Studies Series. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, 1992.
- Elman, Peter. “The Beginnings of the Jewish Trade Union Movement in England.” *TJHSE* 17 (1951–52): 53–62.
- Emanuel, Charles H. L. *A Century and a Half of Jewish History: Extracted from the Minute Books of the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews*. London: George Routledge, 1910.
- Endelman, Todd M. “The Chequered Career of ‘Jew’ King: A Study in Anglo-Jewish Social History.” In *Profiles in Diversity: Jews in a Changing Europe, 1750–1870*, edited by Frances Malino and David Sorkin, 151–81. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1998. [Book originally published as *From East and West: Jews in a Changing Europe, 1750–1870*. 1990.]
- . “Communal Solidarity among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London.” *Victorian Studies* 28, no. 3 (Spring 1985): 491–526.
- . “Disraeli’s Jewishness Reconsidered.” *Modern Judaism* 5, no. 2 (May 1985): 109–23.
- . “English Jewish History.” *Modern Judaism* 11, no. 1 (1991): 91–109.
- . “The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England.” In *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model*, edited by Jacob Katz, 225–46. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1987.
- . “German Jews in Victorian England: A Study in Drift and Defection.” In *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, edited by Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein, 57–87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . “German-Jewish Settlement in Victorian England.” In *Second Chance: Two Centuries on German-Speaking Jews in the United Kingdom*, edited by Werner E. Mosse, Julius Carlebach, Gerhard Hirschfeld, Aubrey Newman, Arnold Paucker, and Peter Pulzer, 37–56. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.
- . “‘A Hebrew to the End’: The Emergence of Disraeli’s Jewishness.” In *The Self-Fashioning of Disraeli, 1818–1851*, edited by Charles Richmond and Paul Smith, 106–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- . *The Jews of Georgian England, 1714–1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979.
- . *Leaving the Jewish Fold: Conversion and Radical Assimilation in Modern Jewish History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

- . “Native Jews and Foreign Jews in London, 1870–1914.” In *The Legacy of Jewish Migration: 1881 and Its Impact*, edited by David Berger, 109–29. New York: Brooklyn College Press, 1983.
- . *Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656–1945*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- . “Writing English Jewish History.” *Albion* 27, no. 3 (Autumn 1995): 623–36.
- Endelman, Todd M., and Tony Kushner, eds. *Disraeli’s Jewishness*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002.
- Englander, David. “Anglicized Not Anglican: Jews and Judaism in Victorian Britain.” In *Religion in Victorian Britain*, edited by Gerald Parsons, 253–73. Vol. 1 of *Traditions*. 1988. Reprint. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Englander, David, and Rosemary O’Day, eds. *Retrieved Riches: Social Investigation in Britain, 1840–1914*. Hants, UK: Scolar Press, 1995.
- Feldman, David. *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture, 1840–1914*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- . “Jews and the State in Britain.” In *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Michael Brenner, Rainer Liedtke, and David Rechter, 141–61. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- . “Jews in London, 1880–1914.” In *Minorities and Outsiders*, 207–29. Vol. 2 of *Patriotism: The Making and Unmaking of British National Identity*, edited by Raphael Samuel. London: Routledge, 1989.
- . “Was Modernity Good for the Jews?” In *Modernity, Culture and “The Jew,”* edited by Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus, 171–76. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Finestein, Israel. “Anglo-Jewish Opinion during the Struggle for Emancipation, 1828–1858.” *TJHSE* 20 (1959–61): 113–43.
- . “The Anglo-Jewish Revolt of 1853.” *The Jewish Quarterly* 26, nos. 3–4 (1978–79): 103–13.
- . *Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times: Studies in Diversity, 1840–1914*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1999.
- . “Arthur Cohen, Q. C.” In *Remember the Days: Essays on Anglo-Jewish History Presented to Cecil Roth*, edited by John M. Shaftesley, 310–15. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1966.
- . “Jewish Emancipationists in Victorian England: Self-Imposed Limits to Assimilation.” In *Assimilation and Community: The Jews in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, edited by Jonathan Frankel and Steven J. Zipperstein, 38–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . *Jewish Society in Victorian England: Collected Essays*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1993.
- . “Post-Emancipation Jewry: The Anglo-Jewish Experience.” Seventh Sacks Lecture, Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, Oxford, June 8, 1980.

