

Jewish households and religious identity in mid C19th Britain

Author

Alysa Levene

Abstract

In the 1960s and 70s historians were exercised by the nature of the relationship between industrialisation and family life. In essence, they were starting to question the truth of the long-standing belief that the upheavals of migration, urban settlement and conversion to an industrial workforce had altered family forms and support networks in a way which promoted nuclearity and (relative) isolation.¹ Michael Anderson's famous study of Preston, published in 1971, was one of the first to challenge this 'master narrative', pointing out the continued importance of family ties in an industrial town, albeit overlain with a strong sense of instrumentality which he suggests may have arisen partly because of a breakdown in older systems of inheritance and network formation.²

Households in Preston were thus not uncommonly extended by kin beyond the immediate nuclear family, but this often reflected a calculated and mutually beneficial relationship based on shared costs or childcare. Laslett *et al* also challenged the thesis that industrialisation disrupted earlier family patterns, by uncovering evidence that the small, nuclear family was a characteristic of British families for a very long period, and one which preceded the onset of industrialisation by several centuries.³ The attack has continued: more recently Barry Reay pointed out that inter-relationships *between* households remained very strong through the nineteenth century, at least in rural Kent, while Tadmor and others have highlighted the fluidity of household forms over the course of the life cycle, making such apparently strict classifications as 'nuclear' and 'extended' rather unhelpful.⁴ The present article very much supports this view. Nonetheless, space has remained in the historiography for the disruptive effects of industrialisation on family ties in a broader sense, and particularly the transition from an agricultural way of life to one based on waged labour. Emma Griffin's recent work on working-class autobiography, for example, has pointed out the freedom that a reliable industrial wage brought to young workers, enabling them to make marriages which would previously have been seen as improvident.⁵ Yet there is still much that we don't know about the transition to the industrial setting, including the impact of urban migration on family structure, and its interactions with other cultural and social factors like religion and shared places of origin.

This article aims to make its own contribution by drawing together three areas of potential change which were coalescing around the middle of the nineteenth century. The first is the form of the family in industrial and manufacturing towns; the second is the impact of migration on family and community cohesion; and thirdly and relatedly, is the role of shared religion in creating or cementing those bonds of family and community. By utilising household analysis of the Jewish population in a range of industrial towns in 1851 I aim to show both how fluid and varied household forms were, and also to highlight the significance of fellowship in religion, language and culture in easing the transition into an urban and British setting. The findings thus consolidate Tadmor's suggestions about the flexibility of household and family forms, and Anderson's about the enduring importance

1
2
3 of kin support. They gain significance from the fact that, as the study shows, these trends clearly
4
5 held true across sectarian divides, and within a highly mobile population.
6
7

8 The population under study consists of 3524 individuals in seven towns: Manchester, Liverpool,
9
10 Birmingham, Hull, Leeds, Sheffield and Glasgow. Of these, 39 per cent were born overseas.⁶ This
11
12 cohort thus offers an excellent way to test some of the mechanisms we still do not fully understand
13
14 about the way that individuals were absorbed into industrial towns in this period. In particular, it
15
16 allows us to ask whether a close-knit and circumscribed cultural bond like religion insulated Jews
17
18 from wider patterns of continuity and change, and whether the Jews' distinctive patterns of
19
20 immigration and residential clustering kept them apart from the wider process of assimilation,
21
22 acculturation and adaptation to an industrial setting.
23
24

25 This is a pertinent bundle of questions to ask, because the latter half of the nineteenth century has
26
27 also been characterised as a period of reduced religious observance; in fact this has become a
28
29 'master narrative' in its own right (albeit now a disputed one).⁷ This narrative originated in the
30
31 middle of the nineteenth century, when commentators like the Rev Dr Thomas Chalmers
32
33 popularised the conclusion that the urban working class was alienated from religion.⁸ The national
34
35 Census of Worship of 1851 seemed to confirm this by revealing what was considered a shocking lack
36
37 of Sunday attendance in Anglican churches - and particularly in manufacturing towns. Scholars have
38
39 related this decline to working hours in industrial settings, competing calls from more secular
40
41 pursuits, and a growing openness to scientific and rational thinking which de-emphasised the
42
43 centrality of religion.⁹ It certainly signalled a great level of concern among contemporaries about the
44
45 atomization of interpersonal ties, the weakening of moral values and family bonds, and a threat to
46
47 social stability. More recent scholars have started to debate what measuring 'bums on seats' in
48
49 churches up and down the land can really reveal about religious identity, and to point out the
50
51 relative vibrancy of several of the Non-Conforming religious sects. In fact in a reworking of the
52
53 official statistics Brown has found that 1851 was something of a *high* point of religious attendance,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and that 'discursive Christianity' in the sense of engrained culture, remained high right up to the
4
5 1950s.¹⁰ Much less is known about the ways that such 'discursive' religious feeling operated in terms
6
7 of inter-personal and intra-communal networks, and particularly where non-Anglican communities
8
9 are concerned.

10
11
12 Histories of the Jews have, however, paid little attention to the relationship between religion and
13
14 the types of wider socio-economic and cultural changes noted above. Instead, they have tended to
15
16 focus on assimilation and acculturation; essentially asking whether and how far Jews blended in to
17
18 British life in this period.¹¹ Yet Judaism offers a particularly interesting lens through which to
19
20 examine the nature of religious ties under industrial conditions, for several reasons. First, Judaism is
21
22 fairly unique, certainly for nineteenth-century Britain, for providing cultural, ethnic and religious
23
24 identity all at once.¹² This raises the possibility that cultural bonds based on shared religion might
25
26 still shape family and communal life even in the absence of religious belief or attendance at
27
28 synagogue (which was revealed to be nothing particularly impressive in the Census of Worship either
29
30 – in the words of one scholar, 'What united most Jews was the synagogue they did not attend'¹³).
31
32
33 Endelman has made this observation for European and British Jewry in the later nineteenth century
34
35 even amid extensive business relations with non Jews. Significantly, he characterises their bonds as
36
37 being more secular in nature than religious: it was cultural solidarity which preserved communal
38
39 identity; 'symbolic ethnicity' rather than 'thick' culture.¹⁴ These tendencies may have been
40
41 strengthened by the self-contained nature of Jewish religious life: its members are non-evangelising;
42
43 religious identity is passed by blood through the maternal line (making endogamy very important);
44
45 and it requires a critical mass of population living in close proximity to allow for quorate worship (a
46
47 minimum of ten men over the age of 13) and the provision of kosher food, ritual baths and ministers
48
49 to carry out circumcision, marriages and so on. Bonds between Jews may thus have several levels of
50
51 closeness and functionality, which provides us with a new perspective from which to test the impact
52
53 of industrial urban life on family and household.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Second, the Jews of mid-nineteenth century Britain were, as Williams observed in his seminal study
4 of Manchester Jewry, a people of two halves.¹⁵ On the one hand they contained a large body of
5 recent immigrants, mainly from Germany, Poland, and the Netherlands, who retained some of the
6 language and cultural preferences of their homelands. On the other, was a core group of families
7 (comprising around 70 per cent of the late nineteenth-century Jewish population) who had been in
8 Britain for several generations, spoke English, had adopted British dress, and were to many intents
9 and purposes, well acculturated. It is worth noting that, unlike many of their Continental
10 counterparts, Jews in Britain faced relatively few obstacles to full acculturation if they desired it;
11 they need not intellectually reject their religion to 'blend in'.¹⁶ In essence, legally they were treated
12 much like the Non-Conforming sects rather than a completely foreign religion, and perhaps more
13 favourably than Catholics. Even cultural prejudice seems to have been tempered by a recognition
14 that some of the Jews' 'undesirable' characteristics had been caused by itinerancy brought about by
15 persecution rather than inherent racial weakness.¹⁷ The implications of this situation are that while
16 community ties could have operated at several different levels, especially in the industrialising towns
17 where the presence of immigrants was high, there should have been relatively little external
18 pressure influencing how and where Jews lived at this time.¹⁸

19
20 And third, is the very high level of mobility among Anglo-Jewry at this time, and especially in the
21 present context, their increasing tendency to settle in the large provincial manufacturing towns by
22 the middle of the nineteenth century. This was particularly pronounced among European
23 immigrants, although there was also an acceleration in domestic migration to the new towns, both
24 from London and from other provincial centres. As we will see, Liverpool was for the whole of our
25 period the largest such settlement, but the communities in Manchester and Birmingham were also
26 expanding rapidly, while Hull and Leeds had central roles to play in a chain of migration from the
27 east coast of England to the west. The manufacturing towns of Sheffield and Glasgow had smaller
28 populations but were to expand enormously in subsequent decades. Alongside this, however, we
29 should consider the atypical nature of Jewish participation in the secondary (manufacturing) sector,

