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ABSTRACT:

A persistent focus on the activities and achievements of the wealthiest and most Orthodox Jewish men, justified a rigorous re-evaluation of overlooked historical source material in order to provide a basis for our understanding the distinctive role of Jewish women within the interconnected British cities of London and Sydney in the second half of the nineteenth century. The chapters are divided into subsections that focus on topics that were significant to Jewish women and girls. The experiences and thoughts of the wealthiest and most influential Jewish women, including women from the de Rothschild and Montefiore families, are presented aside the poorest and most disempowered Jewish females, such as girls, widows and orphans in order to present the widest range of perspectives. The dissertation begins by exploring Jewish women's involvement in the politics related to Jewish emancipation and women's enfranchisement, and the way that Jewish migration into London promoted changes to their social and religious networks and sparked interest in Australia as a destination for Jewish colonists. This provides a basis for understanding the nuances of British-Jewish women's role within the family and the way a preference for smaller families intersected with religious reforms and altered women's attitude toward attending the mikvah and following the laws of Niddah. The dissertation also investigates the distinctive culinary traditions and holiday observances of British-Jewish women, which varied somewhat from American and European women's traditions, as did their role in the synagogue. The educational achievement, employment opportunities, and the contributions of Jewish women as they volunteered in Jewish settings within Sydney and London are explored. These subjects enhance our understanding of women's daily lives and their desire for equality not only with Jewish men, but also with their non-Jewish neighbors. This dissertation provides a basis for future scholars to
include the experiences of English and Australian Jewish women in trans-regional and cross-cultural histories and broadens our knowledge of female migrants from a numerically small religious group.
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Introduction:

Nineteenth-century Jewish women in Britain and the colonies were considered racial and religious minorities and they also experienced fewer social privileges due to a gender bias against women. Jewish women were consistently omitted as subjects of study across most academic disciplines, including Judaic Studies and Women's Studies, through claims that it was beyond the scope of research projects to include them, due to the difficulty of locating relevant historic source-material. Jewish women appear to have generated less personal writing for historians to utilize, and preservation issues further complicate efforts to understand their perspectives and the conditions they experienced. Until recently, much of what was known of their experience was not from their own perspective, but was recorded by non-Jews or by Jewish men who may not have voiced Jewish women's needs and views clearly. The lack of research on Jewish women also results from prevailing assumptions that once the accomplishments and views of men are documented and analyzed there is no need for additional research into Jewish women's lives, in spite of the sharply contrasting gender norms that exist between males and females within Judaism. Prior to this research, newspapers and archival sources had not been systematically reviewed for their content related to women and girls within Sydney's Jewish community. Studies of gender and minority groups contribute to our understanding of broader areas of research, such as religious history and women's history even if the focus on the majority group is subsumed in order to give full attention to individuals that are usually excluded.

The chapters in this dissertation focus on the questions related to how Jewish women's lives in Sydney and London were distinctive due to Jewish religious and cultural traditions, and how Jewish women's equality with Jewish men and non-Jewish society was discussed publicly. The research period for this dissertation begins in 1850, just prior to the gold rush, as free-settlers were arriving in the Australian colonies, and it concludes in 1900, just prior to Australian Federation,
and to women’s enfranchisement in Australia in 1902. An innovative aspect of this research is that it situates historical accounts of women’s lives with halakah, or Jewish religious laws, as well as drawing connections between British laws and local social norms that were based on Protestantism and Catholicism. These two religious groups had the greatest influence on Jewish women’s choices and levels of empowerment outside of Jewish society. Jewish people lived in close proximity to each other, and shared variable aspects of a Jewish heritage and identity, but the terms ‘Jewish community’ and ‘Jewish society’ are not intended to suggest that there was a homogenous set of cultural, religious or political opinions within the population, since this was not the case.

The dissertation is divided into nine chapters that correspond to aspects of Jewish women’s lives. Each chapter provides a basis for understanding women’s gender identity and how religious laws related to women were embedded within Jewish cultural practices. The first chapter investigates Jewish women’s migration into London, and the status of their civil rights in British society. It provides a revisionist perspective on the politics of Jewish Emancipation by interjecting the views of women into the existing narratives related to men’s political lives. Chapter two evaluates the conditions and resources that attracted women to Sydney or anchored them in London. Chapter three investigates women’s role in Judaism in the synagogue in London and Sydney as the Reform movement was becoming influential, particularly at Sydney’s Great Synagogue. Chapter four demonstrates that Jewish women’s married lives were guided by differing religious principles than Christian and Catholic women and that there were protections embedded in Jewish law that safeguarded women’s rights. Chapter five investigates women’s use of the mikvah after their menstrual cycles and questions if their desire to limit their family size was the crucial component of their decision-making around reforms to this aspect of religious tradition. Chapter six explores the fusion between Jewish women’s religious practices and their fluctuating knowledge of how to prepare kosher food, which was expected to be central to their domestic lives, in their role as
'priestesses,' of their households. In chapter seven I question the view that Jewish females were excluded by Jewish men from becoming educated in secular matters and religious study. In chapter eight I evaluate evidence of Jewish occupational trends in Sydney and London. Chapter nine revises previous assessments of women's contributions in the area of charity and philanthropic groups. Each chapter provides evidence that Jewish women's experiences were distinctive of Christian women and from Jewish men. This dissertation provides a basis for understanding the way Jewish women's religious identities were interconnected with their gender and racial identities, as well as to their feeling of cultural belonging within British settlements in the under-researched time-period after England stopped transporting convicts to Australia and in the pre-Holocaust period prior to Australian Federation.

Historical materials by and about Jewish women are brief and often fragmentary, making it necessary to utilize an interdisciplinary approach, in order to establish what women's cultural and religious traditions were, and to analyze their distinctiveness and equality. This dissertation crosses many disciplines, including history, anthropology, literature, Subaltern studies, Women's studies, Black studies, family studies, Judaic studies and law. Historical sources utilized for this dissertation included previously undervalued family histories, donation lists, circumcision registers, entries in minute-books, headstones, cemetery records, attendance records, job announcements, paintings, photographs and articles from the Jewish Historical Societies in England and Australia, which began in 1893 and 1939 respectively. The fragmentary pieces of information, related to roughly five-thousand individual women who were known to be Jewish and living in Sydney between the years of 1850 and 1900, were compiled into a customized database using Endnote software to assist in making broader generalizations about Jewish society. Biographical portraits of individual women were stored in individual Endnote files that could be sorted and searched. This method made it possible to provide relatively equal representation between individuals of varying
social classes and ages, and helped me to distinguish trends from rare instances.

The methodology of this study included viewing all of the microfilmed issues of Jewish newspapers from London and Australian prior to the end of 1901. Information about individual women was gathered from newspapers and archival sources systematically. I photocopied pages that related to women and girls, general themes in the chapters and women's issues. London newspapers included 2890 issues of the Jewish Chronicle (1841-1901) and 119 issues of the Voice of Jacob (1841-1845). Sydney newspapers included two issues of the Voice of Jacob (1842) and 150 issues of the Hebrew Standard of Australasia (1895-1901). Melbourne had three major Jewish newspapers, including 181 issues of the Australian Israelite (1872-1875), 473 issues of the Jewish Herald (1879-1901) and fifty-two issues of the Australasian Hebrew (1895-1896). Although individual newspaper editors held generally conservative perspectives on the issue of religious reform, they published articles with a wide range of opinions, including biased or controversial opinions from poor and affluent members of the community. All of the newspapers included coverage of global events that were considered important to Jews, such as advances made in civil rights or increases in anti-Semitism.

The Registry of Australian Archives and Manuscripts website was searched in order to locate unpublished material related to nineteenth-century Jewish women from London and Sydney. I also consulted archivists to assure that cataloged materials that were not yet in electronic databases were identified. Although the Australian Jewish Historical Society of Victoria had extensive archival materials listed as part of a collection at the Victoria State Library, the nineteenth-century portion of this restricted-access collection was removed and relocated to a site that was inaccessible for most of the time this dissertation was in progress. It should also be noted that there were no household returns available in relation to the census records from Sydney prior to 1900, partly due to their destruction in a fire. The National Archives of Australia's collections relate to people and events in the post-Federation period after 1901, which negated
their use for this research. Sand's business directories were available for the time period covered in this research, but it was difficult to identify Jewish proprietors, even after vital statistics data was entered into the database related to Jewish individuals living in Sydney.