- . *Scenes and Personalities in Anglo-Jewry, 1800–2000*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002.
- . “The Uneasy Victorian: Montefiore as Communal Leader.” In *The Century of Moses Montefiore*, edited by V. D. Lipman and Sonia Lipman, 45–70. Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Fishman, William J. *East End 1888: A Year in a London Borough among the Labouring Poor*. London: Duckworth, 1988.
- . *East End Jewish Radicals, 1875–1914*. London: Duckworth, 1975.
- . *Jewish Radicals: From Czarist Stetl to London Ghetto*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.
- Fletcher Jones, Pamela. *The Jews of Britain: A Thousand Years of History*. Gloucestershire, UK: Windrush Press, 1990.
- Florence, Ronald. *Blood Libel: The Damascus Affair of 1840*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004.
- Frankel, Jonathan. *The Damascus Affair: “Ritual Murder,” Politics, and the Jews in 1840*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Frankel, William, ed. *Friday Nights: A Jewish Chronicle Anthology, 1841–1971*. Compiled by A. B. Levy. London: Jewish Chronicle Publications, 1973.
- Galchinsky, Michael. *The Origin of the Modern Jewish Woman Writer: Romance and Reform in Victorian England*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996.
- Gartner, Lloyd P. “Emancipation, Social Change and Communal Reconstruction in Anglo-Jewry, 1789–1881.” *American Academy for Jewish Research, Proceedings* 54 (1987): 73–116.
- . *History of the Jews in Modern Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870–1914*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960.
- . “A Quarter Century of Anglo-Jewish Historiography.” *Jewish Social Studies* 48, no. 2 (Spring 1986): 105–26.
- Gertner Zatlín, Linda. *The Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish Novel*. No. 295 of *Twayne’s English Authors Series*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1981.
- Gilam, Abraham. “The Burial Grounds Controversy between Anglo-Jewry and the Victorian Board of Health, 1850.” *Jewish Social Studies* 45, no. 2 (Spring 1983): 147–56.
- . *The Emancipation of the Jews in England, 1830–1860*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1982.
- . “A Reconsideration of the Politics of Assimilation.” *Journal of Modern History* 50, no. 1 (March 1978): 103–11.
- Gilman, Sander. *The Jew’s Body*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- . “Proust’s Nose.” *Social Research* 67, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 61–79.
- Glasman, Gina. *East End Synagogues*. London: Museum of the Jewish East End, 1987.
- Glassman, Bernard. *Protean Prejudice Anti-Semitism in England’s Age of Reason*. Atlanta: Scholars’ Press, 1998.

- Goulston, Michael. "The Status of the Anglo-Jewish Rabbinate, 1840–1914." *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 10, no. 1 (June 1968): 55–82.
- Green, Abigail. *Moses Montefiore: Jewish Liberator, Imperial Hero*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Greenberg, Suzanne Kirsch. "Anglicization and the Education of Jewish Immigrant Children in the East End of London." In *Jewish History: Essays in Honour of Chimen Abramsky*, edited by Ada Rapoport-Albert and Steven J. Zipperstein, 111–26. London: Peter Halben, 1988.
- Gunn, Simon. *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: Ritual and Authority and the English Industrial City, 1840–1914*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Halkin, Hillel. "Feminizing Jewish Studies." *Commentary* 105, no. 2 (February 1998): 39–45.
- Heinze, Andrew R. *Adapting to Abundance: Jewish Immigrants, Mass Consumption, and the Search for an American Identity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Henriques, H. R. Q. "The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain." *Past and Present*, no. 40 (July 1968): 126–46.
- Hertzberg, Arthur. *The French Enlightenment and the Jews: The Origins of Modern Antisemitism*. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. "Special Subjects': Women, Children, Jews, the Aged." In *Poverty and Compassion: The Moral Imagination of the Late Victorians*, 135–48. New York: Vintage Books, 1992. [Originally published by Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.]
- Hobsbawm, Eric. "The Example of the English Middle Class." In *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, edited by Jürgen Kocka and Allen Mitchell, 127–50. Providence, RI: Berg Publishers, 1993. [Book originally published as *Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*. 1988.]
- Holmes, Colin. *Anti-Semitism in British Society, 1876–1939*. London: Edward Arnold, 1979.
- . "Immigrants and Refugees in Britain." In *Second Chance: Two Centuries on German-Speaking Jews in the United Kingdom*, edited by Werner E. Mosse, Julius Carlebach, Gerhard Hirschfeld, Aubrey Newman, Arnold Paucker, and Peter Pulzer, 11–30. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.
- Homa, Bernard. *Orthodoxy in Anglo-Jewry, 1880–1940*. 1954. Reprinted. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1969. [Originally published in Yiddish.]
- Humphreys, Robert. *Poor Relief and Charity, 1869–1945: The London Charity Organization Society*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- . *Sin, Organized Charity and the Poor Law in Victorian England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Hyamson, Albert M. *Jews' College, London, 1855–1955*. London: Jews' College, 1955.
- . *The London Board for Shechita, 1804–1954*. London: London Board for Shechita, 1954.
- . *The Sephardim of England: A History of the Spanish and Portuguese Jewish Community, 1492–1951*. London: Methuen, 1951.