1
2
3 where they clustered in the creation of traditional consumer goods.¹⁹ Jews were participants in
4 urban industrial life (as consumers, and also as financiers), but *not* directly in its economic
5 underpinnings. In Rubinstein's words, 'in general, Jews stood at the fringes of the Industrial
6 Revolution'.²⁰ Again, this offers a unique perspective from which to test the dual threads of religious
7 affiliation and industrial life.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 In total, these attributes mean that in mid-nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewry we have a self-bounded
15 religion with strong intra-communal ties based on shared culture and language as well as religious
16 belief – which itself brought exclusive and inward-looking requirements. At the same time, however,
17 we have high levels of domestic and international immigration into the large manufacturing cities.
18 While it is of course impossible to be very definite about the strength of religious practice at this
19 time, most historians of Anglo-Jewry have categorised the mid-century cohorts as culturally attached
20 to their religion while being flexible in the details of its practice.²¹ At the same time, the Jews were
21 anxious to remain inoffensive and low profile as far as society at large was concerned; a legacy of
22 their history of persecution, and the fact that there had never been a formal agreement to
23 accompany their readmission under Oliver Cromwell.²² Keen to acculturate but also to retain their
24 cultural and religious identity; participating in wealth generation but via trade, banking and semi-
25 skilled manufacture rather than tertiary industry and service; and counting a large proportion of
26 people born overseas, the Jews occupy a unique point on the nexus of industrial change and
27 religious affiliation.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Methodology

49
50 The analysis which follows is based on an enriched version of the publicly available Anglo-Jewish
51 Database (AJDB).²³ Demographic studies of religious communities in Britain are usually hampered by
52 the fact that there are no national sources of individual-level information on religious affiliation prior
53 to the modern period. The Jews in the AJDB have been identified via local community studies, trade
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 directories, insurance documents and immigration records, and cross-matched to the 1851 Census.²⁴

4
5 The definition of a Jew was kept deliberately broad: anyone born Jewish, who converted to Judaism,
6
7 'or were likely in their own lifetimes either to have considered themselves, or to have been
8
9 considered by others, to be Jewish.'²⁵ This is useful for the current study because it allows us to
10
11 capture people who might not have attended synagogue regularly – or at all – but who might still
12
13 identify with Judaism sufficiently to utilise its functional ties in setting up home or finding lodgings.
14
15 The 1851 census is also particularly well suited to this project because it fell at a time when the
16
17 Jewish community was well-settled and expanding, but had not yet begun the population explosion
18
19 which occurred with unprecedented numbers of newcomers in the 1880s. The process of
20
21 industrialisation was also well underway, and the towns selected for focus were all fairly substantial
22
23 urban centres, providing a range of employment opportunities and socio-economic conditions; all
24
25 vital for testing the relationships outlined above.
26
27

28
29 The AJDB was further enriched for the current study by placing individuals from the seven towns
30
31 back in their 1851 households of residence, along with any additional servants, lodgers, visitors or
32
33 landlords (including non-Jews, who were naturally not included in the AJDB).²⁶ All of the
34
35 relationships between household members were also noted, to allow the internal structure and ties
36
37 to be recreated. This permitted the calculation of household sizes and forms. The numbers involved
38
39 can be seen in Table 1 below.
40
41
42
43
44

45 **The Jews of provincial Britain**

46
47 The first half of the nineteenth century was a period of continuous and high levels of immigration of
48
49 Jews from Central and Eastern Europe into Britain: the Anglo-Jewish population increased by more
50
51 than 2500 per cent between 1700 and 1830, and the larger part of this growth was from in-
52
53 migration. Estimates suggest that there were perhaps 150 immigrants per year between 1750 and
54
55 1815, and levels continued high after that point as well, when larger number started to arrive from
56
57

Poland and other Eastern European states.²⁷ For the first time, following employment opportunities and the informal networks already set up by itinerant pedlars, the Jewish population started to expand out from London and the other established settlements in southern port and county towns to form notable clusters in manufacturing cities in the north and midlands.²⁸ These numbers were then further boosted by the growing inflow of central and eastern European Jewry arriving at the north-eastern ports of Hull and Sunderland.²⁹ Liverpool was the largest provincial centre but Manchester and Birmingham also had growing Jewish communities, and several other towns contained small but increasingly well-rooted communities who had founded small synagogues and cemeteries, and attracted kosher butchers and slaughterers. The total Anglo-Jewish population around mid-century has been estimated by several scholars at between 30 to 35,000, with approximately 60 per cent resident in London.³⁰ Jews represented around one per thousand of the total population, and 20 to 30 per cent of them were born overseas.³¹

The totals in the AJDB are broadly in line with these estimates, comprising 29,230 individuals or 90 per cent of the estimated total Jewish population.³² The exception is Liverpool, where the numbers in the AJDB fall markedly short of those suggested by other sources (around 850 individuals, compared with a projected 1300 to 2500).³³ It is currently uncertain whether this represents a correction to the impression that the community in Liverpool was growing around mid-century, or whether there is persistent under-identification of Jews in that town. Analysis of the census data does show that the Liverpool community was quite different in several respects from the other sampled communities (in particular in its higher indicators of wealth and household size) but it is not yet possible to be more definitive on whether it captures the true extent of Judaism in that town. However, there are no structural reasons why Jews would have been under-identified there compared with other locations.

Table 1 presents the totals extracted from the AJDB for the current investigation. The sample represents 12.3 per cent of the total population in the AJDB, or 56.2 per cent of the non-London

population. The remainder of the non-metropolitan population was principally in older centres like Plymouth, Portsmouth and Bristol.

[TABLE 1 AROUND HERE]

It is clear that these burgeoning industrial cities had Jewish populations of very different sizes: from only a little over 100 individuals and 25 to 30 households in Glasgow, Sheffield and Leeds – where the highest levels of Jewish immigration were to come later – to 800 and above in Liverpool, Manchester and Birmingham, comprising 159-279 households. Hull also had quite a sizeable Jewish community, reflecting its importance as a key entry point to Britain from Eastern and Central Europe. The number of Jewish households there suggests that people were not simply passing through, however. Some were attracted, no doubt, by the possibilities a port town offered for hawking and selling – common Jewish occupations for new arrivals – as well as those in trade and currency exchange for the better off. Others likely simply ran out of money and settled where they disembarked.

Households and extended kin

What form, then, did these Jewish households take? This is where we must commit to some form of classification; an exercise which has recently been described as useful for comparative purposes but, also bringing risks of transforming household studies into ‘an arid cartographical exercise’.³⁴ In particular, recent critics have stressed that the use of impermeable classes perpetuate simplistic assumptions about location and change over time. The current study thus employed several modifications to the classic scheme devised by Peter Laslett and Richard Wall in order to address some of these concerns.³⁵ In particular, a specific measure has been introduced to capture whether servants or other non kin were present (in Laslett’s scheme any of the major classes could be

extended by servants but this was not bedded into the classification), and the term 'composite' has been used in place of the traditional 'extended' label. This is in recognition of the fact that 'nuclear' families could in fact be much more expansive (or 'extended') than was acknowledged in earlier work on demography and household structure. The analysis which follows will demonstrate how these different emphases allow us to be more subtle in our interpretation of household patterns.

'Nuclearity' may be a problematic concept when applied too rigidly, but it remains a useful starting point. The Jewish households in the seven sampled towns certainly shared the tendency towards nuclearity which has been consistently observed for Britain.³⁶ A fifth or more of households were nuclear in its strictest form, that is consisting only of parent/s and child/ren. In Leeds this reached a quarter of the total. However, things become more interesting if we expand the view to include nuclear families plus all non-relative/s (servants, visitors, lodgers). This produces a higher total of 56.7 per cent of households in Manchester to 71.3 per cent in Liverpool, with a mean average of 62.4; a little under figures for British communities, which usually show in excess of 70 per cent of households in nuclear form.³⁷ On the whole, then, Jewish households consisted of a small and nuclear core, but they often shared living space with people who might not have been related to them. Whether we can regard this as a more flexible and expansive notion of nuclearity in relation to either 'family' or 'household' as Tadmor suggests, is open to debate, but it certainly shows, first that co residence with other kin was not terribly common in the settled Jewish urban populations, but second, that this did not necessarily mean that living spaces were not shared with other people. Hull, in contrast, had a relatively large proportion of co-resident individuals who were not related to each other; a pattern to which we will return in the context of lodging.

Criticisms have also been made recently of the helpfulness of the term 'extended' when it comes to conceptions of households which would have made sense to contemporaries. In Laslett's scheme a household becomes extended when it contains family members beyond the nuclear core, yet Tadmor in particular, has suggested that many of these extensions should be regarded as part of the

more expansive definition of a nuclear family.³⁸ This suggestion would temper our impression that extended forms were relatively less common in Britain than nuclear ones, albeit more familiar at certain points in the family life cycle. Again, the Jewish households do conform to the traditional impression. 'Extended' households were not particularly common at all across the entire dataset (a maximum of 3.8 per cent, which was found in Liverpool). If, however, we expand the remit to households with *non-kin* alongside 'extended kin' (that is, taking in some of the 'composite' classes in the current classification – see the Appendix) we reach totals varying from 25.2 per cent of all households in Liverpool, to an outlying 5.9 per cent in Sheffield. The most general experience was from 15 to 25 per cent. This is notably higher than the figure found for non-industrial communities in 1851 (analysis by Laslett showed that between 11 and 17 per cent of households were extended), although it is broadly in line with the urban samples examined by Anderson and Armstrong, both of which revealed an upper end of 20 to 23 per cent.³⁹ The Jewish population thus show a tendency to live in extended *households* in urban settings, but ones most likely containing non kin as well as members of the wider family. This further rejects the suggestion that urbanisation bred smaller families or weaker family ties.⁴⁰ However, the data also point to the range of people theoretically found in these households, pointing to the potential usefulness of the term 'composite', rather than the narrower 'extended'.