Historian David Fitzpatrick finds that family papers and photos have taken a more prominent place within British archives and are now considered worthy of scholarly attention and preservation for future generations, even when a family was not political, wealthy or otherwise well-known.6 The archival holdings of Sydney's Australian Jewish Historical Society Archive and the Australian Archive of Judaica were systematically reviewed for content related to Jewish women who were in Sydney between 1850 and 1900. There were nearly two-thousand files and boxes in their holdings and I reviewed all files that related to the nineteenth-century. The archives' nineteenth-century holdings include legal documents, vital records, genealogical data, craftwork, photos, prayer books, newspaper articles, letters, journals, family histories, academic literature on Jewish subjects as well as the minutes and annual reports of Jewish organizations. In a few instances articles or privately published family histories, such as about the Keesing and Blashki families also provided broader perspective. However, women's prominence in these histories, for the time period covered by the dissertation, was subsumed, just as it was in academic publications.7 Files without dates were reviewed if they were 'family papers,' related to a synagogue, rabbi, cemetery, an organization, or a theme that directly connected to subjects in the dissertation, such as kosher cooking, known as following the laws of kashruth. Many archival files contained correspondence related to family historians asking for information about their relatives, and some of the information they offered seemed unreliable. This research is rooted in the extensive correspondence, annual reports and minute-books of the Sydney Jewish Board of Education, the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, the Sydney Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home and the Keesing Family photos. The vital records and letter-books of Sydney's Great Synagogue, the Macquarie Street Synagogue, the York...
Street Synagogue, the Bridge Street Synagogue and Brisbane Hebrew Congregation were indispensable, since the on-line register for New South Wales vital statistics cannot be searched by religious affiliation. I created hand-written catalogs of all of the entries related to marriages, births, and female deaths from the 1830s to 1901. I entered this data into the database with fragmentary evidence from other sources. Women's children and their birthdates were listed in her file, and daughters had their own file that was cross-referenced with their mother. This process included matching variations in women's married and maiden-names. Files were only consolidated when there was a clear match to identifying information beyond her name, such as a birthday, death date, an address or a family member. As I began my analysis, I removed the files of women and girls who had no definite contact to Sydney in the 1850 to 1900 time period, such as women who registered their births in Sydney but lived in rural areas. This dissertation is weighted more heavily toward the lives of women in Sydney, because the Bevis Marks Synagogue records were the only sustained published source of information about Jewish individuals in London that could be accessed from Australia and America. This congregation was a sub-focus of research from my master's thesis on Grace Aguilar and I was aware that cultural distinctions between this congregation and the congregations in Sydney would have been unwieldy.

The National Library of New Zealand's Alexander Turnbull Library held the most significant collection of English-Jewish women’s personal writing that is available in Australia or New Zealand. The letters were part of the family papers of Julius Vogel (1835-1899), who was the first Jewish Prime Minister of New Zealand in the late nineteenth-century, and his wife Mary Clayton (1849-1933). He wrote for several newspapers in Australia and New Zealand and was instrumental in making arrangements for the mail-route between New Zealand, San Francisco and England. Mary Clayton was not Jewish, but she was fully integrated into his Jewish family who lived in England and Australia and they corresponded regularly. Their letters provided insight into the contrasts in British culture that existed
between London and the Antipodes. The letters Mary sent to London were not available within this collection. There were letters from their three sons Harry Benjamin Vogel (1868-1947), Julius (Judy) Leonard Vogel (d. 1943), and Francis (Frank) Leonard Vogel (1870-1894) who attended boarding schools in London and lived near Julius’ sister Frances Vogel. The boys often wrote home about their activities and of the social and cultural differences they observed between their boarding schools and their old home in Wellington. The collection also included letters written by their only daughter Phoebe Emily Vogel (1875-1936), who wrote to them when they resided briefly in Dunedin, while she remained in Wellington and was tutored by her governess. The letters from her brothers provide a sharp contrast that illustrates the differing gender-based educational and occupational expectations that were prominent at that time. What the Vogel children had in common was that they were in regular contact with their Jewish relatives, but were educated in Christian environments, which was not uncommon among upper-class Jewish families. Although there are several books written about Julius Vogel’s political career, his daily life and family relationships were not emphasized by previous historians. This is the first study to utilize the Vogel papers for their content about the private life and cultural traditions of this prominent intermarried family and their social networks.

Census data for minority groups, including Jews, is known to be unreliable because poorer people in the nineteenth century moved frequently and were not always aware of their ages, and because workers sometimes gained monetary benefits by mis-reporting their ages. Demographers find that census data for nineteenth-century Jews provides a rough estimate of their population because of variations in how people registered births and deaths with congregations. After 1856, New South Wales instituted a civil registry to record the vital statistics of the local population. In 1900, the global Jewish population was estimated at 9,441,000. The 1901 Australian census counted 1,354,846 individuals on the continent, however this estimate is inaccurate since it did not include Aboriginal-Australians. Between 1850 and 1900, Jews were never more than
half of one percent of the total Australian population. Between these years, there were an estimated eighty-thousand Jewish people in England, one million in America, two million in Austria and four million more lived within Russia. In 1891, there were about 5,484 Jewish residents in the colony of New South Wales. Since migration patterns favored men, slightly less than half of Sydney’s Jewish community were female. Within the city’s metropolitan area, where most Jewish people lived, the number of Jewish men and women was roughly equal. The ratio was less balanced in the outermost suburbs and in rural areas. In contrast, Britain’s 1894 census revealed that there were at least 600,000 more women than men in the overall population. Alice Leon wrote to Mary Vogel that it was difficult for women she knew to find marriage partners and she was anticipating “a long period of Sunday dinners consisting of nine ladies and three genetlmen.” In 1870, New York had 428,859 more males than females in their population, which indicates that the gender imbalance was not limited to areas influenced by British expansion. Today, the Jewish population in the United Kingdom, Australia and America is similarly small percentage of the population.

The most important determinant of a person’s engagement with Judaism, regardless of whether they lived in frontier environments or cities, has to do with the level of cultural and religious inculcation they experienced as a child. In the nineteenth century, many Jewish religious traditions were associated with the home rather than the synagogue. This is referred to as domestic Judaism, or ‘the little tradition within the big tradition.’ Protestant and Catholic women in the nineteenth century may not have had a clear understanding of the religious customs and traditions of their female Jewish neighbors because of the private nature of Jewish home-life, particularly in areas where Jews were less than one percent of the population. According to rabbinical ideals, as well as tradition, Jewish women prayed individually during the day and some attended synagogue regularly. Women’s synagogue attendance fluctuated depending on local custom and circumstances. Jewish women were expected to uphold three mitzvot, or ethical laws and prayers, while men were expected to abide
Women were expected to follow the family purity laws, known as the laws of Niddah. They were to say a prayer, or benediction, over a separated part of the bread, known as challah when they baked, and to say another prayer as they lit the Sabbath candles on Friday nights at sunset when the Sabbath started. They were also expected to maintain their kitchens according to kosher principles. In contrast, men’s mitzvot were often time-bound, meaning that they were linked to a time of the day or to a date in the calendar year. Time-bound mitzvot provided men with a pathway to experience greater temporal awareness. Women were not expected to be able to attend to their children and household matters and also observe these commandments in a timely way, and were often exempted from them. However, in many cases women were not prohibited from acting on these commandments. One reason cited for women’s exemption from time-sensitive mitzvot was that women’s menstrual cycles made them acutely aware of the passage of time and men needed, and presumably wanted, a way to experience the ‘sanctification of time’ in a parallel way to women. In Jewish society, women were usually taught religious guidelines by their mothers and older female relatives, and they also consulted with men when they needed guidance on more complicated or philosophically-oriented religious matters.

Jewish attitudes are rooted in traditions and norms that are based on the Torah, Talmud, Schulhan Aruch, Mishna, as well as to various other sources related to halakah, also referred to as Mosaic Law or Jewish ecclesiastic law. The study of Jewish religious laws is inherently interdisciplinary, historical and cross-cultural, and provided an early foundation for academic disciplines including anthropology, law, economics, sociology, psychology, philosophy, medicine, and gender studies. Sacred literature is expected to help Jewish society regulate social behavior, in order to promote stability, health, prosperity and social harmony. Italian Rabbi Samuel David Luzatto (1800-1865) felt the laws in the Torah should not be taken as a set of religious laws, but instead as “societal” laws to help guide people during a time when nations were forming.20 Rabbi Moshe Meiselman asserts that religious regulations exist to assure that Jews
are "confronted by God in every sphere" so that "there is no area of life or action from which God is absent."\(^{21}\) In 1888, the Schulhan Aruch continued to be thought of as the "textbook of our orthodoxy" according to Rabbi D. Fay of London,\(^ {22}\) and many correspondents to the newspapers agreed with his perspective.\(^ {23}\) However, in the nineteenth-century, many English-Jews were either religiously apathetic or poorly educated on matters relating to the sacred literature.

In the nineteenth century, when individuals had questions about how to interpret or follow halakah, they usually consulted a rabbi or an older man who had studied the laws. In urban areas of London, and in small predominantly Jewish villages in Europe, known as shtetls, most non-controversial matters could be resolved quickly because there were enough men and women in the area with a basic religious education. In areas where there were fewer communal leaders, it was considerably more difficult to find timely answers to urgent and complex questions. Letters, diaries, sermons, oral histories and newspaper articles reveal the variable ways that Jewish laws were acted upon by average people in various regions. Nineteenth-century rabbis in England and Australia understood that their congregants did not strictly conform to all points of Jewish law, partly because they had not been taught the laws, and partly because of a distancing process many Jews had undergone in relation to religious commandments in this time period. Rabbis were realistic in their requests for their congregations to conform to religious norms, which is evident in the themes and content of their sermons.\(^ {24}\)

As interpreters of sacred texts, rabbis and teachers in the Jewish community are, and were, generally sensitive to the distinctive needs and experiences of women, even when they did not intentionally align themselves with feminist ideals. Texts that relate to religiously-based legal rulings and cultural practices remain largely outside of boundaries of the discourses within secular universities because their focus is religious. Until recently, it was uncommon for non-Jewish scholars to approach the study of religiously-observant Jewish women, partly because they lacked an existing knowledge of Jewish
sacred literature. Scholars who focus on women’s empowerment through Jewish law tend to have strong ties to the Orthodox Jewish community, and are criticized for being ‘too close’ to their subjects of study to be objective. When rabbis write about women's role in Judaism and in sacred literature they usually follow the rabbinic method of introducing the most lenient, the most stringent, and the most common or middle perspective, which promotes objectivity. They regularly include the views of rabbis from across the world and cite their rulings from the time the Torah was written to the present day, which promotes Relativism and helps to identify short-lived social trends, idiosyncratic perspectives, as well as the influence of national and cultural values, any of which can introduce bias into their legal rulings, advice or scholarly research. Their methodology is sound because it increases the likelihood that the researcher will provide three or more vantage points to an issue rather than viewing it in narrow or dichotomous terms. A relatively recent genera of scholarship emerged in the late 1970s, discussing halakah in a way that readers who are unfamiliar with Jewish law can readily comprehend, yet this literature is still complex enough to be appropriate for specialists. The authors of these texts were often rabbis, or their spouses. They began by assessing Jewish gender norms in order to provide readers with points of law related to women’s freedoms and high status, which promotes women’s value in the present. Many of their texts provide strong female role-models from the Old Testament, which suggests that rabbis have applied feminist methodologies within their research, even if this was done covertly or unintentionally. Rabbis who are accused of suppressing women's interests are ultimately less guilty of this than many of the academic scholars who critique them.

