

Jews in 19th-Century Britain: Charity, Community and Religion, 1830-1880

(ISBN: 9781350102187)

Alysa Levene, Oxford Brookes University

1: Introduction

This book is a socio-economic history of the Jews in nineteenth-century industrial Britain. Its key concern is how far we can accurately use the word ‘community’ to describe this small minority in British society, bound together by the fellowship of shared religion and culture but in other ways very diverse. It examines how urban provincial Jews arranged themselves in households and neighbourhoods, how they responded to local work opportunities, and how they managed their own welfare needs, all amid the rush of social, economic and cultural change that accompanied industrialization. In doing so, it introduces a new perspective on the nature of community and religious life in a period of great social and economic transformation.

‘Community’ is a word which is easy to throw around and hard to pin down. In its broadest sense it refers to people with shared characteristics. If we drill down deeper into the literature we find that these bonds are usually positive in nature, offering traits like security, identity and solidarity.¹ For sociologists community refers to a form of social organization which is usually spatially bounded; for anthropologists shared culture is a more important feature, while political scientists look for political structures – often in contrast with national governance.² For historians, as Calhoun notes, the term is often used ‘rather loosely’ to refer to ‘a geographically or administratively

bounded population, or to a set or variety of social relations', often with a sense of nostalgic recall for a past time of shared identity and communal obligations.³ While not overtly considering the theoretical boundaries of 'community', Wrightson and Levine refer to life in the early modern village of Terling, Essex in much these terms, as 'a constellation of institutions focusing [residents'] interactions,... a network of ties between kin, friends, and neighbors' which together produce a 'special claim on their loyalties, a special place in their sense of personal identity.'⁴ This is also, broadly speaking, the nature of the nineteenth-century working-class 'community', short on economic resources but rich on shared social and support networks evoked by scholars like Davin, though here the sense of shared and bounded space is also important.⁵ Steve King's studies of eighteenth-century Yorkshire townships, meanwhile, point out that communities have less tangible borders too, such that while some are 'in', others are by definition 'out'.⁶ These boundaries may be readily apparent to outsiders, in the form of shared nationality, religion or club membership. In other cases the borders are much fuzzier, allowing people to decide for themselves whether they – or others - belong or not. Communities are also very flexible in scale, ranging from a small, geographically bounded locale where everyone knows each other by name, to one of its most famous forms, the 'imagined' community coined by Benedict Anderson, where members might never meet, but know, nonetheless, that they share a common bond.⁷ Furthermore, community allegiances can shift over time, and a person may be a member of several communities at once, either overlapping or completely distinct.⁸

Ties between community members are also variable in nature, ranging from horizontal ones among peers – as in Anderson's Preston, which we will explore in further detail below - or vertical, between those of different social status, as Wrightson and Levine emphasized as part of their analysis of Terling. In a religious community they are likely both, where shared faith is overlaid with a social hierarchy consisting of leadership, patronage and charity. Studies of the 'Jewish community' tend, while not engaging overtly with these issues, to assume that a key characteristic of a bounded community is leadership; hence 'community leaders', who shape and patrol its boundaries. On the

other hand, religious bonds form a classic case of an 'imagined community', where common ties are transpatial.⁹ One of the key concerns of this book is to examine how the transpatial community of British Jewry interacted with specific geographical settings.

Another feature of writing about 'community' in the early modern period is the impact of urbanization and the rise of the nation state. These were the conditions that made Anderson's imagined national community possible; they also produced the equally famous shift identified by Ferdinand Tönnies, from the interpersonal and emotional ties that made up the traditional *Gemeinschaft* community, to the formal ones of the modern *Gesellschaft*.¹⁰ Social and economic historians have also identified a weakening of traditional community bonds with the mass urbanization that accompanied the industrial revolution; what Calhoun has called a change from 'the predictable and well-understood nexus of community life to the large-scale and uncertain affairs of political society.'¹¹ Geographic mobility, often for employment, thus (it was proposed) left people unsupported by traditional kin and community networks, living instead in more fragmented domestic units with less oversight of moral behaviour, and more dependent on the collectivity in the form of charities, the state poor law and official authorities.¹²

Many of these models about the impact of political and economic change on family and community life were quickly debunked. Comparative and long-range demographic studies, for instance, pointed out that nuclear families predated industrialization in Britain – and that elsewhere, extended family forms were not inconsistent with industry.¹³ Michael Anderson's famous 1971 study of Preston – an industrial town in the north-west of England - was an early example. Drawing on demographic and social evidence and taking a sociological perspective, he highlighted the continued importance of family ties in an industrial town, albeit overlaid with a strong sense of instrumentality which he suggests arose partly from a breakdown in older systems of inheritance and network formation.¹⁴ Nonetheless, family remained one of the key ports of call when people fell on hard times: as one survey has summarised, '[a]s the Industrial Revolution instigated new life-cycle

risks and intensified existing ones, it seems likely that dense and functional family and kinship groups were one of the few effective defences which individuals could deploy.’¹⁵

Despite these qualifications, then, even the most recent studies acknowledge a *qualitative* change in social relations and personal behaviour which went hand in hand with both industrialization and urbanization. Emma Griffin has suggested, for example, that the reliable and comfortable wages afforded by industrial occupations had a liberating impact on decisions about marriage, work and living arrangements.¹⁶ Many of the most reassuring aspects of community furthermore (including religion), were portable, and chain migration meant that newcomers often joined family members, or people from the same place of origin, so establishing a new sense of shared fellowship.¹⁷ The urban environment also brought new community identities based on religious affiliation, political and club membership, leisure activities or cultural groups. These could help to preserve familiar values and identities, or forge novel ones which provided an equivalent sense of belonging and support. It is probably, therefore, a mistake to see industrial conditions as sundering one type of community tie and replacing it with something inferior; we should instead, interrogate the nature of community life in industrial settings anew, taking in emotional, linguistic, cultural *and* transactional market-based bonds.

One of the key aspects of Jewish ‘community’ ties is that they did indeed operate at several different levels. The first and least tangible were the ‘imagined’ bonds which went with shared religious, ethnic and social heritage. The evidence presented in this book suggests that in a very important and useful sense, Jews felt part of a shared Covenant with God, which brought common practices, a duty of care for one another and a sensitivity to their reputation as a body. However, at a more micro level there were many communities within British Jewry. For one thing, immigration meant that British Jewry included a very diverse set of people. From southern Spain to eastern Russia, the Jews living in Britain by the middle of the nineteenth century spoke a variety of languages, had different prior experiences of persecution and restriction (and thus urban life and

choice of occupation and marriage), displayed different attitudes to their religion and to their host society, and varied from more or less destitute, to fantastically wealthy. Some of these differences were more formal; particularly those between Ashkenazi Jews (from Eastern and Central Europe) and Sephardi Jews (from Southern Europe and northern Africa). These distinctions were principally cultural, based on different styles of worship and vernacular languages, but they were accompanied by very different reasons for settling in Britain.¹⁸ There was also a strong core of Jews from both groups by the middle of the nineteenth century who had been British for generations and who were highly Anglicized. These differences produced sub-communities within British Jewry as a whole, and also, no doubt, different priorities for life in Britain and attitudes to the utility, comfort or practice of religion. By the mid-nineteenth century, as we will see, new identities started to emerge with the growth of communities in the industrial towns.