Who, though, were these other family members? Although one did not need to be co-resident to provide assistance, the presence of wider kin is often taken as a measure of functional support, demographic conditions permitting. This is particularly pertinent in the current setting, as kin were often a vital way for new arrivals to adjust to the conditions of urban industrial life. The proportion of people in the seven sample towns who were born overseas was even higher than that for the AJDB as a whole, at 39 per cent, making the presence of kin a potentially very important source of accommodation and assistance. The data on co-resident kin therefore hints at the extent to which families provided deep and functional solidarity and support – and thus also, potentially, to support religious cohesion. This was particularly important given that alternative sources of support in the

form of the Poor Law, or non-Jewish charities, would likely be unable to cater for the important Jewish demands for special foods and modes of worship.

Table 2 shows the number of times relatives of each type appeared in Jewish households in the four largest communities in the study (there were not enough households in each of these groups in Leeds, Sheffield and Glasgow to permit meaningful analysis). Some households contained more than one type of relative, and all relationships are to the household head.

[TABLE 2]

It is evident that Jewish households contained a wide range of relatives by blood and marriage, consisting both of vertical ties (a generation above and below the head), and lateral ones (brothers and sisters and their offspring). Overall, the most common co-resident relatives were nieces, followed by nephews and sisters. This is very similar to the pattern Anderson found for Preston, although nieces and nephews are more prominent in the Jewish sample. Grandchildren, on the other hand (with or without parents) were notably less common in the Jewish sample than they were in Preston, where they formed 24 per cent of all extended co-resident relatives.⁴¹ In some cases the Jewish nieces, nephews and sisters were a complete family, but in others, children were living with their aunts and uncles without their own parents (and to an extent which they were apparently not doing with grandparents, perhaps pointing to the greater capacity of households headed by working-age adults to expand and accommodate young kin). In Liverpool, for example, two out of ten nieces had their mothers with them, and one had a father, two were without parents but with a brother, and five were without any members of their own nuclear family. Most were aged 10 or under, and only two were over 18. In Birmingham too, the majority of co-resident nieces were without parents, and most were under 14. Several of the younger girls were recorded as scholars on the census form, but 14 year old Julia Olsher was described as a shop assistant, and 21 year old Elizabeth Davis as a companion. Few have information on their own parents recorded in the AJDB, although we know that Elizabeth's father was widowed and living in Birmingham too. It seems likely

1
2
3 that she had left his house to take up a useful, albeit possibly unpaid, position in the house of a close
4 family member. All bar one of the nieces with information on birthplace were British. Finally, it is
5 worth noting that more of the nieces were on the maternal side of the household; that is, related by
6 blood to the head's wife. This is in line with Anderson's finding for Preston, that aid was more often
7 given matrilineally.⁴²

8
9
10
11
12
13
14 The presence of nieces, nephews and grandchildren in these households do not entirely uphold the
15 framework of 'calculative reciprocity' devised by Anderson to explain patterns of co-residence in
16 Preston. Some of the lone children he found in his sample were, he suggested, illegitimate, others
17 were orphaned or left by parents who had remarried or migrated elsewhere. Some had left the
18 family home to relieve overcrowding (sometimes partially supported by the Poor Law), or to help
19 relatives as an alternative to paid labour.⁴³ Few of these suggestions seem to apply so
20 straightforwardly in the Jewish case. The census data suggest that illegitimacy was fairly rare among
21 nineteenth-century Jewry, and few Jews seem to have entered into the sort of relationship with the
22 Poor Law which Anderson identifies for Preston (although more work needs to be done in this
23 area).⁴⁴ It was relatively rare for children to live with elderly grandparents and so potentially provide
24 aid to them, and most were too young to contribute very much to the household (many, we have
25 seen, were described as scholars). Moreover, many were with a parent, which in Anderson's terms
26 was a less promising extension of the nuclear family in terms of costs and benefits, although it may
27 have freed the parent up to earn money and thus contribute to the household.

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 These patterns suggest that Jewish families acted in less instrumental ways than other parts of the
45 industrial population when it came to household formation, perhaps because they participated little
46 in the manufacturing sector with its relatively high wages; perhaps because they had few other
47 welfare options to turn to. It is also possible that what we are seeing here is evidence of one of
48 Tadmor's other criticisms of work on households: the tendency to see instrumentalism and affection
49 as binary opposites⁴⁵ Perhaps Jews moved in together because it was an accepted part of family duty

1
2
3 or cultural expectation; ideally this would at least retain the economic viability of the household, if
4
5 not improve it. It was certainly an accepted trope that Jews looked after their own, and this does
6
7 seem to be what we are seeing at the household level.⁴⁶
8
9

10 We may test this further for the elderly. Here, Ruggles' study of American households from the mid-
11
12 nineteenth century onwards has challenged the received wisdom on instrumentalism vs welfare, but
13
14 in the opposite direction than that usually supposed.⁴⁷ Rather than depending on their grown
15
16 children for housing, he says, it was the older generation who held the cards, with the younger
17
18 reliant on them for inheritance and marriage prospects. Further, when the two generations did co-
19
20 reside (which was common: only 11 per cent of his sample lived alone or with their spouse), the
21
22 poor and sick (the traditional recipients of house-room) were *less* likely to live with their grown
23
24 children, which he speculates is because they had less to offer.⁴⁸ It is worth noting that his model
25
26 relates specifically to agricultural communities, and that he sees the transition to waged labour – the
27
28 conditions we see in the AJDB population - as disrupting older patterns. Nonetheless, it is an
29
30 instructive suggestion that we should probe the nature of the relationships between the generations
31
32 more closely when it comes to co-residence, dependency and mutual interdependence.
33
34
35

36 The older generation of Jews was not very likely to move in with their grown children, though
37
38 mothers were more frequent co-residents than fathers (a not uncommon pattern in other samples
39
40 too). They were more prominent (relatively speaking) among families in Birmingham than
41
42 elsewhere, but there was little difference in the likelihood of these older parents living with either
43
44 their son or daughter. Most of the co-resident parents in Birmingham were widowed, although in a
45
46 couple of cases they were described in the census as married, albeit with no sign of their husband.⁴⁹
47
48 In two cases widowed mothers were living with widowed daughters, a very definite suggestion of
49
50 mutually functional support: 46 year old Esther Harriss formed a household with her 26 year old
51
52 daughter Rachel, and widowed shopkeeper Sarah Isaacs (aged 41) was living with 24 year old
53
54 daughter Julia, who had no occupation listed. A similar male household can be found in Manchester,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 where 66 year old Baer Kantrovitz, retired Hebrew minister, was living with his son Jacob, Reader to
4 the Old Hebrew Congregation, together with a Jewish lodger and a servant.⁵⁰ Esther Harriss and
5 Sarah Isaacs were unusually young among co-resident mothers living with grown children; the
6 remainder ranged from 50 to 77, with four out of nine in total over the age of 60. A rare but
7 particularly interesting example of an elderly co-resident father is 85 year old Simeon Cohen, a
8 widower, who lived in Manchester with his widowed daughter, Amelia Franks, and the household
9 head, widowed grandson Abraham Franks, aged 45. Also present were another six grown siblings of
10 Abraham's, ranging in age from 12 to 27, and including two who were opticians. Although Abraham
11 was the only one of the brothers who seems to have married, this is the closest to the traditional
12 frerèche household that we have in our sample.⁵¹

13
14 It seems, then, that urban Jews were not particularly likely to share accommodation with elderly
15 parents. This is partly because, as Ruggles observed, there were, demographically speaking,
16 relatively few elderly compared to the pool of sons and daughters. Another factor is employment:
17 most of the older generation were recorded with an occupation and living as heads of their own
18 households. In Jewish Manchester, Birmingham and Liverpool between 40 and 47 per cent of the
19 over 60s were household heads (and others were spouses of heads).⁵² Fully two thirds had an
20 occupation listed in Birmingham, over half in Manchester and just over a third in Liverpool. In fact
21 the two oldest people in the Manchester sample were both heads of their households, while all but
22 one of the elderly household heads in Birmingham had an occupation given (occasionally these
23 indicated that they were retired). Many of them had (or had had) fairly high status jobs too: agents,
24 merchants and warehousemen, as well as those in the clothing sector, all of which may have been
25 better suited to work in older age than jobs in more mechanised parts of the economy.⁵³ Moreover –
26 *per* Ruggles - these people were frequently affording house-room to relatives themselves. It may be
27 splitting hairs to suggest that this was so very different from moving in with a son or daughter; the
28 title of household head may in some cases have been a mark of respect by the census enumerator.
29 Nonetheless, it is notable that so many of the older generation were pooling resources with their

sons or daughters. However, it is equally notable that so many seem to have remained independent, at least in terms of housing arrangements.