Historian Ann Curthoys was among the early Australian feminists to request that scholars of Australian life begin to extend their research beyond the creation of dualistic images related to Victorian gender norms that leave little room for women to model themselves after anything but “damned whores” or “God’s police.” This is pertinent advice for scholars of Jewish life since Jewish women in the
Victorian period were rarely called upon to act as 'God's Police' and there were only a few complaints that Jewish women were becoming prostitutes in Melbourne, after they arrived from England. Rabbi Emanuel Myer Myers of the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation later admitted that his initial report was exaggerated and based on only one woman's experience. Because of Judaism's laws of *Onah*, that regulate sexual expression within the privacy of marital relationships and promote women's right to sexual pleasure, Jewish couples were less likely to aspire to the Victorian ideology that valued 'passionlessness' within their private lives, even if they shared an ethic with Protestants and Catholics to remain modest and sexually neutral in the public sphere. The activities, traditions and values that made Jewish women good role models in the nineteenth century were often based on different ideals than Christian and Catholic women, although there were outward similarities, such as that profanity and extra-marital promiscuity were to be avoided if women wished to be respected.

Jewish women in the nineteenth century were potentially viewed as marginal by other Jews within London and Sydney, in addition to being considered a minority group in relation to Christians. Reform-Jews were in the minority, additionally, women's age, racial heritage, cultural background, nation of birth, level of wealth, sexual orientation, marital status, the religious background of her spouse, the number of children she had given birth to, her habits related to keeping *kosher*, her employment status and educational attainment could all potentially alter her social standing. Scholars also frame the material they gather and present based on today's biases around these issues. For example, the strong value placed on married life has meant that the activities and perspectives of unmarried or widowed women are absent or presented in a distorted manner. Adults are given priority over the concerns and accomplishments of children, regardless of their gender. Intermarried couples were, and often still are, viewed as marginal to the cultural groups of both marriage partners. Christine Benvenuto points out that women who intermarried were confronted by a more complicated and stigmatized
role in Jewish society because 'Jewishness’ is traced through mothers, rather than through fathers. As a result of this, the language used to describe intermarried women in Jewish society is more negative than it is toward intermarried men. Wealthy couples are often accorded a higher status and more in-depth attention than those who needed or accepted charity. European-born Jewish migrants were considered ‘foreigners’ in British society even when they had been in the region for a longer period of time than native speakers of English, which was often an outcome of racial prejudice related to the darker skin-color of some migrants. Scholars expect Jewish research to conform to the cultural traditions of Ashkenazic American and European-Jews, and this contributes to British-Jewry and the Sephardim being excluded or misrepresented. In larger cities, the Sephardim and Ashkenazim tend to worship in separate spaces and in smaller communities they often share a building and have services at different times so that they are able to worship according to their own cultural preferences. Hilary Rubinstein asserts in Jews of Australia, that Sephardic Jewry played no important role in Australian history until the post WWII period, partly due to their small population. However, this dissertation would not be possible without the diaries, letters and school records of the often intermarried Montefiore and de Rothschild families, who were among the wealthiest families in Europe and the United Kingdom. They contributed to life in Australia by promoting migration, becoming migrants, as well as through their charitable influence from their distant residences in England, and most importantly for their struggle for equal representation within England’s government. Research for this dissertation provides a more holistic picture of Jewish women’s lives because the experiences of elite women are presented alongside those who were poor, young, orphaned, unmarried, widowed, non-religious, intermarried, as well as those who were marginalized because of their racial background, cultural beliefs or place of their birth.

Isaac Deutscher’s research provides guidance on how scholars can respond to exclusions and biases in their research in his comments about non-religious Jews. He suggests that the perspective of the
non-Jewish Jew, or the non-religious Jew, should be given equal representation because individuals who live on the margins of multiple social groups are able to see beyond the perceptions of those “who are shut in within one society, one nation, or one religion,” and believe their way of seeing the world has “absolute and unchangeable validity and that all that contradicts their standards is somehow ‘unnatural,’ or inferior, or evil.” As Deutscher sees it, marginal individuals are able to “comprehend more clearly the great movement and the great contradictoriness of nature and society.”

Historical research on English-Jewish women began with investigations of famous women and themes that are important to women today. Jewish women’s absence and exclusion from academic research was so severe in 1993, that Naomi Shepherd pronounced in her book *Price Below Rubies*, that there is still “no history of Jewish women.” Today this is no longer the case. However, books and journal articles related to nineteenth-century British-Jewish women continue to be rare. In the last decade, scholars of Jewish life are making progress and the number of community studies is increasing, yet issues related to Jewish economic and political history are more common than studies of ethnicity, gender, religious or cultural traditions. The following scholars have advanced our understanding of British-Jewish women in the nineteenth century by focusing primarily on famous women writers and reformers or the role of women in fiction: Dianne Ashton, Linda Beckman, Brian Cheyette, John Docke, Michael Galchinsky, Albert Hyamson, Laura Marks, Michael Ragussis, Lancia Roselya, Cynthia Scheinberg, Naomi Shepherd, Ellen Umansky, and Philip Weinberger. It is a recent development that studies, such as this dissertation, are setting aside claims that ‘men’s history is women’s history,’ or that it is immodest to focus public attention on the lives of average men and women who were young, old or poor. Thus far, historical research on mid to late nineteenth-century Australian-Jews has focused on the wealthiest and most Orthodox individuals from Melbourne, partly because there were numerous interpersonal conflicts. Lazarus Goldman’s *Jews in Victoria in the Nineteenth*
Century provides a foundation for research in this area, although his book lacked footnotes. In comparison, Sydney's Jewish community lacked internal conflicts. The largest collections of written evidence about individuals within Sydney's four most prominent congregations related to the students, charity recipients, and pensioners. This research included women who were intermarried, or were not religious, as long as they appeared in Jewish vital records, correspondence or Jewish newspapers, without being identified as members of another religious group, such as women who donated funds to Jewish causes but were known to be Christians.

Lysbeth Cohen's Beginning with Esther, challenged women's former exclusion from Australian histories of the free-settlement period by focusing mostly on well-known women whom she had interviewed. A small number of single Jewish women and family groups were assisted by Catholic reformer Caroline Chisholm in England, and Marise Cohen and Bruce Le Bransky published articles about the migrants she assisted. Ilana Lutman's Master of Arts thesis A Woman of Valour, focuses on the life of Ruby Rich, Jewish musician from Sydney who became a prominent feminist after the turn of the century. John Levi and George Bergman provide insights into the lives of early Jewish convicts, involuntary migrants, who lived aside the earliest free-settlers and non-Jewish convicts, generally prior to 1850. Suzanne Rutland's research focuses on events in twentieth-century Jewish history, such as migration, responses to feminism, and the history the Hebrew Standard of Australasia. She co-authored a book with Sophie Caplan, about the history of the New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies after the turn of the nineteenth century. Jewish Sydney, a booklet published by Helen Bersten, the honorary archivist of the Sydney branch of the Australian Jewish Historical Society archives, makes excellent use of available historical sources and provides a concise foundation for research on Jewish Sydney. Hilary Rubinstein and Bill Rubinstein, rarely discuss gender issues or women's history within their research, which covers events from across Australia, from first convict ship in 1788 to the present day. The strength of their research is in their focus on economic issues,
anti-Semitism, philo-Semitism, assimilation and demography. Naomi Gale's *Sephardim of Sydney*, extends our knowledge of a Jewish subgroup in the twenty-first century and provides more emphasis on women's role in society than was traditional in the past.

A factor that contributed to the lack of written evidence by and about Jewish women can be found in Judaism's prohibition against any activity that could be considered work on the Sabbath, which included writing and lighting a fire for warmth and light. In urban areas non-Jewish children were usually hired to drop by and kindle the hearths of Jewish households, but in rural areas this would have been more difficult to arrange. This is part of why Jews showed a marked preference for city life, even prior to the introduction of electric lights that could be left on continuously in the main room and central heating that could be regulated in advance of the Sabbath. Jewish women who were religious did not have a day of rest that allowed them to write to friends or document their observations. In her article "Kinship and Accountability," Janet Doust indicates that the Booth family, who were Methodists, also regularly abstained from writing in their family diary on the Sabbath, similar to the Jewish custom of abstaining from this type of 'work.' Riding a bicycle, for example, was considered an appropriate leisure activity for Christians, but was defined as 'work' by many Jews and was prohibited on the Sabbath. One London writer in 1888 wrote of the contradictory impulses Jews had in relation to religious reforms, which included disregarding some prohibitions against work on the Sabbath, and stated that a Jewish person could be found "Clinging with the most strenuous fidelity to his ancestral faith," yet still be "open to all the influence of the hour." Nineteenth-century Jews were in the process of reforming religious practices, which often entailed mirroring their Christian neighbors more closely, however this was contrary to Jewish norms and the "injunction not to imitate the manners" of non-Jews, which passed between generations "from time immemorial."