Migration was a common feature of life in Britain generally, but it was heavily promoted by the opportunities presented by rapid urbanization.¹⁹ Employment was one of the most common reasons for movement, but people also relocated for marriage, or simply to down/up-size domestic arrangements in response to changed personal economic circumstances.²⁰ Jews moved for these reasons too, like their compatriots, often over relatively short distances, and often to join friends and family. Any of these moves also brought potential isolation though: Steve King's work on migrants to the West Yorkshire township of Calverley suggests that incomers could suffer from long-lasting marginalisation, to the extent of creating penalties in infant mortality and welfare.²¹ However, Jews were far more likely than other Britons to have had the yet more dislocating experience of an international move, to escape persecution and restriction, or to seek economic betterment and business contacts. Petra Laidlaw has calculated that a fifth of the Jews in Britain in 1851 had made at least one long-distance international move in their lives so far.²² This brought an added and outwardly obvious dimension of 'otherness' to large parts of the Jewish community, especially the newer waves from Poland and Russia, who looked and sounded notably 'foreign'. Even

within their own religious community, they were treated with wariness because they were a potential threat to the respectable image of established British Jewry.²³

Nineteenth-century British Jewry thus contained a notable proportion of new and often very 'othered' migrants, living in settings to which – as we will see over the course of this book - they were frequently poorly adapted because of their prior experiences of work and urban life. The way in which they were perceived in British society and popular culture by the period we are concerned with - the 1830s to the end of the 1870s – was ambivalent. While scholars point out that the introduction of an (ultimately unsuccessful) Parliamentary Bill to provide full civil liberties for British-born Jews in 1830 was not accompanied by the same sort of popular disturbance that accompanied the abortive 'Jew Bill' of 1753, Jews were still subject to the hangovers of long-held negative stereotypes about their religious and moral qualities, supported by a firm belief in their intrinsic separateness.²⁴ That said, they largely escaped the mass marginalisation and prejudice which has been identified for that most studied of British minorities: the Irish (or, indeed, Jewish populations in parts of Continental Europe). They also benefited from the influence of Enlightenment-era tolerance – at least until the 'Eastern Crisis' of the mid-1870s, when Disraeli's support of the Muslim Turks over the Christian Bulgarians once again raised fears about malign Jewish influence within Britain.²⁵ In our period, the Jews were, however, a far smaller minority in British society than the Irish, and did not dominate neighbourhoods in the same way. They were not particularly political and nor were they singled out for their anti-social behaviour; in fact, Jews were often commented to be very family-oriented and abstemious when it came to drink.²⁶ Finally, their clerics were far less visible within the wider community (partly because they were much smaller in number), which was another way in which the Irish as a whole were 'othered'. Even when the huge upswing in Jewish immigration of the 1880s did start to attract greater opprobrium, critics were more likely than in earlier decades to cite the conditions under which the Jews had been forced to live in their countries of origin as an explanation for their supposed lack of hygiene and willingness to live and work in poor surroundings.²⁷ While both the Jews and the Irish thus remained targets for a bundle of fears and

stereotypes of long-standing, in the middle decades of the nineteenth century the Jews were living quietly enough that attitudes were, generally speaking, somewhere along a spectrum of accepting and apathetic. The poverty migration of the Famine years, meanwhile, had turned the Catholic Irish – especially in towns like Liverpool where they settled in large numbers and dominated particular neighbourhoods – into a more evident and noisy threat.²⁸

The nature of community ties and reactions to ‘outsiders’ in the industrial period is thus a central debate for this study. It also engages with a second important strand of research, which is the impact of industrialization, broadly defined, on religious practice. Scholars have suggested that new, competing forms of urban leisure, scientific discoveries which challenged the primacy of religion, and long hours of work, all combined to jolt people out of long-held patterns of church-going and religious feeling.²⁹ It certainly worried contemporaries, and especially Anglicans, who were sufficiently disturbed to commission a one-off Census of Worship in 1851 – the results of which did not allay their fears.³⁰ It showed that the manufacturing towns (already a focus for concerns about moral behaviour) had the lowest levels of church-going in the country: fewer than one in ten people went to a place of worship on census day in Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield and Newcastle, and Anglican churches were the worst affected.³¹ Many historians have criticized the emphasis placed on formal attendance in the religious decline narrative, and the underplaying of more personal and societally enshrined aspects of belief – what Callum Brown has called ‘discursive Christianity’ - which seem to have remained vibrant, if increasingly diverse.³² Nonetheless, it seems undeniable that formal and state-based religious worship was coming under a barrage of alternative world-views in this period, and that this was being translated into a more flexible and personal attitude to faith.

When it comes to the Jews too, we know more about attendance and formal membership than we do either about the people who worshipped without paying regular membership to a synagogue (the poorer and more transient members of the community), or what they believed or

did in their homes. The Census of Worship showed that Jews were no more rigorous about attending services than most other religions. In fact, Jews (who were counted on the Friday and Saturday of the census weekend – the Jewish Sabbath) filled a lower proportion of the accommodation they had available for worship than any other enumerated group bar the Quakers: only 24 per cent – although this clearly says as much about the relative size of their accommodation as it does about religious practice.³³ Nonetheless, only about a tenth of the Jewish population (around 3,000 people) had attended synagogue on the Sabbath in question, the rest of the accommodation presumably being filled only at the autumn High Holy Days (the Jewish New Year and Day of Atonement), when many synagogues required overflow facilities.³⁴ In Birmingham the congregation's secretary claimed that the turnout on Saturday afternoon was low because so many adult men were travelling for their work – a suggestion supported by the large numbers of hawkers and dealers in the Jewish population of the town.³⁵ Nonetheless, it underlines the characterisation drawn by several historians of mid-century Jews as flexible, undogmatic and even ignorant in their religious practice: in the words of one leading scholar, 'what united most Jews was the synagogue they did not attend'.³⁶

On the other hand, we know that there were also pockets of Jews who were deeply observant especially in the middling ranks of society, or who (as today) prized highly certain aspects of their religion, such as keeping the Sabbath and High Holy Days, or the life-cycle rituals like circumcision and Jewish burial.³⁷ We will see that community records reveal significant numbers of people not wishing to work on Saturdays; the importance attached to provision for religious instruction and observance for those in state-operated institutions like workhouses and hospitals; and the perceived need for Jewish education as a way of preserving religious affiliation as well as of integrating newcomers. Giving money or time to Jewish charities was a way of gaining esteem within the community (and beyond it), while bodies such as Jewish friendly societies and Masonic lodges often barred people who did not meet minimum standards of observance. Conversely, given the weak and voluntaristic nature of internal control over Jewish life in Britain, there were arguably fewer consequences to lapses from the faith than there were in the Christian denominations (or

Jewish communities abroad).³⁸ This means that people who did not practise or feel their Judaism actively shade out of sight in the records. It is also notoriously difficult to capture what people did and felt privately as distinct from the formal, outward observance which took place in synagogues or churches. However, synagogue and charity records do give us important insights into the ways that Judaism gave structure to people's lives and – more importantly for the current study – the extent to which this created and cemented communities.