- Hyman, Leonard. "Hyman Hurwitz: The First Anglo-Jewish Professor." *TJHSE* 21 (1968): 232–42.
- Hyman, Paula. *Gender and Assimilation in Modern Jewish History: The Roles and Representation of Women*. The Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1995.
- . "Gender and the Shaping of Modern Jewish Identities." In *Jewish Identities: Narratives and Counternarratives—a Roundtable*, special issue, *Jewish Social Studies* 8, no. 2/3 (Winter/Spring 2002): 153–61.
- . "The History of European Jewry: Recent Trends in the Literature." *Journal of Modern History* 54, no. 2 (June 1982): 303–19.
- . "Traditionalism and Village Jews in Nineteenth-Century Western and Central Europe: Local Persistence and Urban Nostalgia." In *The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era*, edited by Jack Wertheimer, 191–201. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992.
- Itzkowitz, David C. "Cultural Pluralism and the Board of Deputies of British Jews." In *Religion and Irreligion in Victorian Society: Essays in Honour of R. K. Webb*, edited by R. W. Davis and R. J. Helmstadter, 85–102. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Jackson, Stanley. *The Sassoons*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968.
- Jacob, Alex M. "Aaron Levy Green, 1821–1883." *TJHSE* 25 (1977): 87–106.
- Jagger, Peter John. *Gladstone: The Making of a Christian Politician*. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1991.
- Johnson, Paul. *A History of the Jews*. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.
- Jolles, Michael. *A Directory of Distinguished British Jews, 1830–1930*. London: Jolles Publications, 1999. Privately published.
- Jones, Gareth Stedman. *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship between Classes in Victorian Society*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Josephs, Zoë, ed. *Birmingham Jewry, 1749–1914*. West Midlands, UK: Birmingham Jewish History Research Group, 1980.
- Josephs, Zoë, and I. A. Shapiro, eds. *Birmingham Jewry: More Aspects, 1740–1930*. Vol. 2. Birmingham: Birmingham Jewish History Research Group, 1984.
- Julius, Antony. *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Kadish, Sharman. *Bolsheviks and British Jews: The Anglo-Jewish Community, Britain and the Russian Revolution*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Kalman, R. P. "The Jewish Friendly Societies of London, 1793–1993." *Jewish Historical Studies* 33 (1992–94): 141–61.
- Kaplan, Marion A. *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family, and Identity, in Imperial Germany*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Katz, David. *The Jews in the History of England, 1485–1850*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

- . “The Marginalization of Early Modern Anglo-Jewish History.” In *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness*, edited by Tony Kushner, 60–77. London: Frank Cass, 1992.
- Katz, Jacob. “Leaving the Ghetto.” *Commentary* 101, no. 2 (February 1996): 29–33.
- . *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770–1870*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1998. [Originally published by Harvard University Press, 1973.]
- . *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages*. Translated by Bernard Dov Cooperman. New York: NYU Press, 1993. [First published in Hebrew in 1958.]
- Katz, Jacob, ed. *Toward Modernity: The European Jewish Model*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1987.
- Kershen, Anne, and Jonathan A. Romain. *Tradition and Change: A History of Reform Judaism in Britain, 1840–1995*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1995.
- Kocka, Jürgen. “The Middle Classes in Europe.” *The Journal of Modern History* 67 (December 1995): 783–806.
- Koltun-Fromm, Ken. “Historical Memory in Abraham Geiger’s Account of Modern Jewish Identity.” *Jewish Social Studies* 7, no. 1 (Fall 2000): 109–26.
- Kushner, Tony. “The Impact of British Anti-Semitism, 1918–1945.” In *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, edited by David Cesarani, 191–208. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- . “Heritage and Ethnicity: An Introduction.” In *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness*, edited by Tony Kushner, 1–28. London: Frank Cass, 1992.
- . *The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society during the Second World War*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Lachs, Phyllis S. “A Study of a Professional Elite: Anglo-Jewish Barristers in the Nineteenth Century.” *Jewish Social Studies* 44, no. 2 (Spring 1982): 125–34.
- Langford, Paul. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650–1850*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “The Progress of Politeness.” In *A Polite and Commercial People: England, 1727–1783*, 59–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Lebzelter, Gisela C. *Political Antisemitism in England, 1918–1939*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1978.
- Liberles, Robert. “The Origins of the Jewish Reform Movement in England.” *AJS Review* 1 (1976): 121–50.
- Lindsay, Paul. *The Synagogues of London*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1993.
- Lipman, Sonia L. “The Making of a Victorian Gentleman.” In *The Century of Moses Montefiore*, edited by V. D. Lipman and Sonia Lipman, 3–22. Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Lipman, V. D. “The Age of Emancipation, 1815–1880.” In *Three Centuries of Anglo-Jewish History: A Volume of Essays*, edited by V. D. Lipman, 69–106. Cambridge: Jewish Historical Society Of England, 1961.

- . “The Anglo-Jewish Community in Victorian Society.” In *Studies in the Cultural Life of the Jews in England*, edited by Dov Noy and Issachar Ben-Ami, 151–64. Vol. 5 of *Folklore Research Center Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975.
- . *A Century of Social Service, 1859–1959: The Jewish Board of Guardians*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.
- . “The Development of London Jewry.” In *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life: Lectures to Commemorate the Centenary of the United Synagogue*, edited by Salmond S. Levin, 43–56. London: United Synagogue, 1970.
- . *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1990.
- . “The Rise of Jewish Suburbia.” *TJHSE* 21 (1962–67): 78–103.
- . *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850–1950*. London: Watts, 1954.
- . “Social Topography of a London Congregation: The Bayswater Synagogue, 1863–1963.” *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 6 (1964): 69–74.
- . “The Structure of London Jewry in the Mid-Nineteenth Century.” In *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by H. J. Zimmels, J. Rabbinowitz, and I. Finestein, 253–73. London: Soncino Press, 1967.
- . “A Survey of Anglo-Jewry in 1852.” *TJHSE* 17 (1951–52): 171–88.
- . “Synagogal Organization in Anglo-Jewry.” *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 1, no. 1 (1959): 80–93.
- . “Trends in Anglo-Jewish Occupations.” *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 2, no. 2 (November 1960): 202–18.
- , ed. *Sir Moses Montefiore: A Symposium*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1982.
- Loewe, Raphael. “Louis Loewe: Aide and Confidant.” In *The Century of Moses Montefiore*, edited by V. D. Lipman and Sonia Lipman, 104–17. Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Magnus, Laurie. *The Jewish Board of Guardians and the Men Who Made It, 1859–1909: An Illustrated Record*. London: Jewish Board of Guardians, 1909.
- McLeod, Hugh. “Why Did Orthodoxy Remain Dominant in Britain? A Comment on Michael Meyer.” In *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Michael Brenner, Rainer Liedtke, and David Rechter, 85–90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Meyer, Michael A. “The Emergence of Jewish Historiography: Motives and Motifs.” *History and Theory* 27, no. 4 (December 1988): 160–75.
- . *Jewish Identity in the Modern World*. The Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1990.
- . “Jewish Religious Reform in Britain and Germany.” In *Two Nations: British and German Jews in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Michael Brenner, Rainer Liedtke, and David Rechter, 67–85. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