The evidence for urban Jews thus suggests quite strongly that the binaries of nuclear/extended and instrumental/affection are not a useful way to think about household patterns. While the majority of Jews did live with nuclear family in the strictest sense of the word, it was very common also to accommodate servants, lodgers, visitors, and a variety of other relatives. On current evidence, there is also little evidence for the 'kinship system weak on trust' and 'strong on calculativeness' which Anderson saw so clearly for mid-century Preston.⁵⁴ Instead, the evidence points to the importance of a combination of mutual assistance, cultural expectations and compassion for family members in need. The findings do, however, agree with Anderson's assessment that very few people lived entirely separately from kin; only one to four per cent of Jews lived alone in 1851, and they may well still have had kin nearby.⁵⁵ Whatever the potential disruption of urban life, it seems not to have weakened kinship ties among Jews. We turn next to see how far Jewish families acted positively to aid the cohesion of the wider community via their role in housing non-kin: lodgers and servants.

Lodgers and employees

Widening the net to include non-kin is another way of examining the nature of ties within the Jewish community. For example, a high incidence of Jewish lodgers and servants will support the existence of functional ties which assisted adaptation and integration on the one hand, and an inward-looking concern to preserve a Jewish identity on the other. The alternative would reveal different networks and priorities at work, or other constraints in supply or demand.

Lodging has not received the attention that other aspects of demography at the household level have – Laslett's early studies overlooked the importance of lodgers, who were regarded as 'inmates' of the 'houseful' (the total living space) but not members of the household or family, while the

census enumerators in 1851 were inclined to record lodgers as separate households.⁵⁶ However, a growing number of studies have pointed to lodging in private dwellings as a vital means for lone individuals, particularly migrants, to integrate into a new setting; acting, in fact, as a sort of pseudo family.⁵⁷ Modell and Hareven, for example, found in their study of several nineteenth-century American towns, that lodgers frequently found house-room with people from the same location or same occupation as themselves – thus building on common bonds and sharing vital knowledge about jobs. Furthermore, they discovered that young lodgers often literally took the place of a recently-departed grown son, enabling host families to maximise their income using the space in their home.⁵⁸ Meek has recently found a similar situation for late nineteenth-century Scotland, pointing to Russian Jewish immigrants as an example of a tightly-bound community when it came to lodging.⁵⁹

The enriched AJDB identifies lodgers who were Jews, and the households where they lived. Any non-Jewish lodgers in the Jewish households were also recorded. It is immediately clear that lodgers were particularly likely to have been born abroad and were thus classic candidates for people in need of networks to help them bed into their new setting: 77 per cent were international migrants compared with 39 per cent of the whole Jewish population of the seven towns (86 per cent if we exclude Glasgow which was an outlier with only a fifth of its lodgers born overseas). The most common place of birth in all towns apart from Glasgow was Poland (most notably in Leeds), followed by Germany, while Russian Jews were a notable presence in Liverpool, but not elsewhere. Liverpool and Glasgow also had an elevated presence of London-born lodgers, perhaps representing the outward spread of certain trades from the capital. Many of the foreign-born lodgers would still have spoken German, Yiddish or Polish, although generally speaking they were quick to adopt English as part of their daily lives. Some hailed from urban locations and so did not have quite the culture shock of a previously rural dweller, but in other places Jews were specifically barred from living in towns and had limitations on the trades they could follow.⁶⁰ In any of these cases, the individuals concerned needed to find somewhere to live on arriving in their new town, and lodging in Jewish

1
2
3 households was a good way to combine shared cultural roots with practical considerations like the
4
5 ability to meet potential marriage and business partners, and to find jobs which could accommodate
6
7 the requirement for the more observant to down tools at sunset on Friday and have Saturdays off.
8
9 The incidence and spatial patterning of lodgers thus has something very significant to tell us about
10
11 the ways that newcomers were integrated into the community and how actively beneficial those ties
12
13 of Judaism were.
14
15

16 Lodgers were found in ten to twenty per cent of Jewish households in the three largest communities
17
18 (8.8 in Liverpool, 11.0 in Birmingham and 20.8 in Manchester). They were concentrated in
19
20 households with no other kin present suggesting that families were unlikely to have the room both
21
22 for extended kin and for paying boarders, although they likely brought different costs and benefits
23
24 for the family. A lodger brought cash into the household, but on the other hand kin might be more
25
26 likely to offer domestic services like childcare and to make a long-term investment in the household
27
28 – as well, of course, as bonds of affection and support. Rather than the ‘empty-nesters’ identified by
29
30 Modell and Hareven, however, the heads who took in lodgers tended to have young children at
31
32 home, and were themselves slightly younger than the average.⁶¹ Both suggest that taking in
33
34 lodgers was something one did at a slightly earlier stage of the life course (the heads who employed
35
36 servants, in contrast, were a few years older than the mean, and they also had larger numbers of
37
38 children than the average. This is perhaps unsurprising given that children brought more work and
39
40 the potential for specific nursing staff. It also, however, suggests a certain level of wealth, which may
41
42 be another way in which some of the servant-keeping households can be distinguished from those
43
44 hosting lodgers .)
45
46

47
48 The picture is quite different if we examine the frequency of lodging from a population point of view,
49
50 rather than a household one (Table 3). Here we find that while only around five percent of Jews
51
52 were in lodgings in Liverpool and Glasgow, this reached over 15 per cent in Hull (where there were
53
54 many people living in houses where they were not related to anyone else), and fully a third of the
55
56
57
58
59
60

whole community in Leeds. This suggests that lodgers were concentrated in individual households in different ways. Over 85 per cent of all lodgers were men in all the towns except Glasgow, where only five Jewish lodgers have been identified.

[TABLE 3 AROUND HERE]

The lodgers in the database were also relatively young: an average across all seven towns of 28.8 years (minimum 24 in Sheffield, maximum 35 in Glasgow). However, this is skewed somewhat by a small proportion of lodgers in Liverpool, Birmingham, Leeds and Manchester who were under the age of ten. Some were children boarding with their parents; a few others in Manchester were scholars at a small boarding establishment. At the other end of the age range there were a few elderly lodgers, possibly lodging because they lacked kin willing to take them in: three in both Manchester and Birmingham were over 70, half of whom had an occupation listed. All were single or widowed. In Sheffield, Glasgow and Hull, meanwhile, there were no lodgers over the age of 55. If we remove the outliers at either end of the age spectrum from the analysis, the average age rises slightly to 29.1 years; firmly in the age range of young working life, and also the age range at which immigrants were most prominent.

Lodgers most often found themselves in households with no other paying members, again suggesting that this was a way for a family to make a little extra money in their existing space. It also by extension meant that a large number were single: more than 80 per cent of the lodgers in all the larger towns.⁶² In Liverpool, and most particularly in Manchester, however, a sizeable number of lodgers were one of two or more. Some of these were couples or even families, like Jacob and Mary Bloom, who were lodging in 1851 with their two year old daughter in the home of Sarah and King Shinefeld and two other lodgers in Fernie Street, Manchester; or Abraham and Marley Morris who lodged with their three children with Simon and Rosa Morris and *their* three children in Verdon Street, also Manchester. Two other lodgers with different surnames completed the household. The foreign (German) birthplaces and young ages of all of the Morris children suggest that both families

1
2
3 – quite possibly relations given their shared surname – had immigrated to Britain only a handful of
4
5 years before 1851. This may well, therefore, have been a case of the classic ‘chain’ migration, where
6
7 migrants followed family members and friends to places where they had already established
8
9 themselves – and in the process temporarily creating a composite or extended household.⁶³ It
10
11 certainly supports the idea that lodging was a vital way to start putting down roots in a new place.
12
13 No further information is available in the AJDB on either of the two lodging families to indicate
14
15 whether they were still in Manchester in 1861, or whether they had moved on.
16
17

18 The data also show the same marked tendency to occupational and national clustering among
19
20 lodgers which is a feature of several other studies for this period. Altogether 44 household heads
21
22 had three or more lodgers in Manchester. The largest were headed by the Portuges and Levi families
23
24 respectively, neither of which were identified as lodging houses on the census form, although they
25
26 certainly look like them. Aaron Portuges, a 29 year old hawker of jewellery, and another resident of
27
28 Verdon Street, shared his house with his 22 year old wife, Risel, their three young daughters, and
29
30 seven lodgers, all Jewish, one of whom was also a hawker of jewellery. Four of the lodgers had the
31
32 surname Cohen; a common Jewish name, and not necessarily an indicator of kinship, although one
33
34 pair was a widowed mother with her ten year old daughter. Three of the lodgers were cap makers.
35
36 This potentially complex household was therefore bound together internally by at least one tie of
37
38 kinship, and several of occupation. Moreover, all of the household members were born in Poland
39
40 except for one lodger, who was another hawker of jewellery. Every member thus had at least one tie
41
42 in common with at least some of the others.
43
44

45
46 The Levi household was similarly composed: Abraham and Minna Levi were slightly older (53 and 40)
47
48 than the Portuges’, and the elder of their five children were in their late teens although the younger
49
50 three were aged 2, 6 and 8. They also kept a servant, and had seven lodgers living with them, all
51
52 Jewish, and including three named Rosenthall, who look like a couple, plus the husband’s brother.
53
54 Again, there are evident ties of fellowship in common: Abraham Levi was a tailor, as were two of the
55
56
57
58
59
60

lodgers, and all the members of the household were born in Poland including the two youngest children – making them (like the Morrisises) likely to have been recent immigrants.