These are particularly important themes for the current study, since Judaism is a religion with an unusual level of internal cohesion and exclusivity. Jews place great emphasis on endogamy and they do not seek to proselytize (in fact, conversion is difficult and protracted); religion is biological - it passes through the maternal line and can in almost no circumstances be completely renounced (even formal converts from the faith can be re-absorbed). Residential propinquity is necessary for public worship which requires a minimum quorum (*minyan*) of ten adult men able to attend by foot³⁹, and for creating a critical mass to attract provisioners licensed to deal in foodstuffs which conform to the dietary laws (*kashrut*).⁴⁰ Synagogue services are conducted in Hebrew or other vernaculars (English sermons started to be adopted during our period as a way to make Jewish worship less obviously 'other' to members of the Established state religion, but even in modern-day Orthodox services, the only prayer read in English is the one for the Royal Family). Judaism is also traditionally defined as both religion and ethnic identity: it is possible to feel strongly Jewish, and to take part in aspects of that affiliation, without being formally observant – and vice versa.⁴¹ Furthermore, while Judaic rules are based on the Old Testament, they also have a certain 'living' quality as they are continually reinterpreted by scholars (hence the emphasis on learning among orthodox Jews).⁴²

This bundle of features makes Judaism a revealing point of departure for a study of community forms and functions. The extent to which Jews blended their religiosity, the cultural and ethnic aspects of their religion and their desire to operate in wider society can tell us a lot about the

power of ethnic or religious feeling, the attractiveness of opportunities beyond it, and the way that identity was framed. By the middle of the nineteenth century, British Jewry also had several formal bodies which shaped and represented it to the wider community. These consisted of the office of the Chief Rabbi, the court of the Beth Din and the Jewish Board of Deputies; all based in London, though with growing input from the provincial communities.⁴³ The influence of these institutions on British Jewry was variable. The highest profile was the Chief Rabbinate – an office held throughout the period covered by this book by the German scholar, Nathan Marcus Adler. He was a driving force behind the anglicisation and orthodox conformity of British Jewry at this time, and the terms of his role specifically required him to visit and direct provincial as well as metropolitan Jewry. Synagogue records reveal him frequently asserting his ideas on decorum and orthodoxy (both invited and not), for example in the context of internal schism and local disputes – which were frequent.⁴⁴ One of his first actions on taking office was to commission a survey of the state of the congregations under his remit, and in 1847 he published a set of regulations that asserted his authority ‘in all matters of ritual and practice’; authority which seems to have been generally (albeit sometimes reluctantly) accepted in the provincial communities studied here.⁴⁵ The Beth Din, in contrast, is rarely mentioned in the records utilized for this study, but the selection of representatives to the Jewish Board of Deputies (est 1760) does crop up and as ‘Anglo-Jewry’s domestic political lobby’ the latter was called on to co-ordinate campaigns for legal emancipation and the protection of the Jewish Sabbath for workmen.⁴⁶ The efforts of the Board have been described as sometimes half-hearted and their business rather a closed shop, but they did have an important role in representing British Jewry.⁴⁷

The Jewish press was also important in giving common identity and voice to British Jews, most famously the lively and sometimes outspoken *Jewish Chronicle*. From 1847 this was published weekly and so could react much more rapidly to wider events than the Board of Deputies. Under the direction of several different editors it took a strong line on various topics of the day, from the growth of the Reform branch of Judaism (on which it was generally supportive), to the plight of the

Jewish poor and the support of Jews overseas. It became something of a virtual community meeting point, with its extensive advertisements, personal announcements and charity subscription lists, and it reported frequently on developments in the provinces and overseas.⁴⁸ David Cesarani, the historian of the *JC*, has credited it with the creation of a Jewish public sphere, and with 'the evolution of a modern form of Jewish solidarity and ethnic identity.'⁴⁹ Its editorials and letters on the provincial communities offer another perspective on the themes developed in this study.

These bodies all arguably formed a common point of identity for British Jewry.⁵⁰ However, many historians have been more concerned with the question of assimilation or 'blending in' and how far that was taken as an acceptable – even desirable – trade-off of acculturation. By the middle of the nineteenth century, according to Lipman for example, 'Anglo-Jewry was...a community of strong religious loyalty, but it was already one of some considerable degree of social assimilation.'⁵¹ This question is often handled rather simplistically, though, and with too much attention to the historical narratives and aspirations internalized by modern Jewry. Pointing this out, the American scholar Todd Endelman suggests that we must keep questions of secularisation and 'blending in' separate. On the former, he notes that it would be surprising were Jews *not* susceptible to the same influences which promoted 'impiety and indifference' as Christians, especially given their concentration in towns like London and Amsterdam where these trends were writ large, and where the culture shock of exposure to new ideas would have been particularly striking.⁵² 'Blending in', meanwhile, lagged behind the loss of religious practice, implying that Jewish identity went deeper than religious observance.⁵³ We will return to these questions of acculturation and the shaping of British Jewry in the conclusion. In the meantime, however, we must try to draw some of these themes of religious observance, imagined community and urban industrial life together into a meaningful – and testable – definition of a Jewish social network.

Social networks

The crux of this book is the extent to which British Jewry operated within an identifiable and useful community. There is obviously a limit to which we can answer this questions with the information available. Nonetheless, we can frame the study appropriately by setting out a proper theoretical framework based on what we know about social networks. This is another term which has been easily adopted into everyday language, but which actually has quite a precise set of meanings. In its loosest sense, a social network refers simply to the interconnected web of interactions which most individuals negotiate on a daily or weekly basis, with friends, colleagues, neighbours, shopkeepers, local authorities and so on. However, within sociology, anthropology and the mathematical sciences it can have more specific and measurable attributes, for example based on the range, intensity, multiplexity and durability of interactions between individuals, firms or groups.⁵⁴ The key attribute of this type of social network for scholars is its focus on relationships between actors, and the reason that this is important is that it is relationships which facilitate (or impede) the transfer of material goods, information, esteem, and so on. As social network theory has grown, it has taken in new perspectives, from the ability of the network to provide opportunities and constraints on actors' actions, to the different ways that knowledge and goods can circulate.⁵⁵ Our focus here is principally on household and neighbourhood connectedness because of the type of information available, but alternative approaches can take in common and overlapping use of space, commercial transactions and information flow.⁵⁶ Essentially, social network theory has its basis in the idea of social capital: a social network arises when social capital between members is acknowledged and active. It cannot be created 'out of need alone'; it needs both resources of some sort, and a set of conduits around which it can flow.⁵⁷

A local social network is thus most likely to develop where people have been resident for a long time, have kinship ties, where they belong to the same social class, and where there is a common local web of shops, places of employment and other facilities.⁵⁸ Anywhere with strong

possibilities for social advancement is less likely to display this sort of community, since people will inevitably move on more rapidly – unless they have other reasons to remain affiliated to one another, such as common religious worship (it is worth registering here, then, that Rubinstein has characterized Anglo-Jewry as exhibiting high levels of social mobility⁵⁹). When an area provides only residential facilities the only ties likely to develop are those based on family and neighbourhood – although these are often categorized as among the deepest and most useful of social bonds.⁶⁰ Shared ethnic or cultural ties are often identified as important elements in a strong urban network, commonly referred to as ‘ethnic urban villages’.⁶¹ In this situation shared cultural backgrounds attract newcomers and provide them with a tight-knit community (potentially more closely knit than the one they left behind), which can in turn help with the acquisition of skills to launch them onwards.