Other issues also contributed to the paucity of women's writing. Janice Gothard finds that it was not illiteracy that inhibited working-
class women from keeping diaries, rather it was that they were cumbersome to carry, time consuming to keep, and many women lacked an audience for their writing after they migrated.\textsuperscript{59} Middle-class writers had more leisure time to write and could afford the postage to mail the writing to their friends and relatives,\textsuperscript{60} and for this reason they are more likely to be represented by historians, although they migrated in smaller numbers than working-class and destitute women. The amount of time women spent indoors also influenced their writing habits. England's cold and rainy climate may have contributed to women spending their leisure time indoors writing, whereas Sydney's climate was conducive to outdoor activity. Across all religious groups, the wealthiest individuals were the most likely to stay in one location, which facilitated their ability to obtain the supplies needed to create and collect letters and other types of memorabilia that historians relish. However, without migration or traveling a distance from 'home,' there was no pressing need to correspond, which makes it particularly difficult to reconstruct the life-ways of a small religious group within one city, where most social contact probably occurred in person.

Throughout history, women writers struggled against bias that favored men and many resorted to writing anonymously or under masculine sounding pen names in order to be published. For example, it is unclear if the column in the \textit{Jewish Chronicle}, which was devoted to providing middle-class readers with kosher recipes, had been written by a woman or a man. Of the Australian newspapers, two women regularly wrote under feminine pen-names. Mrs. Frederick B. Aronson of Sydney published a regular column in the \textit{Sydney Mail} under a pseudonym 'Thalia.' In Melbourne, the \textit{Australasian Hebrew} (1895-96), published Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau's wife Phoebe, who also wrote under the name 'Miriam,' a Biblical \textit{nom-de-plume}. This influential newspaper was available in seven cities in mainland Australia, and could also be purchased in Hobart, Launceston, Wellington, Auckland, Dunedin and Christchurch. The Mitchell Library in Sydney also had a subscription at the time it was published. The \textit{Jewish Chronicle} of London was also
generally available, which promoted interconnections between Jewish residents there and in Australasia. Australian-Jewish women did not have a steady Jewish newspaper that was locally published until 1871, which meant that their writing was only published in the newspapers if their views were approved of by Christian editors, if they wrote anonymously, or if they submitted their letters to London's Jewish newspapers. London papers reduced their coverage of Australian issues once the colonies had their own steady Jewish newspaper. In Sydney, the Hebrew Standard of Australasia (1895-1958), was owned and edited by Alfred Harris, and the family business was influenced by Henry Harris' wife Amelia. She may have written or co-authored some of the articles, many of which were printed anonymously, and she was the colony's first Jewish female compositor, or type-setter. Women were well represented in every issue of this newspaper, perhaps because of her behind-the-scenes influence. Similarly, Harriette Benisch, wife of Abraham Benisch, who was the editor of the Jewish Chronicle, also influenced the content of the paper by working as one of the first Jewish women journalists, although her name did not appear in the paper. She was well known to the Jewish community for the "services rendered" with her sister Mrs. Ellis A. Davis to the Westminster Jews Free School. Upon her death, it was said that she was Abraham's constant companion, and her "strong heart encouraged him; her gifted mind helped him; her assiduous industry aided him; her sweet and angelic disposition blessed him."61 Another public forum for women to present their writing in public was at meetings of the Sydney Jewish Literary and Debating Society. The topics discussed at their meetings were announced in the newspaper and some of the debates generated further discussions in the press. Jewish newspapers in England and Australia provided women with significantly greater influence after 1895. This was likely inspired by the emergence of the American Jewess, which was published from 1895 to 1899 by Hungarian-born editor Rosa Sonneschein (1847-1932). Although London's Jewish newspapers included sporadic letters by Jewish women and women's issues were given coverage, there were few serial columns written by
Jewish women, specifically for women, with the exception of the kosher dinner menus and Grace Aguilar's novels, which expanded her influence posthumously. Only a few women had the sustained resources and social support to influence others through their writing prior to the end of the nineteenth century.

Throughout history, women have preferred to write newspaper articles, speeches, poetry, newsletters, and short essays because they lacked the sustained time necessary to plan and complete complex writing projects. The presence of written evidence about nineteenth-century women from all religious groups is often the result of decisions made by individuals who postdated writers and artists. As one example, the archival records of Sydney's Jewish women's charities were mostly destroyed, but records from the charities maintained simultaneously by their husbands were valued and preserved. Some documents related to women, such as diaries and the records of the Sydney Hebrew Ladies' Dorcas Society, were probably destroyed intentionally in order to conceal sensitive information about women, such as premarital pregnancies, involvement in public drunkenness, prostitution, intimate relationships, or simply news that women did not wish to share with male readers or other family members. It may have been a common but poorly documented practice to destroy personal writing after a person died. Although some correspondence was clearly private, British writers in the nineteenth-century expected that their letters and journals would be read aloud to friends and family members. The writing of non-Jewish Australian women was often preserved and published, including adventurer Lady Jane Franklin (1791-1875), the wife of Lieutenant John Franklin, who was the Governor of Tasmania. Rachel Biddulph Henning's (1826-1914) Australian letters were preserved and published, even though her writing was not overtly controversial. Her letters are exceptionally rich in details related to the views of English migrants in the gold rush period in colonial Australia. In comparison to adventurous women like England's Isabel Burton (1831-1896), Jewish women's travels were rarely solitary and tended to be quite mild and reserved.
Michael Galchinsky finds that Jewish women writers of fiction were among the most active within the Jewish literary community in London, but I found few examples of Jewish women who published their writing and had known links to Sydney. In December 1883, Florence Marion Emanuel, a young Jewess from a wealthy family in Goulburn New South Wales, wrote poetry and short essays, including one titled "Travel as a Means of Culture." She encouraged readers to travel in order to expand their perspectives. Her parents published her writing as a collection after her death, not long after they were written. Some of her writing had distinctly Australian themes, such as her poem "The Kangaroo." Although she was in her teens when she wrote, her contribution is significant because it is one of the few extant books written by an Australian-Jewish female prior to the turn of the century. Unfortunately, with the exception of Emanuel's book, the following texts written by Jewish women in Sydney were not accessible as I was writing. In 1879, Mrs. Charles Cook's *Comic History of New South Wales from 1777 to 1877*, was written about her travels. Her husband had been active in the publishing community through his work at the *Sydney Morning Herald*. Mrs. Julia Blitz's *After a Hundred Years*, was about Australian-Jewish life. In 1900, columnist Mrs. Frederick B. Aronson, formerly Zara Baar, published *Twentieth Century Cooking and Home Decoration*. When Jewish women in Australia did write, their subjects often included themes related to travel and migration, or domesticity, and it seems that most women who migrated so far from their birthplaces preferred to be in motion rather than settling down to write stories or letters to the editor.

Alternative sources of biographical material about women and working-class migrants can occasionally be gleaned from log-books and diaries of the ship's crew, from notes made by fellow passengers, or from minute-books of communal groups that provided migrants with financial assistance. Jewish migrants to New South Wales are not easily identified within written records that originated outside of the Jewish community, such as passenger lists, because in these contexts they were identified by gender and nationality, rather than by
their religion. Women were the subjects of advertisements as well as the presumed consumers of products that were intended for female consumers, such as baking powder, hot cocoa, lime cordials, iron tablets, soaps and 'children's road vehicles.' In the last five years of the century, Jewish women increasingly appeared in photos within Jewish newspapers aside their spouses, and as individuals, often in round cameo photos. They were even represented in drawings that advertised the mining industry in Australia within the Australasian Hebrew.

Scholars who study Catholic and Christian life rarely have sufficient source material or a strong background in the culturally and religiously distinctive practices that are linked to Judaism, and as a result they do not include Jews in a sustained or accurate way within their analysis. Ann O'Brien's book God's Willing Workers, requests that scholars broaden their research to include the lives of Jewish women in Sydney, as it was beyond the scope of her research into the religious lives of Protestant and Catholic women. Similarly, Hilary Carey's Believing in Australia, provides readers with only an introductory glance at Jewish life in the pre-Holocaust period. Although historical source material about Jewish women in England and Australia exists, it was often overlooked because Jews are such a small population and as a result, Jewish women have been mistakenly clumped with Protestant and Catholic women under the belief that Judeo-Christian traditions were indistinct, in comparison to Muslims, Hindus, traditional African religions, Native North and South Americans, Buddhists and Atheists.