There is evidence for common ties in some of the smaller establishments too. The household of Samuel and Charlotte Hadida displayed a distinctive type of network– and one which was quite unusual for provincial Anglo-Jewry: that of the Sephardic Jewish tradition. Samuel was born in Gibraltar, and his three lodgers hailed from Istanbul and Morocco; also Sephardi areas (one of the lodgers was affiliated to the Sephardi Bevis Marks Synagogue in London). Furthermore, Samuel and two of his lodgers were merchants. While the Sephardi practice is based on the same precepts as the north/eastern European Ashkenazi one, it has many subtle differences of tradition and pronunciation which could make worship in the Ashkenazi synagogue appear quite alien.⁶⁴ More traditional ties can be seen within the household of King Shinefeld, whom we met earlier: four of five lodgers were hawkers of pencils although their landlord and his son were both shoemakers. Here the national backgrounds were more mixed: Hungary, Poland and Belgium.

There were also Jewish establishments which were specifically described as lodging houses in the census: eight in Manchester, for example, and all except one run by women (the other was run by a married couple). This supports the suggestion made elsewhere that keeping a lodging house was an acceptable – perhaps vital - occupation for women, and particularly women with no husband present.⁶⁵ Two of the seven female lodging house-keepers in Jewish Manchester were widowed, and another was single. Several of the others were described as married (or were imputed to be so from other evidence), but had no partner at home on census night. Furthermore, in two out of three cases where both halves of the couple was present, it was the woman who was described as the lodging house keeper. The ages of these women ranged from Ann Levy, at 28, who kept a house of 11 lodgers, to 54 year old Sarah Abrams, living with her daughter, a servant and one lodger.

Even the more formal lodging houses were quite varied in form, housing between zero and six lodgers on census night. While Ann Levy, who ran a house composed entirely of lodgers with no live-

1
2
3 in servants or relatives, could be regarded as a professional lodging-house-keeper, widowed Fanny
4
5 Selig seems to have been putting together more of a makeshift arrangement of just a handful of
6
7 lodgers to support a large family which included her mother as well as five children. Only one of
8
9 Ann's lodgers was Jewish, however, and there are few obvious common bonds within her
10
11 household. Fanny Selig's two lodgers had more in common with each other: both were merchants
12
13 and both from the Ukraine (Fanny herself was born in Liverpool but was living in Manchester by the
14
15 1840s, and her children were born there). There were no obvious links between lodgers and/or
16
17 householders in the house run by Sarah Abrams either. We must assume that these lodgers found
18
19 their landladies via other means: a more generalised grapevine, advertisements or other
20
21 intermediaries.⁶⁶ However, in most of the houses examined here, shared religion was clearly a
22
23 factor, even if we can only speculate on its nature or importance. A key attraction may have been
24
25 the ability to observe kashrut (or at least the avoidance of truly taboo foodstuffs like pork and
26
27 bacon) if landladies were providing food, or even just cooking the food provided by their lodgers.⁶⁷ In
28
29 other cases shared language could have been an attraction, or simply the knowledge that there was
30
31 a common understanding of inherited culture.
32
33

34
35 Not all Jews in need of lodgings sought out co-religionists, however, whether by choice or exigency.
36
37 This was rarest in Liverpool, where ten out of thirteen households containing Jewish lodgers were
38
39 also Jewish. In Hull, however, the figure was only eleven of thirty two, and in Leeds, two of thirteen.
40
41 Yet, a little unpacking reveals evidence of Jewish networks in these cases too. In Leeds, for example,
42
43 only 4 out of the 42 Jewish lodgers lodged with household heads who were also Jewish, but there is
44
45 clear evidence of Jewish lodgers sticking together. St John's Square in Leeds housed two
46
47 establishments accommodating a total of 19 Jewish lodgers. Ten lived at number 7, with a non-
48
49 Jewish family. All were hawkers except for one who was a glazier; all occupations traditionally
50
51 associated with lower-class Jews. A further nine resided at number 8, with William and Mary Rea,
52
53 their three grandchildren, a servant, and three other non-Jewish lodgers. The size of both
54
55 establishments suggests that they were lodging houses – the Reas were described as housekeepers
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which could denote this too. Their Jewish lodgers were again, all hawkers, apart from one who was a
4 watch-maker. We cannot assume, therefore, that shared religious practice and identity were
5 unimportant for these people. The concentration of so many Jewish hawkers in two houses in Leeds,
6
7 does point to there being a focus for Jewish rituals or fellowship in this town, as well, perhaps as a
8
9 good base for sourcing the sorts of items they sold. The fact that they were geographically so close
10
11 together further supports this. In total 35 of 40 lodgers with an occupation given in the census in
12
13 Leeds were either hawkers or dealers, and itineracy was a commonly-noted feature of Jewish life at
14
15 this end of the social spectrum. Laidlaw notes the concentration of gangs of itinerant Jewish workers
16
17 in lodgings in Birmingham, Merthyr Tydfil and Newcastle too.⁶⁸
18
19

20
21
22 We should also note that lodging was not inconsistent with family ties; another signal of the fluidity
23
24 of household forms and the relationships within them. We have already come across several lodgers
25
26 sharing a surname with their landlords, and there was probably a fine line between lodging and the
27
28 creation of a composite or extended household-family (in fact it may simply relate to way the census
29
30 enumerator chose to record household relationships). In other cases lodgers clearly sought
31
32 accommodation as a family unit, albeit often truncated or broken ones. The household at 16a Bridge
33
34 Street in Leeds, for example, included what looks like an uncle and nephew named Jacob and Isaac
35
36 Solomon (both dealers, like the other three male lodgers present), together with a one-year old child
37
38 who seems to be Jacob's son. Two of the other lodgers were a pair of brothers, Louis and Abraham
39
40 Lesser. Lodging could thus be a way to support fragmented families as well as solitaires and nuclear
41
42 units, perhaps while sending money back home.⁶⁹ Similar tales of Jewish lodgers clustering together
43
44 in non-Jewish houses can be found in the other towns, too, often sharing nationality and /or
45
46 occupation. While only Sheffield shared the high profile of dealers and hawkers among Jewish
47
48 lodgers, the other typical, low-paid Jewish occupation of glazier was common in Liverpool and
49
50 Birmingham.⁷⁰
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The foreign birth of so many of the Jewish lodgers inevitably directs our attention to boarding as a way of integrating into a new setting. Certainly it outweighs much use of lodging by locally born newlyweds, or non-immigrants lacking in kin, as Anderson found in Preston – or its instrumental use as an alternative to the negative demands of living with family (with the possible exception of some of the elderly cases noted above). This is borne out in the slightly lower proportion of households with lodgers among the Jews than in several provincial towns: in Meek's Govan sample around a quarter of working-class homes contained lodgers throughout the period 1861 to 1911, and earlier studies for this period showed broadly similar patterns.⁷¹ Jewish households were also more likely to contain only one lodger, and Jews were less often found in large lodging houses than the population at large; a reflection of their low density in the population, but also perhaps, a reluctance to use non-Jewish establishments.⁷² Yet we can still see the same functions of the lodging relationship at work: living with another family or in a lodging house was a vital way to adapt, save money, find work, and in the current case, put down roots in a religio-cultural community. In this static snapshot it is impossible to comment on how rapidly the Jewish lodgers moved on to their own homes – if, indeed, they did so. Some limited information in the AJDB from earlier decades suggests that not all of the Jewish lodgers were recent arrivals and that some were already in Britain in the 1830s. Putting down roots did not necessarily mean the end of lodging; it may well have been a longer-term choice for unmarried immigrants, again pointing to its utility as a mode of modern living. Nor can we do more than speculate on how useful the religious link was compared with other alternative means of finding a home. Certainly it must have brought certain advantages for so many single males, and especially those from overseas, to have utilised it in this way. An alternative, of course, is that Jews were not welcome as lodgers in non-Jewish households. This is more difficult to test, although generally speaking, British anti-Semitism is characterised as being low-lying.⁷³ Still, certain commonly-accepted stereotypes of Jews as unclean or deviant may have affected the willingness of non-Jews to take them into their homes.