One of the questions this book seeks to answer is whether this degree of homogeneity and fellow-feeling can be perceived among Jews in provincial industrial cities in the 1850s, 60s and 70s. It takes note of the technical ways of measuring and describing a social network, but it also makes reference to a broader sense of community links which are embedded in shared identity and social capital, and reinforced by residential patterns. In all cases, it attempts to spotlight networks which were *functional* and *useful*, which contributed towards people’s sense of identity and their ability to make ends meet. It looks, in essence, for evidence of Jews choosing to share their house-space with co-religionists, to common patterns of employment and residence, and for welfare facilities which protected poorer Jews and helped them to integrate into the local society. Naturally, this focus privileges positive evidence of networks and has the potential to overlook people who were either not well connected, or whose identity spanned different types of social networks. However, given the tenuousness of our grasp on the qualitative character of Jewish life at this time, this approach must be seen as a positive step forwards, and one which, as we will see, does allow us to see networks operating in many different ways, with varying aims and outcomes.

Studying British Jewry

The current study thus aims to bring new perspectives to the study of British Jewry. While the historiography to date has been rich and detailed, it has tended to focus on several well-rehearsed themes connected to wider stories of acceptance and acculturation, and the growth of specific communities and institutions especially in London. Detailed and comparative studies of different communities are still lacking, as are perspectives from social and economic history which spotlight life at a household level. Attention has been paid to the campaign for political emancipation (which came, finally, in 1858; almost thirty years after equivalent rights were given to Catholics⁶²), but far less to the negotiations which shaped community life and framed its boundaries.

The growing provincial towns provide the perfect setting to probe these topics further, focusing as they do on the challenges of adaptation to a new socio-economic and cultural environment. The communities highlighted in this book: Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Sheffield, Leeds, Glasgow and Hull, grew up with quite different forms and characteristics, but all went into a new and sustained phase of growth during the nineteenth century. Each community made their own decisions about their synagogues and ministers (under the direction of the Chief Rabbi); they formed their own relationships with the urban environment and living spaces and they interacted with the wider cultural and political environment to differing degrees. We know most about the shape and direction of the Jewish community in Manchester, thanks to Bill Williams's seminal 1985 study, *The Making of Manchester Jewry*. However, his book has a distinct class perspective and it is time to test more thoroughly how Manchester compared to other communities in terms of a wider set of reference points concerning living arrangements, residence, occupation and welfare.

The trajectory of research on British Jewry echoes a path found in many other areas of historical enquiry, including the history of welfare and medicine. Thus early work such as Cecil Roth's *A History of the Jews in England* and Vivian Lipman's *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950*

which were published in the 1950s and 60s respectively, tended to focus on elite individuals, families ('cousinhoods', to use a description coined by Chaim Bermant⁶³) and communities, detailed but often somewhat hagiographic in tone, with minimal reference to wider social or economic trends and keen to tell a story of success and assimilation.⁶⁴ They are important reference points for identifying notable individuals and community schisms, but they are less useful for making sense of the status and behaviour of British Jewry within wider society.⁶⁵ Running in parallel, however, scholars like W. Rubinstein and Lloyd Gartner were starting to produce larger-scale studies of British Jewry, which took in relations with non-Jews, the history of political emancipation and the impact of mass Eastern European immigration from the 1880s.⁶⁶ These were useful in setting up a broader landscape for the history of British Jewry, but they tended to perpetuate similar 'stories' of success in a benign and liberal environment, especially compared to the more colourful and alarming histories of Jews in other European nations.⁶⁷

A third wave of scholars, given impetus by Williams's 1979 work on Manchester Jewry, and influenced by the new emphasis on social history and 'history from below' in the field more broadly, started to bring a sense of wider contexts to bear on their topic. Williams was joined by scholars like Todd Endelman and David Feldman, who had a much greater sense that they were writing social or political histories which focused on the Jewish community, but with an eye to what this could reveal about broader trends.⁶⁸ They were also much less inclined to trust earlier, hagiographic accounts of the Jewish community, and instead – most notably in Endelman's *Broadening Jewish History* - made room for analysis which emphasized division, criminality and poverty: that is, which allowed for the possibility that a shared religion did *not* necessarily produce a homogeneous or harmonious sense of a single community.⁶⁹ Others have taken a more overtly sociological perspective; most notably Kokosalakis's study of Liverpool Jewry, while local historians continue to produce a range of narrower single-town studies.⁷⁰

The current book has its roots in this latter approach. However, it aims to move the field on further still, by drawing in a deeper sense of economic, social and demographic history; essentially, drawing the history of the Jews further into the mainstream of modern British history. It does so from the household level up, retaining a sense of the community as a whole, and not merely the most notable or the most disadvantaged. These are areas in which Jewish history has yet to make much of a mark.⁷¹ In 1994 Englander noted that Jewish family history was 'still in its infancy'; made up of 'myths' 'in place of systematic knowledge on marriage, household structure, kinship relations and residence patterns.'⁷² The publication of the impressive online Anglo-Jewish Database (AJDB), based on the 1851 Census and explored in further detail below, opened up huge possibilities for investigating mid-century British Jews in just these terms (despite its name, the database includes Jews in Scotland, Wales and Ireland), but beyond the editor Petra Laidlaw's own work on marriage and occupations, these opportunities have not yet been taken up.⁷³ This is particularly surprising given that the database gives us the ideal opportunity to address the London bias in much of the work on British Jewry, and to join together isolated local studies to say something more meaningful about provincial Jewry at this time of economic change.

This book thus aims to fill several notable gaps in the treatment of British Jewry in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. By spotlighting the socio-economic experience of Jews living in some of the largest industrial and commercial towns in Britain it is able to take a far more fine-grained and comparative view of the composition of these communities.⁷⁴ Importantly, it also asks how far their imagined community translated into concrete and functional networks for support, worship and patronage. And finally, it examines whether migration to increasingly urbanized centres had an impact on family and household forms and whether there is evidence for a falling off of religious feeling as Jews adapted to life as Britons in the most thoroughly modern of British cities.