People from minority groups often look to the past in order to find role models that are suited to society's current social needs. Protestant women are generally able to read books and articles related to life in England and Australia and see aspects of themselves mirrored back. When Jewish women read books that claim to represent a cross-section of English or Australian society, they often find that their own cultural and religious norms are absent or are skewed, while Protestant and Catholic women's values are presented accurately and as if their lives were normative. This provides a false
representation of society and tends to alienate readers whose religion is not based on the *New Testament*. Australian feminists Ann Curthoys and Barbara Caine find that many aspects of British women's lives in Australia remain open to exploration by historians, which means women from all religious backgrounds are still in need of a wider range of role models from the past.\(^7\) Scholars often prefer to engage with issues linked to rational thought, rather than to belief systems, and post-colonial scholar Durree Ahmed and anthropologist Susan Starr Sered suggest that religion is the last frontier within academia. They assert that studies of religious life hold tremendous potential to contribute to debates about identity formation.\(^7\) In the late 1970s, minority women rapidly created their own discourses on feminism and civil rights issues to combat categorizations that created multiple layers of oppression or exclusion for religious women who experienced homophobia,\(^7\) racism, sexism and classism.\(^7\) Research on Jewish women emerged more strongly in the 1990s. Historians David Cesarani and Tony Kushner find that British historians are still reluctant to study minority groups.\(^7\) This is changing and British Prime Minister Gordon Brown praised Greville Janner and Derek Taylor for their recent book *Jewish Parliamentarians* and indicated that although Jews were always a small component of the population, their loyalty to Britain was highly appreciated.\(^7\) The erasure and invisibility of minority religious groups within academic scholarship solidifies that Christianity is the most viable and desirable set of religious values. The inclusion of minorities disrupts this hegemony.

In addition to being omitted from research, Jews are still the subject of negative attention in literature that is often written by non-Jewish academics. In Judith Godden's 2005 article "A 'Region of Indecency and Pruriency': Religious Conflict, Female Communities and Health Care in Colonial New South Wales," a single Jewish man, Joseph G. Raphael, a craftsman and argumentative member of a board, was the focus of attention primarily for his use of profane language. His ongoing, and amiable, contributions to Jewish life, particularly through the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, were not mentioned. He stood as the sole representative of
Judaism within the article and was referred to as “the Jew.” Jewish women’s absence in the field of nursing was not mentioned, nor that they found it a ‘degrading’ occupation. In contrast, Catholics and Christians were given fair representation. Anti-Semitic biases continue to circulate today and still need to be challenged.

Words convey power, and the ability to write and speak in public, even if it is in the form of profanity, is reflective of an individual’s social standing. Oppressed individuals are often denied the freedom to express themselves or preserve evidence of their views, which reduces their level of influence and credibility, and at times diminishes their “personhood.” Jewish feminists, including Gerda Lerner, argue that the suppression of women’s experiences is symptomatic of women’s marginality and exclusion from structured power. Paula Hyman adds that in their research, many scholars have unwittingly reified and privileged masculinity, and the types of social and financial power that women could not access equally. Jewish women’s writing may be scarce, because they experienced a double oppression, in that their words could be silenced within Jewish society on the basis of gender and by Christian society on the basis of being members of a religious group whose values were perceived to challenge the truth of Christianity. Within the sphere of religious history, women’s activities are rarely presented, even when they were the most active members of their congregations and affiliated auxiliary groups. As a result, Karla Goldman finds that Jewish women’s communal organizations in the nineteenth century are open to further investigation. Women continue to be overshadowed by men in religious affairs and politics, partly because women have not yet participated equally in these areas of life for a sustained period of time.

Rachel Adler, a Jewish-feminist theologian, effectively justifies research on Jewish women with the argument that their choices “require some degree of power.” She requests that scholars become attuned to female perspectives and forms of empowerment, because women’s inclusion necessarily modifies the boundaries of the existing masculine discourses. In order to alleviate tensions and stigmas associated with being undervalued, she proposes that we begin to view
differences, as "variation, rather than deviation." Jewish women's contributions within the home are often ignored, discounted and misunderstood by scholars who privilege involvement in public traditions, particularly the synagogue. This generates an unbalanced view of women's lives. Orthodox and Reform-Jews have contrasting views on women's equality and disempowerment, and these variations can be presented as viable alternatives to each other. Women's role as care-givers to children was always central to the maintenance of Judaism and is something Jewish women held in common with women from other religious groups. The religious education of women and their children is one of many issues addressed in this dissertation that should be treated as central components of scholarship related to women's religious observances and their contributions to nineteenth-century communal life. The most effective way to make Jewish women visible within historical research is to re-value their role in the home, and to view their choices on a wide range of religious issues as reflections of their distinctive social power.
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Chapter 1: Anglo-Jewish Women’s Observations about Religious and Racial Tolerance.

British Jews viewed themselves, and were viewed by others, as distinctive because of their ‘race’, and religion. Their cultural identities and traditions often originated in nations outside of the United Kingdom and British colonies. One Jewish writer succinctly asserted that if it “is difficult for the Christian to understand the Jew; it is more difficult still for him to understand the Jewess.” This began to change during the nineteenth century. Prior to Jewish political Emancipation in 1858, one writer observed that roughly “three-fourths of the whole subjects of the British dominions are Hindoos, Mahomedans, Fetish worshippers, heathens and idolaters.” Jews were a part of this larger group of non-Christians who shared a British identity without basing their lives on the teachings of the New Testament. In the nineteenth century, it was increasingly accepted that “one-half of our domestic population never enter a place of worship, and never perform an act of religious devotion,” which meant that religion had lost some potency as a social boundary, at a time when women’s inclusion in politics became more accepted. Even when Christians and Jews had a heightened desire for conversation across religious and political boundaries, in the 1890s, it was still difficult because of differing gender norms and a lack of knowledge about each other’s religious practices, which further obscured efforts to collaborate across other boundaries, such as race, age, wealth, ethnicity and national origin.

Jewish men and women were expected to follow Jewish law differently from each other on the basis of gender, and it was particularly unsettling for some men in the 1870s when some Jewish women requested that they be treated identically under civil law. It was often considered immodest for women of any religious or racial background to accept “significant roles in politics and government,” in the nineteenth century, because women were not expected to be able to care for their families and succeed at a career that was both
public and time-intensive. Women’s political views remained overshadowed by men’s opinions until end of the twentieth century.6

The discourse surrounding the struggle for Anglo-Jewish Emancipation and Jewish women’s rights rarely includes the voices of individual men and women from the past. Their opinions continue to be almost completely muted by the historians representing them, even in recently published sources and internet sites, with authors Pamela Nadell and Aron Rodrigue as notable exceptions.7 Generalizations about Jewish women’s attitudes are usually formulated based on our knowledge of a few reformers from England, including Amy Levy (1861-1889), Lily H. Montagu (1873-1963), Grace Aguilar (1816-1847) and the women in the wealthy de Rothschild and Montefiore families, who either wrote fiction, newspaper articles, diaries or had collections of letters that were published posthumously.8 Iliana Lutman finds that the accomplishments and social activism of twentieth-century Australian-Jewish feminists, such as Ruby Rich-Schalit (1888-1988), were not acknowledged to be Jewish because she was not religious. She considered herself Jewish because her mother was Jewish and because she was culturally Jewish. At times, she and other politically active Jewish women are not recognized as feminists because the tone and style of their activism did not appeal to Protestant and Catholic women’s definitions of feminism, from the perspective of second and third-wave feminists.9 In the absence of studies detailing the daily lives of Jewish women in various regions, it still remains difficult to compare the political views of famous women whose experiences were atypical, to those of their less-famous cohorts.

This chapter complicates the existing literature in relation to Jewish men’s struggle for political emancipation by documenting women’s parallel efforts to overcome legal and de facto discrimination as they sought the right to vote. Women confronted prejudiced stereotypes and occupational exclusions in a variety of ways. Their views challenged the popular belief, then and now, that there was minimal anti-Semitism in nineteenth-century England and Australia.10 The response of native-born British-Jews and non-Jews to newly arrived persecuted European-Jewish migrants in the last quarter of
century reveals that non-native born Jewish women also had to struggle for full equality within Jewish society as a result of racism, classism and prejudices against foreign-born individuals.

In the nineteenth century, prior to the formation of Israel, Jewish people were accustomed to negotiating for their full inclusion and equality within the societies where they settled and only a few had experienced life in what was then called Palestine. Due to anti-Semitism, Jewish people were accustomed to spending "extraordinary periods of time in the absence of any homeland,"¹¹ and thought of themselves as part of a Diaspora, or group of people who had become "scattered" across the world.¹² Jewish religious laws provided individuals with a common set of ethics that ideally guided the way they behaved so that they avoided conflict with each other and their non-Jewish neighbors. In the nineteenth-century, people who identified themselves as British were still predominantly Protestant, except for the Irish. The alternative beliefs of religious minorities challenged the 'truth' of Protestantism, which in the past had equated with treason.¹³ Jewish religious beliefs differed significantly from Christianity, and Edward I had expelled Jews from England in 1290 on the basis of these differences. The Sabbaths passed nearly nineteen-thousand times before Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) successfully assisted Jewish efforts to live openly again in England in 1656. After their readmission, many British-Jewish families retold family stories about what it was like for them when they were exiled from England, or from Spain or Portugal during the Inquisition when Jews lived secretly as Crypto-Jews who appeared to be Catholic in order to survive. In some areas of the world the Inquisition was still active in the nineteenth-century. As a previously exiled minority group, Jews were not prominent in political matters and laws existed to curb their influence in government affairs.