- . “Modernity as a Crisis for the Jews.” *Modern Judaism* 9, no. 2 (May 1989): 151–64.
- . “Reflections on Jewish Modernization.” In *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi*, edited by Elisheva Carlebach, John M. Efron, and David N. Myers, 369–77. Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 1998.
- . *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- . “Tradition and Modernity Reconsidered.” In *The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era*, edited by Jack Wertheimer, 465–70. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992.
- . “Where Does the Modern Period of Jewish History Begin?” *Judaism* 24, no. 3 (Summer 1975): 329–38.
- Montefiore, Right Rev. Hugh W. (Bishop of Birmingham). “Sir Moses Montefiore and His Great Nephew: A Study in Contrasts.” Eleventh Montefiore Memorial Lecture, Southampton, UK, 1979.
- Mundill, Robin R. *England’s Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262–1290*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Naggar, Betty. “Old-Clothes Men: Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.” *Jewish Historical Studies* 31 (1988–90): 171–91.
- Neusner, Jacob. “The Role of English Jews in the Development of American Jewish Life, 1775–1850.” *Yivo Annual* 12 (1958–59): 131–56.
- Nevett, T. R. *Advertising in Britain: A History*. London: Heinemann, 1982.
- Newman, Aubrey. *The Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1760–1985: A Brief Survey*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1987.
- . “The Chief Rabbinate.” In *Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain*, prepared by Aubrey Newman. Papers for a conference at University College London, July 6, 1975.
- . “German Jews in Britain. A Prologue.” In *Second Chance: Two Centuries on German-Speaking Jews in the United Kingdom*, edited by Werner E. Mosse, Julius Carlebach, Gerhard Hirschfeld, Aubrey Newman, Arnold Paucker, and Peter Pulzer, 31–36. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.
- . “The Historiography of Anglo-Jewry, 1892–1992.” *TJHSE* 33 (1992–94): 215–24.
- . “Setting the Scene, Anglo-Jewry in 1870.” In *A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life: Lectures to Commemorate the Centenary of the United Synagogue*, edited by Salmond S. Levin, 1–12. London: United Synagogue, 1970.
- , ed. *The Jewish East End, 1840–1939*. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1981.
- Newman, Aubrey, and N. Grizzard. “Board of Deputies.” In *Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain*, prepared by Aubrey Newman. Papers for a conference at University College London, July 6, 1975.
- Owen, David. *English Philanthropy, 1660–1960*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964.

- Parfitt, Tudor. "The Year of the Pride of Israel: Montefiore and the Blood Libel of 1840." In *The Century of Moses Montefiore*, edited by V. D. Lipman and Sonia Lipman, 131–48. Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Parkes, James. "The History of the Anglo-Jewish Community." In *A Minority in Britain: Social Studies of the Anglo-Jewish Community*, edited by Maurice Freedman, 3–51. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1955.
- Perkins, Harold. *Origins of Modern English Society*. London: Routledge, 1969.
- Pollins, Harold. *Economic History of the Jews in England*. Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. East Brunswick, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1982.
- Price, Richard. "Historiography, Narrative, and the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of British Studies* 35, no. 2 (April 1996): 220–56.
- Prochaska, Frank. *Royal Bounty: The Making of a Welfare Monarchy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Pulzer, Peter. "Emancipation and Its Discontents: The German-Jewish Dilemma." In *The German-Jewish Dilemma: From the Enlightenment to the Shoah*, edited by Edward Timms and Andrea Hammel, 5–24. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1999.
- Ragussis, Michael. *Figures of Conversion: "The Jewish Question" and English National Identity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Ravitsky, Aviezer. *Messianism, Zionism, and Jewish Religious Radicalism*. Translated by Michael Swirsky and Jonathan Chipman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996. [Originally published in Hebrew in 1993.]
- Richmond, Collin. "Englishness and Medieval Anglo-Jewry." In *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness*, edited by Tony Kushner, 42–59. London: Frank Cass, 1992.
- Rollin, A. R. "Russo-Jewish Immigrants in England before 1881." *TJHSE* 21 (1968): 202–13.
- Rosenbaum, Rev. M. *The History of the Borough Synagogue*. London: Perry and Hull, 1917.
- Ross, J. M. "Naturalisation of Jews in England." *TJHSE* 24 (1975): 59–72.
- Roth, Cecil. *Anglo-Jewish Letters, 1158–1917*. London: Soncino Press, 1938.
- . *Essays and Portraits in Anglo-Jewish History*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1962.
- . *The Great Synagogue, London, 1690–1940*. London: Edward Goldston, 1950. Accessed November 9, 2017. <http://www.jewishgen.org/JCR-uk/susser/roth/>. [Part of the Susser Archive of the Exeter Hebrew Congregation.]
- . "The Haskalah in England." In *Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, edited by H. J. Zimmels, J. Rabbinowitz, and I. Finstein, 365–76. London: Soncino Press, 1967.
- . *A History of the Jews in England*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- . *The Jewish Chronicle, 1841–1941: A Century of Newspaper History*. London: *Jewish Chronicle*, 1949.