Sources and remit

The core source for this study is the 1851 decennial census (as distinct from the one-off Census of Worship of the same year, which was a simple head count). The English, Scottish and Welsh censuses did not record religious affiliation until 2001, but by intensive cross referencing to local studies and records like naturalization papers, synagogue records and family histories, the AJDB has been able to capture an estimated 90 per cent of British Jewry in 1851, numbering 29,230 individuals.⁷⁵ The definition of a Jew for the purpose of drawing up the database was kept deliberately broad: ‘anyone who was, or may be assumed to have been, Jewish by either birth, conversion or cultural affiliation, whether or not they retained that identity later in life’.⁷⁶ For the current purposes, people identified as Jewish and living in the seven selected towns in 1851 were extracted (over 3,500 in total, more than half of the total Anglo-Jewish population living outside London at this time), and were each traced back to the census enumerators’ books in order to reconstruct their households. This included capturing intra-household relationships, the incidence of shared housing and any non-Jews living in the home. In a separate exercise all residents (Jews and non-Jews) on the most populous Jewish streets in each of the three largest communities (Manchester, Liverpool and Birmingham) were recorded for comparative purposes. It is worth noting that while the total number of Jews identified in the database is broadly in line with other estimates for the period at around 31-32,000 of whom around 22,500 were in London, those in Liverpool are notably lower.⁷⁷ It is unclear whether this represents incomplete coverage or a decline in the Jewish population of this town at this time. This will be borne in mind in the chapters which follow.

The seven towns were selected in order to capture the outward geographical movement of Anglo-Jewry into a variety of manufacturing and commercial cities. An additional consideration, given the growing significance of both immigration and trans-migration in this period was their location at or near the arrival and departure ports at Hull and Liverpool. We will see that this shaped the Jewish populations of all of the selected towns.⁷⁸ In other respects, the selected towns were very different.

All had had a period of unprecedented growth in the decades before our study begins: between 1821 and 1831 the populations of Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, Liverpool and Sheffield all grew by 40 per cent or more, Manchester topping a quarter of a million people by 1831, and Liverpool passing 375,000.⁷⁹ By the 1850s this was beginning to slow: the era of the 'shock' industrial city was ending and making way for a period of differentiated and emerging local character. Always characterized as a home of radical politics and class consciousness as well as the hub of a regional centre of cloth production and factory industry (a set of characteristics not unlike its Yorkshire rival, Leeds) Manchester was settling into a phase of respectability and local culture by 1851. Its successful Royal visit in that year perhaps confirms this new status.⁸⁰ Birmingham and Sheffield had longer histories of workshop-based manufacture and this was retained into the nineteenth century, but while the former attracted attention for the coherence of its approach to local governance, Sheffield remained a city of small and disparate communities.⁸¹ Liverpool's wealth (like Hull's, though to a greater degree) was built on its docks: lacking in significant primary manufacturing it remained largely a service industry with a heavy presence of migrants (most notably the Famine Irish of the 1840s) and maritime personnel – as well as the slums and public health problems which were to earn it the moniker the 'black spot on the Mersey'.⁸² Glasgow, meanwhile, as the primary manufacturing city in Scotland, housed a growing proportion of the Scottish population over the course of the century, from 5.1 per cent in 1801, this had reached 11.5 per cent: a larger percentage growth than that seen in London.⁸³

Of the seven towns, Birmingham and Liverpool probably contained the longest-established Jewish communities. The Manchester congregation had taken up critical momentum only a few decades before this study begins, receiving its largest impetus from Jews moving from Liverpool and London, or migrating from Germany and Poland. By 1851 it had overtaken Birmingham to become the largest provincial community in the country. Together, these three cities will form the key focus of Chapters 3 to 6 because of their larger size and hence wider array of community documentation. The communities in Leeds, Glasgow and Sheffield remained small for much of our period, growing

out of all proportion with later waves of immigration from Eastern Europe, while Hull Jewry expanded in line with the rise and fall of international migration.⁸⁴ By 1851 the seven communities varied in size from 1,107 individuals in Manchester, to 104 in Glasgow and 112 in Sheffield. They will be introduced more thoroughly in the chapters which follow, and together form the basis of the demographic analysis reported in Chapter 2. Where possible the smaller communities are also referenced in the context of wider charitable patterns in Chapters 5 and 6, and it is hoped that future work will allow a more detailed analysis of Jews in these cities.

The AJDB itself forms a key justification for the focus on the mid-nineteenth century. However, there are other reasons too. First, the period coincides with a phase of growth in the Jewish community especially in the form of movement to the industrial towns, but precedes the mass immigration of the 1880s when numbers became both unmanageably large for comparative study and the subject of much greater attention in other work. Second, it falls at the end of the period of unprecedented growth in the industrial towns which was noted above, and which had radically altered their character and status. This opens up the possibility for a targeted study of how the Jewish population integrated into a new style of workforce and a new set of concerns about poverty and living standards. These concerns will be developed further in Chapter 4.

Third, there exists a very large amount of supplementary material generated by the various communities – and especially those reaching larger critical mass - which can be used to enrich the census information for the surrounding decades. These include synagogue minutes, charity records and articles in the Jewish press. Where possible these have been linked to the AJDB to build up a picture of community leaders, charity donors and recipients, and (thanks to the biographical detail in the AJDB) allowing the perspective to be taken back to the 1830s and forwards to the end of the 1870s. This is a period of Jewish history often characterized, according to Williams, as one of tidying up ‘loose ends’, but otherwise constituting a ‘plateau between two periods of substantial and fundamental change’.⁸⁵ This book confirms that Williams was right to be sceptical about this

characterisation, especially for the newer provincial communities where Jews were engaging in significant experiments in creating cohesion and identity, and in supporting – and moving on - growing numbers of poor.

The book is divided into two halves. Chapters 2 to 4 focus on households, residence patterns, wealth and poverty. Chapter 2 explores the composition of Jewish households, and whether they shared their living space with others, Jewish or non-Jewish. Chapter 3 maps out where Jews settled within the spatial environment of the larger cities and whether this meant living close to community institutions and co-religionists. Chapter 4 traces the relative wealth and poverty of the Jews in the three largest communities via their occupations, skill levels and living standards. In doing so, it starts to pull out commonalities and differences between Jews in the larger towns. Together these chapters highlight evidence of community networks which seem to have brought positive and useful benefits.

The second half of the book (Chapters 5-6) deals with poverty, philanthropy and the shaping of the poor. This is a well-rehearsed topic, but previous studies of Jewish welfare have lacked a deep understanding of the wider context of poverty, charity and statutory relief, and the ways that these interacted with the economies of the industrial towns. Chapter 5 deals with the earlier part of the period, when Jewish charity took familiar philanthropic forms, but with what community leaders saw as a strong and distinctively Jewish ethos behind it. We can see several wider reference points about 'deservingness' and belonging at work, but heavily tempered by a sense of responsibility towards 'casual' and transient Jews. Chapter 6 turns to the 1860s and 70s, when the Jewish community was challenged in new ways by rising immigration, but also moved into the forefront of attempts to triage and consolidate charity under the auspices of new local Jewish Boards of Guardians. The findings from the industrial towns acknowledge the much publicized theme of charity as a way to anglicize the immigrant poor and make them respectable, but finds that this is only part of the story. Wider trends in the economy and the charitable landscape also played their part, as did an

increasingly desperate eye to the community balance sheet. Finally, Chapter 7 offers an extended conclusion, re-addressing what the evidence can add to our understanding of the ways that Jews experienced the industrial economy and the ways that they navigated what many of them saw as their key challenge: that of becoming both British and Jewish.