Initially, after Jews were readmitted to England in 1656, Sephardic Jews were the predominant group and their histories and cultures were distinctive from Ashkenazic Jews. Their cultural and ethnic identities were based in traditions from Portugal, Spain, Italy, Holland, North Africa and the Middle East, where they lived aside Catholic and
Muslim neighbors. Many of them experienced the Inquisition more directly than Jews who lived in Europe, Asia, North America or the West Indies. Ashkenazic Jews had their origins in the remaining areas of Continental Europe, and migrated in substantial numbers to England, Australasia and America after 1880, as they escaped persecution that became increasingly violent, common and legal.

Although English-Jews were subjected to negative depictions, they were not the only religious minority to face legal and occupational restrictions and social stereotyping. Catholics, Unitarians, Atheists and other Protestant Dissenters also had fewer privileges than Protestants even when they had the social advantage provided by being white-skinned, wealthy and native-born. Jews often had ‘Semitic’ features and distinctive clothing styles that made them easy to identify in public, whereas Catholics were often visually indistinct from Protestants of their same social class. In 1837, there were about thirty-thousand Jews living among England’s overall population of about fifteen-million. Jews represented about two percent of the population. In comparison, there were five to six-million Catholics and about three-million Protestant Dissenters. The percentage of Protestants, Catholics and Jews remained in roughly the same proportion to each other as the overall population in Britain expanded. There was a general fear among Jews that Catholics were collaborating in “nefarious schemes” with easily corrupted government officials in order to obstruct justice for Jews as they were seeking political emancipation, which prevented Jews from forming alliances with Catholics over their shared legal disabilities. Similar to Irish-Catholics, Jews served as a referent for what the Protestant majority viewed as outsiders or ‘others,’ but they were a small component of the population compared to Catholics and they did not attract the same level of negative attention. Catholics or Atheists were viewed as being disruptive to the status quo to a greater extent than Jews.

Catholics were vulnerable to accusations that they were more loyal to the Pope than to British interests, and Jews faced similar treatment due to their identification as members of the ‘Hebrew Nation,’ or the ‘Jewish Nation.’ Jews valued this aspect of their identity and often
reflected upon it proudly, but rarely, if ever, saw it as being in conflict with their allegiance to Britain. For the most part, Jews in England and in the colonies were considered as 'patriotic' and 'virtuous' as their Protestant neighbors. Jewish philanthropist and communal leader Sir Moses Montefiore integrated British cultural traditions into Jewish ones by saying “God Bless the Queen” each day after removing his yarmulke as he had his glass of port.19 His relatives Constance and Annie de Rothschild were presented to Queen Victoria (1819-1901) as young women, and Constance maintained contact with the Queen thereafter.20 Jews saw themselves as being part of a larger group who represented the British flag and “formed a sacred fellowship”21 in their loyalty to the Queen, who they prayed for during synagogue services. They hailed her as the ‘Queen of the Jews’ because of her benevolence.22

The concept of ‘tolerance’ toward British Jews did not necessarily equate with equal legal rights. The prevailing presumption in London and Sydney was that the “tolerance” extended to Jews was synonymous with being provided with equal legal, economic, political and social privileges as every other ‘free-born Englishmen,’ even when Jews did not yet have full political, educational or legal rights.23 In 1895, a writer named Quidnune suggested that Jewish political emancipation in 1858 had not helped Jews to achieve full social equality and stated that this was “painful to acknowledge,” particularly because “it is not caused by any fault of our own.”24 Although, English Protestants were more willing to listen to religious minorities speak about their “grievances”25 and they were often credited with taking a “greater interest in the condition of the Jews than the people of any other country”26 their interest sometimes concealed efforts to convert Jews to Christianity or to erase their cultural differences.27

Jews did not have a significant amount of control within the publishing industry, and their complaints about their experiences with racism, anti-Semitism and anti-immigrant sentiments were not well recorded until 1841 when London’s Voice of Jacob newspaper was first published. The Jewish Chronicle became available to readers in
1844, which had positive influence on Jewish society. The ability of women and Jews to present their own words to the public conveyed a form of social and economic power. Literature and theatrical productions also promoted anti-Semitism within British society and in 1847, Aguilar defended Jews by placing them in a broader category, that of being human and prone to doubts and errors, as well as being engaged in the process of learning, which invariably entailed making mistakes. Her wording was paraphrased in 1864 in a newspaper article, which was a reminder that discrimination still haunted the streets of London in the post-Emancipation period.

T. T., of Manchester, argued in 1844 against the presumption that being an Englishman was synonymous with being a Christian, by arguing that equality was not shared by everyone equally: "Thousands there are who obstinately refused the English Jew any right to the possession of political freedom," even as they "staunchly maintain 'that political freedom is the birthright of every Englishman!'" Although freedom was perceived to be a "wholesome national appetite," circumstances compelled the author to question why it was that an Englishmen who happened to be Jewish was not yet "permitted to claim his seat at the general political feast, on the fair condition, that he will curtail no neighbour whatever". After expressing dissatisfaction about the way the "claims" of Jews had "hitherto been disregarded in this country," the reader was asked to consider why these questions were "never satisfactorily answered." In 1877, Helen Taylor suggested that the religious apathy of English-Jews had contributed to the feeling of 'tolerance' between people: "there is a great deal of indifference, and that is why we have tolerance." In other words, Jews achieved higher levels of integration in British societies because they were in the process of assimilating and had dropped many of the religious customs that made them distinctive.

English-Jews were sometimes labeled 'foreign' because their association with the land was not as clearly established as it was for Protestant families. Centuries of exclusion had caused most Jewish
families to trace their heritage through areas in continental Europe, where they often lived within Catholic communities. In the 1840s and 1850s this was a detrimental association given that England’s Jews and Protestants shared a strong anti-Catholic bias, partly because of the history of the Inquisition. T. T., of Manchester, defended Jews by suggesting that they could question their Christian ‘opponents’ by asking them to prove that they were “not the offspring of some Italian singer, Dutch sailor, German sugar-baker, French dancing master or Portuguese cabin-boy,” given that undoubtedly “more than one honest Englishman’s lineage may be traced” to migrants from these predominantly Catholic countries. This argument continued with the reminder that William the Conqueror had “either found Jews in this country at his arrival, or brought Jews over with him on his invasion,” making the Jewish connection to the land as “ancient,” and by extension as legitimately British, as the names “Howard and Percy.” Another writer asserted that Jews had “English blood” flowing “through our veins” and had always “imbibed that noble pride which is inseparable from free-born Englishmen.” This writer argued that being native-born was necessary in developing an English identity. This perspective contributed to social tensions between native-born British-Jews and recent European migrants who were escaping persecution and hoped to acquire fuller political and social rights after they settled in ‘tolerant’ England.

British-Jews from Reform and Orthodox congregations expressed a shared desire to avoid overt linkages to superstitious practices and outdated attitudes that were associated with the religious practices of many migrant Jews from Europe. At times their actions bordered on being anti-Semitic toward their co-religionists. As early as 1859, there were tensions between native-born and foreign-born Jews over who had control over communal resources, and new divisions were formed on the basis of national origin, access to wealth, racial characteristics, and those who were accustomed to socializing with upper-class non-Jews. Jews born outside of Britain were thought to “studiously estrange themselves” from British-born Jews and were accused of failing to “bear their portion of communal burdens.” Their ‘criminal
tendencies’ and promotion of radicalism were feared,\textsuperscript{38} and as a result, their “ethnological idiosyncrasies” were closely examined.\textsuperscript{39} They were also resented and blamed for promoting ‘sweat work’ within factories and for outcompeting native-born Jews by working for low wages.\textsuperscript{40} In 1892, the Chief Rabbi referred to London’s East End as a “colony” in need of “refining, civilizing and Anglicising,” because of the large number of non-British born migrants living in the area.\textsuperscript{41}

Minorities are vulnerable to being criticized by those with greater social power when they engaged in self-protective strategies and the idea that English Jews lived in segregated communities entirely by choice, rather than compulsion, went unquestioned by William Chambers of Edinburgh, who published Grace Aguilar’s \textit{History of Jews in England} (1847). He commented at the end of her monograph that it was the “peculiar religion of the Hebrews and their habit of worshipping apart,”\textsuperscript{42} that caused them to remain socially aloof. His observation that they were a “group apart” was supported by later historians.\textsuperscript{43} English-Jews lived within close proximity to each other within the larger metropolitan cities, not only for protection and a sense of affirming their identities, but also in order to be near the resources that supported Jewish religious customs, such as synagogues, \textit{kosher} butchers, schools, Jewish communal organizations, social activities, and extended family members.\textsuperscript{44}

Jews in England were not always able to hold those in power accountable for their lack of civil rights and other abuses. In 1847, Jewish authoress Grace Aguilar viewed the Jewish Diaspora as a group of exiles grieving over their losses, while enduring “the most awful persecution and misery, if not by actual violence, by contempt and abasement,” as well as “being socially and politically denied our privileges.”\textsuperscript{45} In 1849, another Jewish writer in London complained openly about the ability of Christians to act with impunity and “enjoy all the triumph and all the pleasure of your persecution without exposing yourselves to any danger.”\textsuperscript{46} Constance de Rothschild, a member of one of England’s most influential and wealthy Jewish families, did not agree with her sister Annie that a universal religion
might resolve the social tensions that they observed. She was
determined to continue practicing Judaism, even if that meant that
she spent her life in a "battle against human prejudice and
intolerance." She observed that Jews "had no very assured social
standing, and there was in many quarters a deep-seated prejudice
against them." Annie's desire was to "elevate my poor, sunken race,
to make them better and more solid men; to forget all past injuries,
only think of the present worth." She was apologetic for her inability
to change the world as a result of limits placed on her by society's
gender norms and ultimately surrendered her political aspirations for
domestic ones: "But I am a woman and must think of myself and my
own circle." The men in her family led the public debates on Jewish
Emancipation and even as a fifteen-years-old, she reflected that the
inclusion of British-Jews into Parliament could be the "greatest
misfortune that could befall the Jews." She feared it would lead to the
erasure of Jewish culture as individuals assimilated to Protestant
society. Civil rights discourses from the 1840s to the present day,
include women as moderate reformers who addressed their shared
concerns about how they might transform British society into a
country where justice was available to everyone equally.