- . *Magna Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica*. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1937.
- . *Records of the Western Synagogue, 1761–1932*. London: Edward Goldston, 1932.
- Rozin, Mordechai. *The Rich and the Poor: Jewish Philanthropy and Social Control in Nineteenth-Century London*. Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press, 1999.
- Rubens, Alfred. “Anglo-Jewry in Caricature, 1780–1850.” *TJHSE* (1971): 96–101.
- . *A History of Jewish Costume*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1967.
- . *A Jewish Iconography*. London: Jewish Museum, 1954.
- . “The Jews of the Parish of St. James, Duke’s Place, in the City of London.” In *Remember the Days: Essays on Anglo-Jewish History Presented to Cecil Roth by Members of the Council of the Jewish Historical Society of England*, edited by John M. Shaftesley, 181–205. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1966.
- Rubinstein, W. D. *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain*. Studies in Modern History. London: Macmillan Press, 1996.
- Rudavsky, David. *Modern Jewish Religious Movements: A History of Emancipation and Adjustment*. New York: Behrman House, 1967.
- Ruderman, David B. “Cecil Roth, Historian of Italian Jewry: A Reassessment.” In *The Jewish Past Revisited: Reflections on Modern Jewish Historians*, edited by David N. Myers and David B. Ruderman, 128–42. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- . *Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key: Anglo-Jewry’s Construction of Modern Jewish Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Russell, C., and H. S. Lewis. *The Jew in London: A Study of Racial Character and Present-Day Conditions*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1900.
- Salbstein, M. C. N. *The Emancipation of the Jews in Britain: The Question of the Admission of the Jews to Parliament, 1828–1860*. London: Associated University Presses, 1982.
- Samuel, Wilfred S. *The First London Synagogue of the Resettlement*. London: Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1924.
- Schmidt, H. D. “Chief Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler (1803–1890): Jewish Educator from Germany.” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 7 (1962): 289–311.
- Schwarzfuchs, Simon. *A Concise History of the Rabbinate*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993.
- Scott, J. H. *A Short History of Spitalfields, 1197–1894*. London: Alex Napier, 1895.
- Scruton, Roger. *England: An Elegy*. London: Chatto and Windus, 2000.
- Seton-Watson, R. W. *Disraeli, Gladstone, and the Eastern Question*. London: Cass, 1962.
- Shannon, Richard. *Gladstone*. Vol. 2, 1865–1898. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- . *Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation, 1876*. London: Nelson, 1963.
- Sharot, Stephen. “Native Jewry and the Religious Anglicization of Immigrants in London: 1870–1905.” *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 16, no. 1 (June 1974): 39–56.
- . “Reform and Liberal Judaism in London: 1840–1940.” *Jewish Social Studies* 41, nos. 3–4 (Summer–Fall 1979): 211–28.

- Singer, Steven. "Jewish Education in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: A Study of the Early Victorian London Community." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 77, nos. 2–3 (October 1986–January 1987): 163–78.
- . "Jewish Religious Thought in Early Victorian London." *AJS Review* 9, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 181–210.
- Sombart, Werner. *England under the Heel of the Jew: A Tale of Two Books*. London: C. F. Roworth, 1918.
- Stansky, Peter. "Anglo-Jew or English/British? Some Dilemmas of Anglo-Jewish History." *Jewish Social Studies* 2, no. 1 (Fall 1995): 159–78.
- Stephens, W. B. *Education in Britain, 1750–1914*. Social History in Perspective, edited by Jeremy Black. London: Macmillan Press, 1998.
- Steyn, Juliet. "Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*: Fagin as Sign." In *The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity*, edited by Linda Nochlin and Tamar Garb, 42–55. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995.
- Susser, Bernard. *The Jews of South-West England: The Rise and Decline of Their Medieval and Modern Communities*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1993.
- , ed. *Alderney Road Jewish Cemetery, London E1, 1697–1853: Anglo-Jewry's Oldest Ashkenazi Cemetery*. London: United Synagogue Publications, 1997.
- Tananbaum, Susan. *Jewish Immigrants in London, 1880–1939*. Perspectives in Economic and Social History. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Taylor, Derek. *British Chief Rabbis, 1664–2006*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2007.
- Thompson, F. M. L. *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain, 1830–1900*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- . "Social Control in Victorian Britain." *The Economic History Review*, New Series, 34, no. 2 (May 1981): 189–208.
- , ed. *The Rise of Suburbia*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1982.
- Thompson, James. "After the Fall: Class and Political Language in Britain, 1780–1900." *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 3 (1996): 785–806.
- Vital, David. *A People Apart: The Jews in Europe, 1789–1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Wahrman, Dror. *Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, c. 1780–1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Waterman, Stanley, and Barry Kosmin. *British Jewry in the Eighties: A Statistical and Geographical Study*. London: Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1986.
- Whitfield, Stephen J. "Enigmas of Modern Jewish Identity." In *Jewish Identities: Narratives and Counternarratives—a Roundtable*, special issue, *Jewish Social Studies* 8, no. 2/3 (Winter/Spring 2002): 162–67.
- Williams, Bill. "The Anti-Semitism of Tolerance: Middle-Class Manchester and the Jews, 1870–1900." In *City, Class, and Culture: Studies of Social Policy and Cultural Production in Victorian Manchester*, edited by Alan J. Kidd and K. W. Roberts, 74–102. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985.