1
2
3 The experience of servant keeping, on the other hand, is quite different, and the evidence shows
4 that Jews very often employed people who did not share their religion, either as domestic servants
5 or as trade assistants. Employing live-in staff was common: 71 per cent of all Jewish household
6 heads in Liverpool employed at least one person named as a servant or employee, 55 per cent in
7 Birmingham and 68 per cent in Manchester. This is notably higher than figures for non-Jews in other
8 industrial and urban locations at this time, pointing potentially to greater affluence in the current
9 sample, and the insulation of wage-earner households from trends away from servant-keeping.⁷⁴
10
11 Most of the Jewish households contained only one employee, although a handful kept large staffs of
12 domestic servants. The largest was that of the Salis Schwabe of Crumpsall House in Manchester, a
13 convert to Unitarianism, who kept 20 servants including a companion, a Jewish cook, a lady's maid, a
14 clerk, nurse, kitchen maid, laundry maid, butler, footman, groom and four footmen to look after
15 himself, his wife, six young children and a niece. Despite his thorough integration into Unitarian and
16 Liberal circles, he still chose to keep a (German) Jewish cook; ironically one of only two Jewish cooks
17 in the dataset.⁷⁵ Live-in Jewish employees, on the other hand, were not common, although where
18 they appear, they did tend to work for fellow-Jews.⁷⁶ There were 11 such employees in the Liverpool
19 community, 7 in Birmingham and Hull, and 18 in Manchester.

20
21 Although the Jewish employees did prefer to work for Jews, most employers were clearly willing to
22 have non-Jews in their households. This might have been because they were not concerned to keep
23 their households exclusively Jewish despite the potential for transgressing Jewish laws, particularly
24 in the preparation of food. A second possibility is that it was a way of demonstrating acculturation. A
25 third was simply that it was hard to find Jewish servants. We have seen that Jewish cooks were very
26 rare; not one of the women employed in childcare capacities (including one wet nurse) was Jewish
27 either, and only one household had a Jewish governess.

28
29 Not all of the live-in staff in Jewish households were domestics though; many were business
30 employees and they sometimes lived with their employers in a scenario quite similar to a lodging

house. Birmingham's largest household, for example, consisted of 23 people headed by James Cohen Pirani of Union Street, alongside his wife Abigail and their infant son, Abigail's brother, and 23 employees working either in James' woollen and outfitting business (which was presumably co-located with his home), or serving the household. Three of the woollen workers were Jews, but none of the household staff. Benjamin Hyam of Manchester employed 24 live-in workers in his clothing business,¹³ of whom were Jewish, 11 of them men, and working mainly in managerial and clerical roles: two managers, six salesmen, a cashier, a clerk and a collector. In contrast to the Jewish lodgers, Jewish employees of all types were frequently British-born, although not necessarily from the town where they were living in 1851. Only in the port towns was foreign birth more common among employees, and in all cases only a handful of Jewish employees worked *and lived with* non-Jewish employers. For most of these people, then, their employment and domestic arrangements can be seen as part of a functional Jewish network, either where Jews were preferentially employed over non-Jews, or where Jews were more likely to receive notice of employment opportunities via their communal networks than non-Jews. On the other hand, it is also clear that non-Jews were willing not only to work for, but live with, Jews; in itself a not insignificant indication of tolerance and acculturation.

Conclusions

We may return, then, to the question posed at the outset: what can Jewish households tell us about the impact of rapid economic change on community networks and religious feeling? First, the current study confirms that there is no evidence to support the old theory that industrialisation brought about shrinking family sizes and a lessening of kinship ties. Jews had a strong tendency to live with close kin, and quite frequently to extend their families to accommodate other relatives too, particularly young nieces and nephews. What the evidence suggests perhaps even more strongly, though – and in keeping with recent writing on the eighteenth century – is that Jewish families were fluid in form, and in ways which defy brittle classifications. On the related question of the supposed

instrumentality brought about by industrial conditions, the Jews also offer a more tempered view. There is little evidence that they entered into calculated relationships, taking in small children and truncated family units who might not be best placed to contribute to the household. The elderly did sometimes move in with their grown children, possibly contributing with childcare or economic resources in the way that Anderson suggested, but they even more frequently remained in their own homes, possibly pooling resources or offering aid to other family members by sharing their own house-room. It is not enough to characterise these household arrangements as *either* instrumental or affectionate; there was clearly a combination of factors at work, which are not easily boiled down to economic rationality.

Motivations are notoriously hard to read into demographic sources, especially when they capture only one point in time, but patterns of lodging and servant-keeping offer an even more revealing insight into intra-communal ties among provincial Jews. The evidence suggests very strongly that Jews chose to lodge with co-religionists, and that their shared religious faith (and the commonalities that it brought in terms of national origins, shared culture and language) must have played a big part in their choices about where to live. Although not all lodgers were recent arrivals, this was particularly marked among those who were young, male and single, and born overseas. The same was not true for employees, where a very small number of Jewish domestics forced families to look outside the faith, even for cooks. However, there is evidence of businesses employing relatively large numbers of Jews and housing them too. It seems, then, that migration – domestic and especially international - is a key to understanding the ways that many Jewish households worked in this period. The evidence points to urban opportunities as the principal disrupting force here, rather than industrialisation *per se*, alongside restrictions and (increasingly) persecutions overseas.

Internal ties such as those seen here are likely to have played a large part in further reinforcing that bundle of cultural, religious and social identities which made up being a Jew, and potentially held back further absorption into British culture. This is noteworthy in a period when Jews were still

working out how to operate successfully both as Britons and as Jews. Future work will reveal whether residence patterns served the same purpose, and how far communal support also reinforced internal solidarity. It is worth ending, however, by noting that although the Jews were not remarkable in displaying this sort of preference to live with people with whom they shared characteristics, the unusual blend of moral, religious and cultural bonds which makes up the Jewish religion may have been a particularly strong force for inclusivity. Anderson's original model for a well-functioning network included ties of shared ideology or culture, as they offered assurances that obligations between members would be repaid. In his words, mutual religion or language 'seem to have increased the extent to which, in a strange town, immigrants...felt dependent on, and were glad to be integrated into, a community of this kind.'⁷⁷

It is worth noting again that the Jewish communities of these seven towns did not have the same experience of industrial life as those in Anderson's working-class Preston sample, or Griffin's sample of autobiographers. They participated lightly in the most industrial sectors of the employment market – and its often enviable wages - and they represent a fuller cross-section of the population, as some of the very affluent examples have shown. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that their shared cultural ties offered very real assistance both in finding security and in 'blending in' to life in an industrial town – but in ways which preserved community networks and a sense of shared ethnicity.

TABLES

Table 1: Jews in seven British industrial towns, 1851

| | Liverpool | Birmingham | Leeds | Glasgow | Hull | Manchester | Sheffield | TOTAL |
|---------------|-----------|------------|-------|---------|------|------------|-----------|-------|
| N individuals | 848 | 906 | 128 | 104 | 320 | 1106 | 112 | 3524 |
| N households | 159 | 223 | 34 | 27 | 99 | 279 | 34 | 855 |

Source: AJDB/census database

Table 2: Relatives found in 'composite' and 'extended' Jewish families, 1851 (percentage of all non-nuclear relatives)

| | Liverpool | Birmingham | Hull | Manchester | Total |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Aunt | 6.25 | 3.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.09 |
| Brother | 3.13 | 8.77 | 17.65 | 1.79 | 5.67 |
| Brother in law | 7.81 | 7.02 | 0.00 | 3.57 | 5.67 |
| Cousin | 10.94 | 1.75 | 0.00 | 1.79 | 4.64 |
| Daughter in law | 1.56 | 1.75 | 0.00 | 1.79 | 1.55 |
| Father | 0.00 | 5.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.55 |
| Father in law | 3.13 | 0.00 | 5.88 | 7.14 | 4.12 |
| Granddaughter | 6.25 | 3.51 | 11.76 | 3.57 | 5.15 |
| Grandmother | 1.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.57 | 1.55 |
| Grandson | 4.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5.36 | 3.09 |
| Grown up daughter | 4.69 | 1.75 | 11.76 | 5.36 | 4.64 |
| Mother | 4.69 | 10.53 | 0.00 | 5.36 | 6.19 |
| Mother in law | 4.69 | 3.51 | 0.00 | 10.71 | 5.67 |
| Nephew | 9.38 | 15.79 | 11.76 | 3.57 | 9.79 |
| Niece | 14.06 | 12.28 | 29.41 | 10.71 | 13.92 |
| 'Relative' | 1.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 23.21 | 7.22 |
| Sister | 12.50 | 7.02 | 5.88 | 7.14 | 8.76 |
| Sister in law | 3.13 | 14.04 | 0.00 | 5.36 | 6.70 |
| Son in law | 0.00 | 3.51 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 1.03 |
| Total | 64 | 57 | 17 | 56 | 194 |