¹ D. Rabinowitz, 'Community Studies: Anthropological', in *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, ed. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B Baltes Oxford: Elsevier 2001), 4 vols, 2387; C. J. Calhoun, 'Community: Toward a Variable Conceptualization For Comparative Research', *Social History* 5, no. 1 (1980): 105-129.

² Gerard Delanty, *Community* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 2-3. Interestingly, Delanty (a sociologist) characterises the nineteenth-century as the century of community, compared with the crisis of the twentieth century (4).

³ Calhoun, 'Community', 106. See also Delanty, *Community*, 9-10.

⁴ Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and Piety in an English Village: Terling, 1525-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).

⁵ Anna Davin, *Growing Up Poor: Home, School and Street in London, 1870-1914* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1996); see also Michael Anderson's *Family Structure in Nineteenth-Century Lancashire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971) for a more qualified example of a close-knit working-class community in nineteenth-century Preston. Also J. Connell, 'Social Networks in Urban Society', in *Social Patterns in Cities*, Institute of British Geographers Special Publication No 5, (London: Institute of British Geographers, 1973): 41-52.

⁶ Steven King, 'Migrants on the Margin? Mobility, Integration and Occupations in the West Riding, 1650-1820', *Journal of Historical Geography* 23 no. 3 (1997): 284-303.

-
- ⁷ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, rev. edn (London and New York: Verso, 2006). Another classic study of Britain is Linda Colley's *Britons: Forging A Nation, 1703-1837*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), which identifies shared Protestantism as a key definition of belonging.
- ⁸ John Scott, *Social Network Analysis: a Handbook*, 2nd edn (London, Thousand Oaks Ca, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2000), 21.
- ⁹ See Laura Vaughan, 'A Study of the Spatial Characteristics of the Jews in London 1695 & 1895' (MSc diss., University College London, 1994).
- ¹⁰ Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Association*, trans. Charles P Loomis, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955). Tönnies did not devise this theory but he clarified and popularised it.
- ¹¹ Calhoun, 'Community', 113.
- ¹² For example, see Calhoun, 'Community', and the overviews provided in Tamara Hareven, 'The History of the Family and the Complexity of Social Change', *The American Historical Review* 96, no. 1 (1991): 95-124; Neil J. Smelser, *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution: an Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry* (Aldershot, Hants: Gregg Revivals, 1959).
- ¹³ For example, see Peter Laslett, 'Introduction' in *Household and Family in Past Time*, ed. Peter Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 1-89, and the Introduction and references to Anderson's *Family Structure*, 1-4. For more recent contributions see Barry Reay, 'Kinship and the Neighbourhood in Nineteenth-Century Rural England: the Myth of the Autonomous Nuclear Family', *Journal of Family History* 21, no. 1 (1996): 87-104; Naomi Tadmor, 'Early Modern Kinship in the Long Run: Reflections on Continuity and Change', *Continuity and Change* 25, no. 1 (2010): 15-48.
- ¹⁴ Anderson, *Family Structure*.
- ¹⁵ Steve King and Geoff Timmins, *Making Sense of the Industrial Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 275.
- ¹⁶ For example, see Emma Griffin, *Liberty's Dawn: a People's History of the Industrial Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2013).
- ¹⁷ Katherine Lynch, *Individuals, Families and Communities in Europe, 1200-1800: the Urban Foundations of Western Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), e.g. 101.
- ¹⁸ In Britain the Sephardi congregation was longer-established than the Ashkenazi and was also, as a body, much wealthier. They maintained separate synagogues and separate welfare schemes for their 'own' poor. By

the early nineteenth century, the Ashkenazim were starting to dominate numerically. It was they who gave the outward migration to new provincial centres in the early nineteenth century its character, and so attention in this book is invariably skewed in this direction. The Sephardim, however, coming from lands where it had been illegal to practise Judaism, were often more accustomed to living and working among non-Jews. The first provincial Sephardi congregation was established in Manchester in 1874 (Bill Williams, *Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740-1875* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), 240-56, 319-24).

¹⁹ Jewish immigration to Britain had seen a notable upswing between 1750 and 1815 when 120 to 150 new migrants arrived per year predominately from the German speaking lands, Amsterdam and Poland. Rates then slowed with the impact of the Napoleonic Wars, quickening again with the Continental upheavals of 1848 and then a combination of improved transport links and periods of persecution. It was between these years that the provincial industrial communities started to grow, in a trajectory which took on ever-quickenning momentum in the subsequent decades. By the late 1850s to 1881 500 to 1,000 foreign Jews were entering the country each year, notably from Poland and Russia (Vivian D. Lipman, *Social History of the Jews in England, 1850-1950* (London: Watts & Co., 1954), 8; *ibid.*, *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1990), 12).

²⁰ For example, see Colin Pooley and Jean Turnbull, *Migration and Mobility in Britain Since the Eighteenth Century* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

²¹ King, 'Migrants on the Margin?'.

²² Petra Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: Birthplaces, Residence and Migrations', *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* 53 (2011), 48.

²³ This is a major theme of Williams's work on Manchester Jewry in the nineteenth century (*Making of Manchester Jewry*, *passim*).

²⁴ For example, see Frank Felsenstein, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes: a Paradigm of Otherness in English Popular Culture, 1660-1830* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1999; Bryan Cheyette, *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

²⁵ Todd Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1741-1830: Tradition and Change in a Liberal Society* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979), 86-117. On the Irish see, for example, Mervyn Busted, *The Irish in Manchester c. 1750-1921: Resistance, Adaptation and Identity* (Manchester: Manchester

University Press, 2016); John Belchem, *Irish, Catholic and Scouse: the History of the Liverpool Irish, 1800-1939* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007); Roger Swift and Sheridan Gilley, eds, *The Irish in Britain: the Local Dimension* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999). On the impact of the 'Eastern Crisis' on perceptions of Jews see Cheyette, *Constructions of 'the Jew'*, esp. Chapter 1. Anti-Jewish feeling was also stoked by fears about 'aliens' in the context of mass-immigration from Eastern Europe in the 1880s and beyond (see Colin Holmes, *Anti-Semitism in British Soc, 1876-1939* Edward Arnold, London, 1979).

²⁶ Rev. Moses Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, 3 vols (London: Richard Bentley, 1851), Vol. 3, 159-60.

²⁷ W. D. Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), 59.