- . “East and West’: Class and Community in Manchester Jewry, 1850–1914.” In *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, edited by David Cesarani, 15–33. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- . *The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740–1875*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1976.
- Wolf, Lucien. *The “Mashebat Naphesh” Early History and Anecdotes*. London: Jewish World, 1879.
- . “A Plea for Anglo-Jewish History, Inaugural Address.” *TJHSE* 1 (1893–94): 1–7.
- Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. 1982. Reprinted. New York: Schocken Books, 1989.

Index

Page numbers followed by letter “n” refer to footnotes.

- Adler, Hermann, 7, 26, 49, 53 n85
Adler, Nathan Marcus, 7, 25, 40, 42–44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51–53, 54, 138–139, 140, 142, 144, 159
 “Laws and Regulations for all the synagogues in the British Empire,” 44–46
 forms of prayer, 50–51
Aguilar, Grace, 3
Alderman, Geoffrey, 1
 Controversy and Crisis, 1
Alderney Road Cemetery, 15
Alex, Ephraim, 79
Alexander I, 21
Alexander II, XVI
Aliens Bill, 7
Amsell, Sarah, 85–86
Anglo-Jewish Archives at the University of Southampton, XIII
Asher, D., 134
Aspen Boarding House Academy for Young Ladies and Young Gentlemen in Milton, Next Gravesend, 150
Baker, Norman (Norrie), XIII
Barnett, Arthur, 145–146
Bevis Marks Synagogue, 15, 16, 26, 20, 34–35, 40
Berkowitz, Henry, 155–157
Berkowitz, Michael, XIII
Bermant, Chaim, 12
 Cousinhood, 12
Birkbeck, George, 142
Black, Eugene, 1, 6
 The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 6
blood libel, XVI
Board of Deputies of British Jews, XV, XVIII, XIX, 9, 29–33, 36, 50–53
Board of Guardians for the Relief of Jewish Poor (Jewish Board of Guardians), XVIII, 8, 10, 58, 63, 72–74, 80, 82–83, 87
 “strange” poor (*orchim*), 76–79, 81–82
Buccleuch, Duke of, 71
Burnam, Rickie, 8
 “Middle-Class Anglo Jewish Lady Philanthropists and Eastern European Jewish Women,” 8
Cannadine, David, 12
Cambridge, Duke of, 70, 71
Carter, John, 139
Carroll, George, 70
Castle Street Board School, 164
Caulfield, General, 71
Cesarani, David, 13
Charity
 appeals in *Jewish Chronicles*, 85–87, 88
 British traditions and values of, 60–62, 66–67, 68, 73–74, 79, 82, 90, 136, 139, 145, 146
 dinners, 66, 69–71
 help from Jews to English charitable causes, 51, 89
 in Jewish tradition (*zedakah*), XVI, 7–8, 10, 30–31, 56–57, 59, 63, 64–65, 90
 international aid, 88–89
 institutions, 65, 71–73, 79–80, 87, 168 ff.
 voting schemes, 61–63
Cheyette, Brian, 3, 13
Chief rabbi (of England’s Ashkenazi community), 15, 30, 41–42
City of London School, 160
Clermont-Tonnerre, 22
Clifton College, 163
Cohen, Arthur, 99
Cohen, Lionel Lewis, 79
Cohen, Stuart, 9
 English Zionist and British Press, 9
Creechurch Lane Synagogue, 15, 16
D’Israeli, Isaac, 26
Dallas Holocaust Museum/Center for Education and Tolerance (Dallas Holocaust and Human Rights Museum), XIV
Deputados, 29