Source: AJDB/census database

Table 3: Jewish lodgers as a proportion of the Jewish population in seven towns, 1851

| | Liverpool | Birmingham | Leeds | Glasgow | Hull | Manchester | Sheffield | Total |
|--|-----------|------------|-------|---------|-------|------------|-----------|-------|
| N Jewish lodgers | 34 | 84 | 42 | 5 | 51 | 154 | 10 | 380 |
| Proportion of the Jewish population who were lodgers (%) | 4.01 | 9.27 | 32.81 | 4.81 | 15.94 | 13.92 | 8.93 | 10.78 |

Source: AJDB/census database

Appendix: Household composition among Jews in seven industrial towns, 1851

| Household category | Liverpool | Birmingham | Leeds | Glasgow | Hull | Manchester | Sheffield |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Singles (1) | 2.52 | 1.36 | 3.03 | 3.70 | 1.02 | 0.72 | 5.88 |
| Nuclear | | | | | | | |
| 2ai (Couple with children) | 8.18 | 9.55 | 21.21 | 14.81 | 17.35 | 6.14 | 8.82 |
| 2aai (Couple without children) | 1.26 | 6.36 | 3.03 | 3.70 | 5.10 | 1.08 | 2.94 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| children) | | | | | | | |
| 2b (Father with children) | 0.63 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.36 | 0.00 |
| 2c (Mother with children) | 0.63 | 3.64 | 3.03 | 3.70 | 1.02 | 1.08 | 0.00 |
| Nuclear, total | 10.7 | 20.0 | 27.27 | 22.21 | 23.47 | 8.3 | 11.76 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Extended | | | | | | | |
| 3a (Nuclear family with other kin) | 2.52 | 1.82 | 0.00 | 3.70 | 1.02 | 3.25 | 0.00 |
| 3b (Two or more related nuclear families only) | 0.00 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 0.36 | 0.00 |
| 3c (Two or more related nuclear families plus other kin) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 3d (Two or more related persons, not family nuclei) | 1.26 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Extended, total | 3.78 | 3.64 | 0.00 | 3.70 | 2.04 | 3.61 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Composite | | | | | | | |
| 4a (Single nuclear family, plus kin and non-kin) | 17.59 | 15.00 | 15.15 | 11.11 | 14.29 | 14.44 | 2.94 |
| 4b (Single nuclear family plus non-kin) | 60.57 | 43.64 | 39.39 | 40.74 | 33.67 | 48.01 | 47.06 |
| 4c (Two or more related nuclear families, plus kin and non-kin) | 0.63 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 4d (Two or more related nuclear families, plus non-kin) | 1.26 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.04 | 0.00 | 2.94 |
| 4e (Two or more non-related nuclear families, with or without others) | 1.26 | 1.82 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.04 | 1.81 | 0.00 |
| 4f (Two or more related persons but not a nuclear family, plus non-kin) | 1.89 | 1.36 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.04 | 1.08 | 0.00 |
| 4g (Non related persons only) | 2.52 | 5.00 | 6.06 | 7.41 | 9.18 | 7.58 | 5.88 |
| Composite, total | 85.72 | 67.72 | 60.6 | 59.26 | 64.28 | 72.92 | 58.82 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Other/unknown (5) | 6.92 | 8.64 | 9.09 | 11.11 | 9.18 | 14.08 | 23.53 |
| | | | | | | | |
| N households | 159 | 220 | 33 | 27 | 98 | 277 | 34 |

Source: AJDB/census database

Acknowledgements: Grateful thanks to Joanne Begiato for her perspicacious and helpful comments on a first draft.

¹ For an overview see the Introduction and references to Michael Anderson's *Family structure in nineteenth-century Lancashire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 1-4.

² Anderson, *Family structure*.

³ For example, see the author's Introduction, Peter Laslett, ed., *Household and Family in past time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 1-89.

⁴ 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.

⁵ Emma Griffin, 'A conundrum resolved? Rethinking courtship, marriage and population growth in eighteenth-century England' *Past and Present* 215 (2012), 125-64. Also see Steven Ruggles, 'Multigenerational families in nineteenth-century America' *Continuity and Change* 18, no. 1 (2003) 139-65.

⁶ The proportion was even higher among adults; in Laidlaw's words, 'the British-born proportion increases sharply for those born from 1830 onwards...[reflecting] the fact that most potential young-adult immigrants in these birth cohorts would not yet have reached typical migration age, and were still living abroad.' (Petra Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: birthplaces, residence and migrations' *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 53 (2011), 35-6).

⁷ See Callum G. Brown, *The death of Christian Britain: understanding secularisation 1800-2000* (Routledge: London and New York, 2001).

⁸ Brown, *The death of Christian Britain*.

⁹ For example, 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.

¹⁰ Brown, *The death of Christian Britain*, 145-69.

¹¹ See N. Kokosalakis, *Ethnic identity and religion: tradition and change in Liverpool Jewry* (Universal Press of America: Washington, 1982), esp. 7-9 on the nature of assimilation/acculturation and the relationship with the host culture. For a nuanced example which takes in a range of other factors including intellectual currents (but not industrialisation *per se*) see Todd M. Endelman, *Broadening Jewish history: towards a social history of ordinary Jews* (Littman Library of Jewish Civilization: Oxford, Portland Oregon, 2011), 30-48. An earlier consideration of the same topic links Jewish identity with Britishness: Todd Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England, 1741-1830: tradition and change in a liberal society* (Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia, 1979), 118-65.

¹² Kokosalakis, *Ethnic identity*, 1-2.

¹³ Endelman, *Broadening*, 44. According to Lipman, the ratio of attendance to places in synagogue was as low in 1851 as any denomination except the Quakers, with only around ten per cent of the Jewish population attending synagogue on the Sabbath in question (Jewish places of worship were enumerated on the Friday and Saturday). V. D. Lipman, *A history of the Jews in Britain since 1858* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1990), 28. See also Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 126-131, but also 135-7 on the strong links retained with the community notwithstanding, for example, via Jewish charities. The lower middle classes tended to be more observant than the upper middle (136).

¹⁴ Endelman, *Broadening*, 34-48.

¹⁵ Bill Williams, *The making of Manchester Jewry, 1740-1875* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976).

¹⁶ W. D. Rubinstein, *A history of the Jews in the English-speaking world: Great Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996), 7-21. The principal impediment to full participation in political and economic life was the necessity to swear the Christological oaths, but it is thought that British Jews at this time had little inclination to join the government, the professions or university life in any case. Full political emancipation came for the Jews in 1858 (twenty years later than the Catholics). See Endelman, *Broadening*, 19-48; and also 78-80 on the relative lack of impediments to full emancipation. Endelman also points out that Britain lacked a Continental-style rabbinate to regulate and oversee Jewish life (Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 139-46).

¹⁷ Endelman, *Broadening*, 23-4.

¹⁸ Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: birthplaces'.

¹⁹ Petra Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851' *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 56, nos 1 and 2 (2013), 115. They were most commonly found in the tertiary (trade and service) sector, and hardly at all in the primary (agriculture and mining).

²⁰ Rubinstein, *A history of the Jews*, 65.

²¹ This is often contrasted with the stricter Orthodoxy of later waves of immigrants from the 1880s. Examples of the flexible approach include socialising with non-Jews, hiring people to run Jewish businesses on the Sabbath, and keeping kosher principally at home (Endelman *The Jews of Britain*, 114).

²² The Jews had been expelled from Britain under Edward I in 1290, had quietly begun to return from the 1630s and were more formally welcomed – albeit without any legal change of status – from the mid-1650s (Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 14).

²³ This is available at www.jsgsb.org.uk/1851-database. It was compiled and is maintained by Petra Laidlaw and is based on the contributions of a number of scholars including Laidlaw's own work on London. I am grateful to Petra for her support for this project and her help with the database. It is also available via the UK Data Service at <https://discover.ukdataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/?sn=7668>.

²⁴ This is the regular decennial census, and should be distinguished from the parallel Census of Worship which was a one-off count of worshippers at religious services in the same year.

²⁵ Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: birthplaces', 30.

²⁶ The census records at www.ancestry.com were used for this exercise. Occasionally, households could not be identified in the census; these households were omitted from the analysis. A number of the household listings for Hull were not connected to the correct digital image of the census form, which again precluded some positive links. The transcribed listings for Glasgow were not linked to the digitised forms, with the same effect.

²⁷ Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 173. Laidlaw notes that recent work has placed the start of notable numbers of Polish immigrants earlier than first thought; the first half of the nineteenth century rather than the second ('Jews in the British Isles in 1851: birthplaces', 38)

²⁸ There were also small communities in Ireland and Wales, as well as Scotland (Lipman, *A history of the Jews*, 15).

²⁹ Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: birthplaces', 38.

³⁰ See *Ibid.*, 29-5 for an overview of the various estimates put forward by scholars.

³¹ Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles' (2013), 115.

³² 1851 Anglo-Jewry database, UK Data Archive background notes, available at doc.ukdataservice.ac.uk/doc/.../7668notes_on_content_definitions_and_sources.pdf.