²⁸ On these attitudes to the Irish, see Mary J. Hickman, *Religion, Class and Identity: the State, the Catholic Church and the Education of the Irish in Britain* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1995). She contends that the more negative ideas were projected specifically onto the Catholic Irish, although there was long-standing antipathy to Catholics in Britain more generally. More recent readings of Irish immigration have tended to stress a more positive story of internal ethnic solidarity – see, for example, Belchem, *Irish, Catholic and Scouse*. The editors of the *Jewish Chronicle* took up an anti-Catholic stance in the 1840s and 50s as a way of demonstrating their Englishness, although Cesarani notes that this rather perversely meant associating themselves with Evangelical Protestants (*Jewish Chronicle*, 20-1). Sponza (*Italian Immigrants in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Realities and Images* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1988)) reads a similar story of apathetic acceptance into British reactions to Italian immigrants in this period.

²⁹ For example, A. D. Gilbert, *Religion and Society in Industrial England: Church, Chapel and Social Change, 1740-1914* (London and New York: Longman, 1976), xii and 77; C. D. Field, 'Counting Religion in England and Wales: The Long Eighteenth Century, c.1680-c.1840', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 63, no. 4 (2012): 693-720; David Newsome, *The Victorian World Picture: Perceptions and Introspections in an Age of Change* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2007).

³⁰ See Callum G. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation 1800-2000* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

³¹ Gerald Parsons, 'A Question of Meaning: Religion and Working-Class Life', in *Religion in Victorian Britain II: Controversies*, ed. Gerald Parsons (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1988), 64-7. See also Asa Briggs, *Victorian Cities* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 63, 68. More than half of the total attendance in Bradford, Leeds, Oldham, Wolverhampton and Sheffield was at non-conforming places of worship, and between 40 and 50 per cent of those in Birmingham, Manchester, Salford and Newcastle. Catholics were also prominent in Liverpool (30 per cent) and Manchester (20 per cent). Parts of London were equally affected.

³² Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain*, 145-69. He maintains that this discursive Christianity remained strong up to the 1950s. See also Parsons, 'A Question of Meaning', 77-9.

³³ Lipman, *A History of the Jews*, 28.

³⁴ The contemporary observer John Mills stated that 'Every Jew who has the least feeling of Judaism, attends the Synagogue on the Day of Atonement' (John Mills, *The British Jews* (London, Houlston & Stoneman, 1853), 174).

³⁵ Birmingham Jewish Local History Study Group, 'A Portrait of Birmingham Jewry in 1851', available at <https://www.jewishgen.org/jcr-uk/Community/Birmingham/articles/birmingham-vic2.htm> Bham [accessed 15 February 2017]. Originally published in A. Newman, *Provincial Jewry in Victorian Britain*, (London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1975). The Census of Worship counted 82 attendees at the Friday night service at the main synagogue in Birmingham, 185 on Saturday morning and 40 on Saturday afternoon. See Chapters 3 and 4 for more on occupations.

³⁶ Todd M. Endelman, *Broadening Jewish History: Towards a Social History of Ordinary Jews* (Oxford, Portland, Oregon: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2011), 43. He makes a similar point about the more acculturated Continental Jews for whom assimilation was largely the result of 'apathy and carelessness' (Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, p. 7).

³⁷ From 1836 Jews secured the rights to register marriages which took place in synagogue (Rubinstein, *A History of the Jews*, 72).

³⁸ Todd M. Endelman *The Jews of Britain 1656 to 2000* (Berkeley and London: University of California Press, 2002), 59-60.

³⁹ Using a conveyance like a carriage – or in the modern era a car – constitutes ‘work’ and is thus banned on the Sabbath.

⁴⁰ The laws of *kashrut* (which produce food that is *kosher*) are laid down in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. They cover foods that are permissible and those that are taboo, and also set out rules for ritual slaughter of permitted animals and prohibitions on combinations of certain foods (meat and milk must not be combined in the same meal, for example).

⁴¹ Kokosalakis described Judaism as ‘a special kind of religion which cannot be understood apart from the history, the ongoing life and the social experience of the Jewish people ... Judaism is an ethnic folk religion *par excellence*....’ (N. Kokosalakis, *Ethnic Identity and Religion: Tradition and Change in Liverpool Jewry* (Washington: Universal Press of America, 1982), xxii). John Mills also stated that ‘The Jewish idea of religion is national; that is, in his estimation his faith and his nation are synonymous. To profess the one is to belong to the other; and to change the former is to deny the latter. Thus there is no line of demarcation between religion and nationality.’ (Mills, *The British Jews*, 67).

⁴² The most famous collections of rabbinic interpretations are known as the *Talmud* (which contains most of the Jewish laws) and the *Midrash*. Although these were based on the teachings of rabbis, a formally qualified minister is not actually necessary for worship to take place as long as a member of the congregation is capable of leading it.

⁴³ Eugene C. Black, *The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880-1920* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), 38-41.

⁴⁴ Black, *Social Politics*, 26-27; Lipman, *Social History*, 23-4, 38-40; Endelman *Jews of Britain*, 115-121. The Chief Rabbi did not have the same authority as his equivalents on the Continent, but he was the acknowledged leader of the community as whole.

⁴⁵ Black, *Social Politics*, 26.

⁴⁶ Black, *Social Politics*, 39; Rubinstein, *History of the Jews*, 71.

⁴⁷ Cesarani (*Jewish Chronicle*, 25) claims that the Board of Deputies was ‘ignored by most of the Jewish population.’ See also Black, *Social Politics*, 40-1. Attitudes were improved once its proceedings started to be reported in the Jewish press, and once community notable Sir Moses Montefiore had taken the reins in 1835 (Rubinstein, *History of the Jews*, 71-2). The provincial seats were often taken up by allied members who lived in London.

⁴⁸ Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*. The paper was launched in 1841 but was initially short-lived; another Jewish paper, *The Voice of Jacob* was founded in the same year but merged with the *JC* in 1848. Together they were possibly the first minority community journal in the English-speaking world (Rubinstein, *History of the Jews*, 91). Two of the early recruits to the paper's editorial team were Jacob Franklin of Liverpool and Dr Morris J. Raphall, later minister of the Birmingham Hebrew Congregation (Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*, 8-9).

⁴⁹ Cesarani, *Jewish Chronicle*, 31.

⁵⁰ These organisations were joined in the early 1870s by the London United Synagogue (a joint body representing the main metropolitan Ashkenazi congregations) and the Anglo-Jewish Association, founded to organise aid for Jews overseas (Todd M. Endelman, 'Communal Solidarity Among the Jewish Elite of Victorian London', *Victorian Studies*, Spring 1985: 491-526).

⁵¹ Lipman, *Social History*, 37.

⁵² Endelman, 'Broadening Jewish History', 30-1.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 31-3.

⁵⁴ For example, see Scott, *Social Network Analysis*; Stephen P. Borgatti, Ajay Mehra, Daniel J Brass and Giuseppe Labianca, 'Network Analysis in the Social Sciences', *Science* 323, no. 5916 (1990): 892-895. Also Connell, 'Social Networks'.

⁵⁵ John Scott, *What is Social Network Analysis?* (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012; Stanley Wasserman and Katherine Faust, *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

⁵⁶ Network theory has been used to address the question of how village networks responded to the influences of industrialization and urbanization. See Scott, *Social Network Analysis*, 77; Borgatti et al., 'Network Analysis', 897.