- Disraeli, Benjamin, 13, 106–107
- Dissenters' British and Foreign School System, 163
- Education Act of 1870, 163
- Jewish Board schools, 164
- reaction of Jewish community, 164
- Endelman, Todd, 4–5, 7, 12
- “The Englishness of Jewish Modernity in England,” 4–5
- The Jews of Georgian England*, 7
- Farebrother, Admiral, 71
- Feldman, David, 1–2, 6
- Englishmen and Jews*, 2, 6
- Finistein, Israel, 11
- Anglo-Jewry in Changing Times*, 11
- Fishman, William J., 6
- Freke, Evans, 71
- Galchinsky, Michael, 3
- The Origin of the Modern Jewish Woman Writer*, 3
- Gartner, Lloyd, 6
- The Jewish Immigrant in England*, 6
- Gaster, Moses, 9
- George IV, 28
- Gilam, Abraham, 2
- The Emancipation of the Jews in England*, 2
- Gladstone, William, 103–104, 106
- Gloucester House Academy, 149–152
- Goldsmid, Aaron, 94
- Goldsmid, Isaac Lyon, XVIII, 32–34f, 93, 99, 140, 144
- Goldsmid, Francis Henry, 33, 40, 93, 94, 98, 138, 139–140
- Graham, Bellingham, 71
- Great London Synagogue (Duke's Place), 15, 28, 30, 35, 75
- Greenberg, Suzanne, 164
- Hambro' Synagogue, 15, 28, 30, 36
- Hart, Frederick, 71
- Hartog (Moss), Marian, 3, 152–154
- Haskalah*, 3–4, 24, 26, 130–131
- hakham*, 15–16, 30, 34, 52
- Herzl, Theodor, 9
- Higgins, Mary Pat, XIV
- Hirschell, Solomon, 15, 40–41
- Hodges, L., 102
- Holmes, Colin, 10
- Howard, Michael, 13
- Hurwitz, Hyman, 149
- Hyamson, Albert, 9
- Iggers, Georg, XIII
- Ingles, R. H., 102–103
- Jessel, George, 99
- Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge (later the Jewish Religious Education Board), 161
- Jewish Board of Guardians, *see* Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor
- Jewish Bread Meat and Coal Society (*Mashebat Naphesh*), 61
- Jewish education
- Haskalah* schools, 131
- traditional, 127–130
- Jewish Historical Society of England, 11, 131
- Jewish Naturalization Bill, 19
- Jewish Studies Library at University College London, XIII
- Jewry
- Algerian Jews, 88
- Anglo-Jewry (British Jews, English Jews)
- burial, 15, 17, 77
- charity, 58 ff.
- classes of supplicants, 75–79, 80
- commercial activity, 94, 96
- communities, 16, 20–21, 26, 28–30, 60
- composition and demography
- Ashkenazim, 14, 15, 15 n44, 15 n45, 18, 28, 34, 36, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62 n21, 63, 92, 137–138 n31
- distribution between London and the provinces, 10–11, 91–92, 110, 121, 134
- distribution in London, 119–121, 123–126, 159
- immigration, 15, 81–82, 91, 164
- from Amsterdam, 14
- from Eastern Europe, XVI, 6–7, 92, 121
- from Germany, 18
- immigration post-1880s, 54–55
- population growth, XVI, XIX, 18, 91–92, 111, 120
- Sephardim, 14, 14 n42, 16, 18, 29, 36, 62 n21, 72, 92
- social classes, 7, 8–10, 18, 33, 58, 60, 83, 93–94, 97, 98, 120–121, 138–139, 159, 164
- economical development, 107, 121

- advertisements regarding
 - commodities, 117–118
- advertisements for wedding
 - spaces, 116–117
- development of restaurants,
 - 112–113
- new professions, 107–110
- proliferation of baths (*mikvaot*),
 - 112
- proliferation of travel and
 - short-term lodgings, 111–112, 114
- emigration, 115
- education, 9, 132 ff.
 - connected to emancipation, 139–140, 145
 - Continental Jewish schools, 157–158, 160
 - for adults, 140
 - forging identity, 164
 - gender-based education, 136, 151
 - in secular schools, 160–161
 - private schools, 146–161
 - schools for poor children, 133–134
 - supplemental (social) education, 161–162
- Enlightenment (*Haskalah*), 3–4
- hybrid identity formation, XV,
 - 11–13, 20, 37, 54, 83, 89, 118–119, 121, 141, 166
- Anglicization / emancipation
 - debate, 118, 140, 141–142, 144, 145, 164
- and religion, 37, 132, 167
- as process of choices, XV, XVII,
 - 5, 132
- as response to modernity,
 - XVII, 5
- combining communal
 - consciousness and class awareness, 60, 83
- interacting with English
 - national identity, 2, 5, 11–13
- perceived as native, 11, 35
- related to growth and changes
 - within the community, XVI, XVII, 37
- literature about, 1–14
- marriage legalization, 30, 40
- novelists, XVIII–XIX, 3–4
- occupations, 92 ff., 107–111,
 - 122–124
- Orthodox movement, 24, 44–48
- perception in England
 - acceptance, 17, 132, 141–142
 - antisemitism and prejudice, 3, 7, 10, 18–19, 27
 - attendance of Jewish public events, 70
 - as “other”, 5, 18–19, 69–70, 102, 106
 - expecting to conform, 13, 69, 166
 - interaction with English intellectuals, 3
 - need to raise the Jews in the esteem of the English, 141, 145
 - providing social and political emancipation, 5, 13–14, 102
 - restrictions towards Jews, 17, 19
- press
 - as historical source, XVIII
 - as political venue, 32
 - charity announcements, 62–63, 84–89,
 - education advertisements, 147, 151–152, 159, 159 n87, 164
 - history of, 67 n36, 144 n50, 147 n56, 159 n87
 - interaction with English press, 67
 - vacation advertisements, 114
 - work advertisements, 109–110
- prohibited professions, 100, 106
- political history, 1–3, 13–14, 30–33,
 - 36, 52, 100–105, 140
- Reform movement, 24–25, 34–37,
 - 38–39
 - limited duration of service, 35, 38
 - primacy of Torah, 39–40
 - translation of prayers, 38
- religious practice, 8–9, 26, 167
- responses to modernity, 4–6, 20–23
- synagogues, 15–16, 28, 30, 34, 36,
 - 74, 77 n72, 79, 157
- Eastern European Jews, XVI
- Jews of Damascus, XV–XVI, 31
- French Jews, 22–23