Jews were excluded from attaining high positions within the
English government, and even today if a member of the Royal family
marries someone Jewish or Catholic they are not permitted to ascend
to the throne and become the head of state. There is an exhaustive
literature detailing men's views on the public debates associated with
'the Jewish Question' as they sought to alter existing political
arrangements so that Jews had legal equality. Baron Lionel de
Rothschild (1808-1879) was elected to the House of Lords five times,
but was prohibited from taking his seat because it required him to
take an oath stating that he would fulfill his duty to the country 'on
the true faith of a Christian.' His wife was Charlotte de Rothschild
(1819-1884). She and Louisa de Rothschild (1821-1910 formerly
Montefiore), wife of Sir Anthony de Rothschild, and mother of Annie
and Constance de Rothschild, regularly attended the parliamentary
debates with Louisa's mother Henrietta de Rothschild (1791-1866).
They sometimes stayed up until three in the morning, and some sessions lasted eight "fatiguing hours." Between 1847 and 1858, she and her female relatives wrote about their views on the speeches they heard. Most of the time they felt that Jews were "courteously treated" and did not expect "all prejudice, bigotry and dislike to be silent." They were alert to the "feeble" points raised by some of the discussants, and in May 1848, Louisa viewed Lord John Russell's speech as the only valuable one. At some of the debates their supporters received "long and loud cheers." Lord Brougham's supportive speech was "alternately witty and grave," and although he "amused and delighted the House," their opponents won by twenty-five votes. Some of the speeches were "long and violent." Louisa described them as "intolerant and bigoted and calumnious," particularly the one by the Bishop of Oxford. His speech was criticized as "fiery, zealous," "unscrupulous," and an "eloquent torrent of not very sound argument." The de Rothschild women were also disappointed that "Wilberforce's son should have made such a display." Charlotte Montefiore agreed and wondered when the spirit of religion would be "felt to be not a matter of mere creed and of doctrine" but instead a matter of "love and peace and charity, binding us all lovingly to God." She preferred to see the world in terms of a wider humanity and was "sick of the appellations 'Christian' and 'Jew,'" because "they are but names for intolerance and persecution." Given that Irish people were among Britain's religious minorities who sought fuller rights, the Archbishop of Dublin understood how to argue against opponents of Jewish rights. Women in the de Rothschild family thought his arguments were "reasoned well," even if he spoke "without any entertainment." In February 1849, seven speeches "attacked" the bill favoring Jewish rights, and the women in the de Rothschild family did not fail to notice that Benjamin D'Israeli (1804-1881) had been silent in his defense of Jews. They recalled that "last year he was our warmest champion," but his wife had also spoken to them about "the changes that friendships undergo," which may have hinted that his political views had shifted away from supporting Lionel de Rothschild's political aspirations.
D'Israeli was considered a marginal figure in Jewish politics because he had converted to Christianity at a young age and as a result of being converted, he did not share their political disability. Year after year, the women in the de Rothschild family rallied a “strong conviction that we shall carry it next session.” Even if they did not state it outwardly, the tone of their comments suggests that they could not escape the feeling that women could and ought to become more politically involved.

In July of 1850, Louisa de Rothschild nervously waited for the moment when her husband Lionel de Rothschild would take his seat in the House of Commons. The process of having her hopes excited and subsequently let down left her feeling “less zealous.” She knew it might result in another election but was still “deeply interested in the cause.” In 1856, the issue of Jewish Emancipation had lingered long enough to be in the doldrums, as was evident in one Londoner’s poetic description: “Gloomy is the political sky and murky is the atmosphere.” This writer felt that “nothing but the confidences in the ultimate triumph of the cause of justice can support our drooping spirits.” Similarly, Thomas Babington Macaulay’s (1800-1859) reply to Lord John Russell’s request for support of the Oaths Bill in 1858 stands as a short summary of what has been written on the subject of Jewish Emancipation. Macaulay was so exhausted by the process that he expected to cast his vote without another word on the “long worn out” subject. After twenty-eight years of public speeches on the matter, he had “nothing to say but what has long been in print, and has been read, reviewed, quoted, praised and abused both in England and America.” Instead, he wanted to preserve the potency of his words by introducing new subjects and avoiding those that he had already “told all the world twenty times before.” Once the Jewish Relief Act passed, non-Christians were permitted to have their own oath and Lionel de Rothschild became the first Jewish MP. Jewish politician Sir David Salomons (1797-1873) had also been elected and unseated because of he refused to swear by the Christian oath, and in 1859 he took his seat without obstruction. Atheists
were not covered by this legislature and it was another thirty years before they gained equal status through the Affirmation Bill.85

Jews in Sydney, Melbourne and New Zealand celebrated when Lionel de Rothschild took his seat in Parliament in 1858 and believed that they were already in a stronger political position in comparison.86 Australian-Jews served as inspiration to English-Jews since they were able to sit on the Australian Legislative Council in 1849.87 Yet there appears to have been greater resistance and violence associated with Jewish political emancipation in Australia. Nathaniel Levi migrated to Melbourne in the 1850s from Liverpool England and was elected to the Victorian Parliament as a representative of Maryborough. He took the Oath on the Old Testament while wearing his yarmulke, signaling that he was unwilling to conceal his 'Jewishness' by feigning to be a Christian for political gain, but that he was nevertheless loyal to the British government. Upon his election, the resulting social unrest was reported to be the worst in the history of the colony and included "Rioting, fighting, upsetting of vehicles, pistol shooting," and "double voting and personification were rife."88 After shots were fired into his work space, police and local residents assisted his effort to temporarily leave town.89 Political equality was not easily obtained or retained by Jewish representatives in government positions in Australia or England.

Typically, the right to vote in English-Speaking countries was extended to wealthy Caucasian men, then to poor men and then to individuals who were considered racial and ethnic minorities, and women were among the last minorities to be enfranchised.90 Women's involvement in Jewish Emancipation generally predated their public requests to be enfranchised as women. In 1842, the Sydney City Incorporation Act provided men with the right to vote if they were over the age of twenty-one, had property that was worth a certain value and passed certain residency requirements. This would have empowered many Jewish men. Men who had received charity or given their children up to orphanages, which was not uncommon, were disenfranchised.91 This Act excluded Aboriginal-Australians, who were denied the right to vote until 1962, over a century later.92
Australian women were enfranchised by The Commonwealth Franchise Act of 1902, which simultaneously allowed them to hold seats in Parliament. New Zealand women gained the right to vote in 1893 regardless of their racial background, and women in the United Kingdom who were over the age of thirty could vote after 1918. American women experienced strong opposition and were obstructed from voting until 1920.

In the 1870s, a rare but lively debate about the rights of Jewish women appeared in London’s the Jewish Chronicle newspaper. The argument began with an editorial signed with the Hebrew initial “S,” in which the author raised the most rigid version of the separate spheres ideology, by suggesting that nature, rather than male oppression, was the cause of women’s presumed biological and intellectual inferiority. This argument negated the need for men to make adjustments to their own activities and attitudes in order to elevate women’s status in society, since in his view, they played no role in causing the arrangement in the first place. “S” disapproved of alterations by men to the existing division of labor even though he was aware that some men affirmed “their masculine rights by working beautifully in Berlin wool,” and understood how to maintain their households. He gave these men “a wide berth as weird and eccentric beings,” and was similarly anxious to see that women maintained the status quo by remaining aloof from the area of politics. Amy Levy, likely the same woman who became a famous Jewish-lesbian authoress, immediately challenged “S.” In her view, he failed to recognize that although Parliament declared that marriage was the predominant “occupation open to women,” the reality was that there were not enough men living in England for them to subsist through this arrangement. She also shared the view of many middle-class women in America and Britain that it was unfair for women to be taxed without being provided with equal representation in the government.