⁵⁷ Borgatti et al., 'Network analysis', pp. 892-895, esp. 293; Lynch, *Individuals, Families and Communities*, 68. Lynch cites church membership as one such 'inspiration' for an active network of 'invented kinship' (68-102).

⁵⁸ Connell, 'Social Networks', 44.

⁵⁹ Rubinstein, *History of the Jews*, 70.

⁶⁰ Connell, 'Social Networks', 44.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 46-7.

⁶² This tardiness is often attributed to the fact that there were few areas of discrimination which directly affected Jews or which could not be got round, and also that they were small in number. Municipal office holding was allowed under the Jewish Disabilities Removal Act of 1845. The first Jewish MP to be elected was Nathan Rothschild, for the City of London. The House of Commons was prepared to allow him to take a modified oath so that he could take his seat, but the Lords consistently overruled this until 1858, when the need to take a Christological oath was lifted. Rubinstein, *History of the Jews*, 73-6.

⁶³ Chaim Bermant, *The Cousinhood* (London: Macmillan, 1971).

⁶⁴ Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964); Lipman, *Social History* For an excellent overview of the historiography see Todd M. Endelman, 'English Jewish History', *Modern Judaism* 11 (1991): 91-109 and the introduction to Endelman's, *Broadening Jewish History*; also David Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture, 1840-1914* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994), 7-9.

⁶⁵ Almost all of the communities studied underwent secession by some of their members, commonly because of dissatisfaction over access to positions of influence; occasionally because of personal differences. 'New' congregations were formed in 1839 in Liverpool, 1844 in Manchester (and again briefly in 1869) and 1852 in Birmingham. The schisms in Manchester and Birmingham were short-lived, as were equivalents in Glasgow and Hull, but in Liverpool it endured. (Williams, *Making of Manchester Jewry*, 137, 132-4; Kokosalakis, *Ethnic Identity*, 71-4; Birmingham Jewish History Society (BJHS), *Birmingham Jewry: Vol. 2, More aspects, 1740-1930* (Oldbury: Birmingham Jewish History Research Group, 1984), 13-14. For one example of several in Hull see Israel Finestein, 'The Jews in Hull Between 1766 and 1880', *Jewish Historical Studies* XXXV (1996-8), 38, and on Glasgow, A. Levy, *The Origins of Glasgow Jewry, 1812-1895* (Glasgow: A. J. Macfarlane Ltd, nd, preface dated 1949), 43-4.

⁶⁶ Rubinstein, *History of the Jews*; Lloyd P. Gartner, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1960).

⁶⁷ For these criticisms see Endelman *Jews of Britain*, 2; Todd Endelman, 'Jews, Aliens and Other Outsiders in British History', *The Historical Journal* 37, no. 4 (1994): 959-969.

⁶⁸ Williams, *Making of Manchester Jewry*. Endelman states, of Williams's book, that 'he made the parochial disputes of a provincial, culturally undistinguished Jewish community relevant to both students of the

Victorian middle class and students of Jewish assimilation in Western Europe and North America.’ (‘English Jewish History’, 93); Endelman, *Jews of Georgian England*; Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews*.

⁶⁹ Rubinstein, in contrast, finds some of this work ‘deliberately adversarial’ and calls instead for a refocusing of attention on the relative tranquillity of the experiences of British Jewry (*History of the Jews*, 32-33 and 22-33 generally).

⁷⁰ Kokosalakis, *Ethnic Identity*. Some examples of local studies are M. Freedman, *Leeds Jewry: the First Hundred Years* (Leeds: Jewish Historical Society of England (Leeds branch), 1992); BJHS, *Birmingham Jewry, Vol. 1: 1749-1914* (Oldbury: Birmingham Jewish History Research Group, 1980) and *Vol. 2*; Ben Braber, *Jews in Glasgow, 1879-1939* (Ilford: Vallentine Mitchell & Co Ltd, 2007).

⁷¹ An exception is Endelman’s, *Broadening Jewish History*.

⁷² David Englander, *A Documentary History of Jewish Immigrants in Britain, 1840-1920* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1994), 63-4.

⁷³ Laidlaw, ‘Jews in the British Isles: Birthplaces’; Petra Laidlaw ‘Jews in the British Isles in 1851: Marriage and Childbearing’, *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 57, nos 1 and 2 (2015): 7-43.

⁷⁴ This book uses the terms ‘industrial’ and ‘commercial’ interchangeably, in recognition of the fact that the selected towns had diverse economies, which were not all based in manufacturing. It also consistently uses the term ‘British’ rather than ‘Anglo’, since there were growing Jewish communities in Scottish, Irish and Welsh towns.

⁷⁵ This is available at www.jgsgb.org.uk/1851-database or via the UK Data Service at <https://discover.ukdataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/?sn=7668>. On the collection of the data see Laidlaw, ‘Jews in the British Isles: Birthplaces’, 30-1.

⁷⁶ Laidlaw, ‘Jews in the British Isles: Birthplaces’, 30.

⁷⁷ Laidlaw, ‘Jews in the British Isles: Birthplaces’, 33. The AJDB gives a population of around 850 in Liverpool in 1851 compared with earlier estimates of 1,300 to 2,500. Ongoing work by Phil Sapiro indicates that there may have been significantly more Jews in Liverpool in 1851 than are enumerated in the AJDB, although it is not yet clear how many of these were long-term residents (personal communication, November 2019).

⁷⁸ On the different local character of some of these cities, see Briggs, *Victorian Cities, passim*. It was cheaper to take a boat to America from England than from Dutch or German ports by the 1880s, hence the popularity of

transmigration across the narrow point of northern England (Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews*, 154). Some of the Jews settling in Glasgow had arrived at the Scottish port of Leith.

⁷⁹ Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, 86.

⁸⁰ Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, 32, 112-128, and 88-138 *passim*.

⁸¹ Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, 36.

⁸² Gerry Kearns, Paul Laxton and Joy Campbell, 'Duncan and the Cholera Test: Public Health in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Liverpool', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 143 (1993): 87-115; A. T. McCabe, 'The Standard of Living on Merseyside, 1850-1875', in *Victorian Lancashire*, ed S. Peter Bell (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1974), 127-49.

⁸³ Briggs, *Victorian Cities*, 34, 60.

⁸⁴ There were around 100 Jews in Leeds at mid-century; by the end of the 1870s this had grown to 2,250 (Feldman, *Englishmen and Jews*, 121). Finestein, 'The Jews of Hull', 33-5. On Sheffield see K. Lunn, 'Historical Introduction', in Barry A. Kosmin, Marzy Bauer and Nigel Grizzard, *Steel City Jews: a Study of Ethnicity and Social Mobility in the Jewish Population of the City of Sheffield, South Yorkshire* (London: Research Unit Board of Deputies of British Jews, 1976): 1-6.

⁸⁵ Williams, *Making of Manchester Jewry*, 327.