- inborn difference, 23
 Reform movement, 24–25
 differences from English reform, 38–39, 47
 responses to Napoleon, 21–22
 Wissenschaft des Judentums, 25
 Jews' and General Literary and Scientific Institution, 142–146
 Jews' College, 159–160
 Jews' declaration bill, 102–106
 Jews' Free School, 65, 67, 68, 69, 134–137, 139
 Jews' Hospital, 139–140
 Jews' Orphan Asylum, 65–66, 138–139
 Kadish, Sharman, 10
 Bolsheviks and British Jews, 10
 Kahn, Ezra, XIII
 Katz, Jacob, 4, 5–6
 Toward Modernity, Out of the Ghetto, 4 Tradition and Crisis, 4
 Kelley, W., IX
 The Post Office London Directory, 1841, IX
 Kushner, Tony, 10, 12, 13
 Levetus (Leo, Moss), Celia, 3, 152–154
 Lipman, V. D., 8, 11
 A Century of Jewish Social Service, 8
 A History of the Jews in Britain, 11
 London College of Jewish Studies, XIII–XIV
 London Metropolitan Archives, XIII
 Lowy, A., 138
 Macaulay, Thomas, 104–105
 Magnus, 77–78
 Maimonides, 57–58
 Mandeville, 71
 Marks, David W., 37, 40
 Forms of Prayer, 37–38
 shortening of liturgy and religious texts, 38–39
 translation of Aramaic prayers, 38
 Martin, D. N., 150
 Mayhew, Henry, 76, 95–97
 Meldola, David, 40
 Mendelssohn, Moses, 142
 Meyer, Michael, 35–36
 Mocatta family, 34
 Mocatta, F. D., 138, 140
 Montefiore, Horatio, 34
 Montefiore, Moses, XVIII, 18, 29–30, 32, 34, 40, 51, 52–53, 70, 89, 99, 140
 Narin van Court, Elisa, XIV
 National Schools of the Anglican Church, 163
 Naylor, John, XIII
 Neumegen, Leopold, 149–152
 New Synagogue, 15, 28, 30, 36
 Newman, Aubrey, 6
 Nightingale, Florence, 62
 Noailles, Loure de, 71
 Ommanney, F., 70
 Palmerston, XV, 31
 Phillips, Benjamin, 68, 68 n38, 138, 140
 Pollins, Harold, 7
 Economic History of the Jews in England, 7
 Poor Law, 64
 Portuguese Synagogue, 28
 Protestantism
 and Anglo-Jewish Orthodoxy, 47
 and Anglo-Jewish Reform, 39–40
 religious pluralism, 17 n51, 132
 discomfort with all other religions, 13, 103–104
 philosemitic strain, 5, 14 n41
 Purvis, Captain, 71
 Ragussis, Michael, 3
 Figures of Conversion, 3
 Rapaport, Salomon Judah, 38
 Raphall, M. J., 134
 Roth, Cecil, 3
 “The Haskalah in England,” 3
 Rothschild family, XVIII
 Rothschild, Anthony de, 40, 68, 70, 71, 89
 Rothschild, Ferdinand de, 137
 Rothschild, Lionel de, 101–102
 Rothschild, L. N. de (Austrian consul general), 94
 Rothschild, Nathan Meyer (merchant), 94, 99
 Rozin, Mordechai, 8, 58–60
 Rubinstein, W. D., 4, 13–14
 A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World, 13
 Ruderman, David, 3
 Jewish Enlightenment in an English Key, 3
 Russell, John, 103
 Salomons, David, 40, 71, 99, 100–102, 140, 144
 Salomons, P., 71
 Samuel, Herbert, 13
 shehitah, 48–50
 Sidney, Sheriff, 71
 Simon, John, 98
 Somerset, Duke of, 70
 Spanish Synagogue, 28
 Stern family, 154–155
 Stuart, Dudley Coutts, 71
 Sussex, Duke of, 70
 Tananbaum, Susan, 6
 Jewish Immigrants in London, 6

- Tivoli House Academy, 155–157
 Tower Hamlets Local History Archive, XIII
 Tracz, Dalia, XIII
 Tucker, Charles, XIV
 University College School, 160
 Velho Cemetery, 15
 Victoria, Queen, 32, 51, 70
 Waldman, Steve, XIV
 Webb, Henry, 71
 Weizman, Chaim, 9
 West London Synagogue of British Jews, XV,
 8, 34, 36, 40, 52–53
 West Metropolitan Jewish Schools, 137–138
 Whaley, Jacob, 98
 Williams, Bill, 7, 11, 13
 The Making of Manchester Jewry, 7
 workhouse, 64
 Zatlín, Linda Gertner, 3
 *The Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish
 Novel*, 3
 Zionism, 9–10
 Zunz, Leopold, 38