³³ Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: birthplaces', 33. Laidlaw has gone to some lengths to try to identify further Jews in Liverpool but at the time of writing, to little avail. Further work for the current project using charity records identified only three more individuals who were missing from the AJDB.

³⁴ Silvia Sovič, 'European family history: moving beyond stereotypes of 'East' and 'West'', *Cultural and Social History* 5, no. 2 (2008), 151.

³⁵ See Laslett, 'Introduction', in Laslett, ed., *Households and family*, 26-32. The amendments follow the United Nations classification, which can be found at <https://unstats.un.org/Unsd/demographic/sconcerns/fam/fammethode.htm>.

³⁶ It has also been observed in the few studies of Jewish demography. See Petra Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: marriage and childbearing', *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, 57, nos 1 and 2 (2015), 27.

³⁷ For example Laslett, 'Introduction', in Laslett, ed., *Household and family*, Table 1.15, 85 showing that 78 per cent of households in Ealing in 1599 were nuclear in form. 73 per cent of households in Anderson's Preston were nuclear (*Family structure*, 44).

³⁸ In most of the sub-categories of the 'extended' class this means a nuclear family plus other kin, but it can also include two or more related persons, none of whom are a family nucleus.

³⁹ Laslett, 'Introduction' in Laslett, ed., *Household and family*, 61; W. A. Armstrong, 'A note on the household structure of mid-C19th York in comparative perspective', in Laslett, ed., *Household and family*, 213.

Enumeration areas from Leeds, Birmingham, Hull and Manchester were included in this sample. Michael Anderson, 'Household structure and the industrial revolution; mid nineteenth-century Preston in comparative perspective', in Laslett, ed., *Household and Family*, 220. Anderson compared the industrial town of Preston to a non-industrial sample and found a similar incidence of extended families there.

⁴⁰ Anderson, 'Household structure', 220.

⁴¹ Lynch has noted that the strongest family bonds were between parents and children, and between siblings, which would explain the prevalence of nieces and nephews (Katherine A. Lynch, 'Kinship in Britain and beyond

from the early modern to the present: postscript' *Continuity and Change* 25, no. 1 (2010), 187). Anderson *Family structure*, 44. This pattern of lone children living with grandparents was also found in Anderson's rural sample from 1851 ('Household structure', 224).

⁴² Anderson, *Family structure*, eg on 56.

⁴³ Anderson, 'Household structure', 227-30.

⁴⁴ Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851: marriage', 25.

⁴⁵ Tadmor, 'Early modern kinship', 26-7.

⁴⁶ See, for example, Rev John Mills, *The British Jews* (London, 1853), 257 and 273-87.

⁴⁷ Ruggles, 'Multigenerational families'.

⁴⁸ Richard Wall has noted that the widowed and elderly in England were also less likely to live with children ('Economic collaboration of family members within and beyond households in English society, 1600-2000' *Continuity and Change* 25, no. 1, 83-108).

⁴⁹ The complete AJDB 'reconstitutes' families who were separated on census night, but who can be linked by other internal evidence. These missing partners are therefore unlikely to have been simply staying elsewhere, and a note would also have been made if they had been found in subsequent censuses.

⁵⁰ Williams, *The making*, 164.

⁵¹ See Laslett, 'Introduction', in Laslett, ed., *Household and family*, 30.

⁵² This is a further contrast with Preston, where few of the over 65s lived apart from relatives, and only 37 per cent were living with a spouse. 80 per cent of those who had a child alive were living with them in 1851 (Anderson, 'Household structure', 224-5). Reay has demonstrated a similar situation in rural Kent: there 45-56 per cent of elderly men and women co-resided with kin in 1851 and also in 1881, and almost three quarters of widow/ers lived with children or other kin. 28 to 37 per cent lived alone with a spouse. About 80 per cent of men over the age of 65 were employed, however (Reay, 'Kinship and the neighbourhood', 96).

⁵³ The two largest occupational categories according to the scheme used in the AJDB were miscellaneous (which is where many of the potentially higher status occupations are classed) and clothing, footwear and textiles. Most were categorised as semi-skilled rather than skilled or professional, however. In Liverpool five of the elderly were classed as leisured, two of whom were also household heads.

⁵⁴ Anderson, *Family structure*, 38.

⁵⁵ The proportion of solitaires was slightly higher in Sheffield, at 5.9 per cent.

⁵⁶ By the time that *Household and family* was published in 1972 Laslett had corrected this oversight, finding that lodgers made up 3.4 per cent of the population from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, and that they were present in 18 per cent of domestic groups, occurring more frequently than extended kin (Laslett, 'Mean household size in England since the C16th', in Laslett, ed., *Household and family*, 134). Boarders (who paid for extras like food) are more likely to be seen as part of the household since they share domestic spaces.

⁵⁷ Modell and Hareven see this emphasis on pseudo-family changing over time, towards a greater service based exchange which facilitated independence (John Modell and Tamara K Hareven, 'Urbanization and the malleable household: an examination of boarding and lodging in American Families', *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 35, no. 3 (1973), 467-79).

⁵⁸ Modell and Hareven, 'Urbanization'. See also Mark Peel, 'On the margins: lodgers and boarders in Boston, 1860-1900' *The Journal of American History*, 72, no. 4 (1986), 813-34.

⁵⁹ Jeff Meek, 'Boarding and lodging practices in early twentieth-century Scotland', *Continuity and Change*, 31, no. 1 (2016), 79-100.

⁶⁰ Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 177-.

⁶¹ In both Liverpool and Birmingham heads with lodgers were around three years younger on average than those without: approximately 39 years compared with 42 or 43. In Manchester there was almost no difference between the two categories. The number of children in the family was also slightly lower than the average, suggesting that the family was not yet complete (Birmingham 2.94 for households with lodgers, and 4.55 for those without; Liverpool 4.67 and 5.22; Manchester 3.48 and 4.22)

⁶² The only exception was again Glasgow where 40 per cent were married (but numbers of lodgers were very small).

⁶³ C. Pooley and Jean Turnbull, *Migration and mobility in England since the eighteenth century* (London: University College London Press, 1998), 193-4.

⁶⁴ Lipman, *A history of the Jews in Britain since 1858*, 4.

⁶⁵ See, for example, Leonore Davidoff, 'The separation of home and work? Landladies and lodgers in 19th and C20th England', in *Fit work for women*, ed Sandra Burman (London and New York: Routledge, 1979), 64-97.

⁶⁶ Williams notes that widowed Sophia Leon of Blackfriars, London advertised space for lodgers in her home in the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1851, for example. Williams, *The making*, 86.

⁶⁷ Strict Jews would not want their food prepared in vessels which had contained non-kosher meats, or to have meat and milk served or cooked together.

⁶⁸ Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles in 1851', 125.

⁶⁹ Ernest Krausz suggests that this was the case in Leeds, with wives and children being sent for once the husband was established (*Leeds Jewry, its history and social structure* (Cambridge: Jewish Historical Society of England, W. Heffer and Sons, 1964), 5.

⁷⁰ Clothing, footwear and textiles were prominent among lodgers in Birmingham, Hull and Manchester (cap-makers, tailors, slipper-makers and shoe-makers), while Birmingham was well-represented in the personal requisites category (mainly dealers and manufacturers of jewellery and watches, plus a handful of cigar-makers)

⁷¹ 'Meek, 'Boarding and lodging practices', 83-4. 23 per cent of households in Anderson's Preston sample contained lodgers, and in both York and Nottingham the figure was 22 per cent (Anderson, 'Household structure', 220; Armstrong, 'A note', 220).

⁷² In Preston 21 per cent of lodgers shared a house with more than six other lodgers, and 11 per cent with 12 or more. Anderson, *Family structure*, 47.

⁷³ Endelman, *The Jews of Georgian England*, 86-117.

⁷⁴ 29 per cent of households in York, and 10 per cent in Preston had servants in 1851, although the latter was an exclusively working-class sample (Michael Anderson, 'Household structure', 220). Armstrong suggests that between 5 and 15 per cent of households in parts of Leeds, Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool contained servants with a further 0.5 to 3 trade assistants. Armstrong, 'A note', 205-14.

⁷⁵ 'Salis Schwabe, 1800-53', *Dictionary of National Biography*. Endelman notes this tendency for German migrants, especially those from urban areas (where Jews experienced considerable discrimination), to be 'indifferent or hostile' to Judaism, and to use their move to Britain as way to reshape their identity. Unitarianism was a relatively popular alternative in the manufacturing cities like Manchester as it represented the norm in the socially elite social circles they wished to emulate, as well as being broad-minded and anti-

Trinitarian. It is possible, therefore, that the German-ness of the Schwabes' cook was more important than her Jewishness. Endelman, *Broadening*, 145-67. Almost 200 Jewish households in the dataset employed a cook, but only three (one in Liverpool and two in Manchester) have been identified as Jewish.

⁷⁶ According to Laidlaw only 4.3 per cent of the Jews in the AJDB were in domestic service compared with 13.8 per cent in the British population. Laidlaw, 'Jews in the British Isles', 120

⁷⁷ Anderson, *Family structure*, quotation on 101.