A second woman responded to “S” by explaining the changes that women were seeking as they argued for “women’s rights.” They wanted spinsters and widows to have the right to vote and for women to have equal access to education and to fill a wider range of professional
occupations. Women, in her view were not seeking total equality, since they had no wish to “be soldiers nor sailors, nor policemen, nor even Members of Parliament.” She defended women with stinging and sarcastic paraphrases that mocked men like “S” who refused to give women equal rights. She began with men’s view that women were too politically ignorant to even want rights: “Oh you are a woman, you don’t want to be represented.” Assets had been the basis of men’s voting rights. She then countered the idea that women didn’t have enough wealth to be politically minded: “true, you have several thousand acres of land, and have founded hospitals and homes with your money.” She then attacked the idea that men were more moral and more deserving of rights than women: “true, your gardener, who gets drunk regularly once a week, has a vote,” and uses it to support candidates who will “see that the public-houses are kept open all night long every day in the week.” She continued challenging the condescending tone men took in relation to their responsibilities toward women’s welfare: “you are only a woman; we will look after you, we will see that you are well taken care of.” She also countered these limitations by citing examples of professional women who were strong role models in society as well as “devoted wives and loving mothers,” such as Queen Victoria. Although she felt women’s intellectual capacity had been “cribb’d, cabined and confined,” she did not believe there was any basis for arguing that women were biologically inferior, except in physical strength. As a result, she held men responsible for assisting women in their goal of becoming equal citizens. It is unclear if her views were shared by other Jewish women, because there were so few open critiques published by Jewish women about men in the Jewish newspapers in England or Australia prior to 1901. It is possible that this writer was not a religious Jew, or that she was not Jewish at all since some Christian activists had Jewish friends and probably read Jewish newspapers printed in English. Constance de Rothschild was good friends with Frances Power Cobbe, for example, who was known for being outspoken about women’s rights, particularly within marriage.
In the 1870s, Jewish men and women had expanded their ability to influence the politics of their local governments. Julius Vogel (1835-1899) was knighted in 1875 for his work as Prime Minister, Postmaster General and Colonial Treasurer in New Zealand. He was an Englishman by birth, and a former migrant to Australia during the gold rush in the early 1850s. Vogel maintained a close relationship with his sister Frances who lived in London. After reading his election speeches, she assured him that it must be "a relief to the people to have you there to steer them clear through all their difficulties." In 1887, a number of the Vogel's female correspondents, including Matilda Isaac of London, followed his political career and waited in anticipation for the results of the elections. Although Di Nathan had great confidence in his ability to guide the country, she also felt women might have superior skills to men in public affairs: "I have an idea perhaps an enormous one, that men rather muddle things that require a delicate touch." Women in positions of political power were also prone to corruption, perhaps because they emulated men. Mary Vogel corresponded with Laura Jane Suisted (1840-1903), a journalist and the first female note taker in New Zealand's House of Representatives in 1887. In a confidential letter Suisted explained to Vogel that she had the power to influence the election in Julius Vogel's favor, by calling in a past favor owed to her. She said she did not do this regularly, and had "never confided it to anyone before," but felt confident that she could swing the vote "on any question." She boasted that her efforts to manipulate the outcome of elections had "never yet been denied." Vogel apparently disproved of this abuse of power and answered Suisted's letter by saying she was not feeling well enough to be involved in political matters and it appears they did not correspond on the matter again. Vogel's health had been problematic for many years, and there was little change at this time in her correspondence with other women she knew. Suisted's comment suggests that Vogel would need to resort to unethical practices in order to win the election, even though Vogel was a strong leader. In 1889 he published Anno Domini 2000- a Woman's Destiny (1889), about a fictional world in which women provided...
greater leadership and were more autonomous. A few days after Queen Victoria's death, the *Jewish Chronicle* commemorated her reign with a list of important dates related to Jewish Emancipation. Julius Vogel was on the list, but women were not yet named for their political achievements.\textsuperscript{110}

Prior to the turn of the century, women with a strong involvement in Jewish communal affairs did not advocate as openly for women's rights when compared with women who were on the margins of Jewish society.\textsuperscript{111} Jewish feminist Ruby Rich-Schalit was still a young girl in 1900, and although suffragist Vida Goldstein (1869-1949), was well-known for her newspaper *Australian Woman's Sphere*, she was not Jewish as is often believed. Her mother's relatives were Dutch-Irish Christians, as was her father. His family included Polish-Jews, and Dora was proud of her Jewish heritage, but she was not actively involved in Jewish communal affairs. With the exception of Frances Power Cobbe (1822-1904), who was a close friend of Constance de Rothschild, the following first-wave British feminists were not Jewish and their direct influence on Jewish society appears to be minimal: Emily Davies (1830-1921), Barbara Bodichon (1827-1891), Helen Bosanquet (1860-1925), Josephine Butler (1828-1906), Millicent Garrett Fawcett (1847-1929), Octavia Hill (1838-1912), Caroline Norton (1808-1877), Violet Markham (1872-1959), Harriet Martineau (1802-1876), Mary Ward (1851-1920), Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797), Catherine Helen Spence (1825-1910) and Beatrice Webb (1858-1943).\textsuperscript{112} Jewish women rarely discussed feminism in Jewish newspapers, private letters or diaries. This may be an indication that Christian and Catholic women were more agitated about their status than Jewish women since they lacked some of the protections offered by Jewish law and the teachings of the *Talmud*, which urged men to respect women and granted women specific social, sexual and financial rights.

Feminist Rose Scott (1847-1925) presented a paper to a predominantly male audience at the Sydney Hebrew Literary and Debating Society in 1895, titled *Social Life*. Although she was not
Jewish she was related to the Mitchell family, many of whom were Jewish. She prefaced her lecture by situating herself as a representative of women's views, although not in a sense that was antagonistic towards men. However, she criticized men as being too self-interested to reflect upon women's needs without being prompted to pay closer attention. Her assertion that men and women were similarly "wrecked on the rock of sex" and therefore prevented from realizing their "ideas as human beings," suggests that she wanted greater cooperation with men and her words were not intended to solidify existing boundaries. She called attention to the need for social reforms so that all types of slavery could be abolished, allowing "every human being," particularly women, to attain the freedom to be self-determining. She did not raise exceptions and appears to have been advocating universal suffrage. Her argument countered the popular notion that enfranchising women would lead to "domestic misery." She was an early advocate of the perspective that 'the personal is political' and recommended that change should begin within individual households. She claimed that if men resisted women's efforts to have the same level of autonomy, then they were to blame for the disharmony of their homes. She spoke against the unequal moral standard that existed by subverting the Christian doctrine of 'Original Sin' and suggesting it was more constructive to "preach the doctrine of original virtue." Another aspect of her desired political reforms was that educators should teach students how to become mothers, fathers and citizens, instead leaving knowledge of these subjects to "blind chance." She concluded with the statement that society would benefit from "temperance in all things, even in virtue." While some in attendance felt she had overstated the disabilities women confronted in their daily and political lives, her views were respected because they were rooted in the "true spirit of religion." Religious organizations and clubs sometimes provided women with a location from which they could argue for political reforms in a structured and supportive public environment, rather than relegating these conversations to informal settings among a limited number of close
associates, or in public settings that were hostile to women’s agendas.\textsuperscript{122}

In Melbourne, where Jewish life was more conservative and contentious than in Sydney, Nathaniel Levy opposed women’s suffrage as a Jewish Member of the Legislative Assembly, since he did not believe it would benefit women, men or the State.\textsuperscript{123} His associate Ephraim Zox (1837-1899), was an activist in the area of Jewish education and also opposed granting women the right to vote in 1898 on the insubstantial grounds that if women were given equal rights they would no longer “endear themselves to men.”\textsuperscript{124} Although most Jewish men, particularly in Sydney, seemed amiable about women’s desire for equality, there were some men from all religious backgrounds who were invested in women’s unpaid labor and their unequal status. The above comments reflect the anxiety men felt over the potential loss of women’s dependence on them.

Women’s leadership and ability to influence political views was typically limited to their influence within the home. Politics and religion in England in the nineteenth-century were intertwined. Missionary schools targeted Jewish females to a greater degree than males because of the value Judaism placed on women as educators of their children.\textsuperscript{125} Aguilar rejected conversion themes within her domestic novels that were written in the 1840s, and were published and popularized in the 1850s. Her writing reveals both a fantasy and a strategy, which was that if Jewish women were better-educated in religious matters they would remain loyal to Judaism, declining to become Christian wives, and that this would not have to be accomplished by living in isolated Jewish ghettos. She observed that women and children who possessed a strong knowledge of Judaism were not easily converted and were less tempted by partners who lacked a similarly strong faith. Jews have always been, and continue to be, a small component of British society. It was not uncommon for them to resist integration with Christian society based on the belief that it contributed to the reduction in their population through intermarriage, conversion and religious apathy. The most salient of Aguilar’s points was that Jews should interact with Christians without
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fearing they were going to turn out to be missionaries. She felt society would be improved if Jews could view themselves in terms of their similarity to non-Jews instead of emphasizing their differences, which meant that Jewish women needed to be able to discuss Judaism knowledgeably with Christian women who were often experts in theology. Aguilar’s texts were published or still circulating in the 1850s, and provided Jews with a framework for understanding Judaism, which advanced the political and social integration of Jews in British society without diminishing anyone’s religious identity.

Most British Jews were aware that racism limited their prosperity, social activities, and level of social influence, just as women were often aware that gender discrimination limited their abilities. Anti-Semitism manifested across the globe and in England, in a variety of ways and was particularly detrimental to women who struggled with sexism. The most common issues related to social and occupational exclusions, which influenced women’s household budgets when their husbands could not earn a fair wage. Dr. Bernard Van Oven observed that upper-class Protestants had the most motivation to prevent the upward mobility of British-Jews, but the Protestant middle-class was distinctive because they were more inclined to promote Jewish advancement. It was generally understood that Jews intended no harm to the nation, yet it was quite safe for Protestants and Catholics to exclude them from positions of power, which influenced the amount of their wages.

As racial and religious minorities, European-Jews and British-Jews faced a complex range of abuses that included varying combinations of the following conditions: an inability to obtain rights or citizenship without converting to another religion, difficulties in obtaining government or military positions, involuntary conscription, educational quotas or exclusions, restrictions of against property ownership, forced removal, marriage restrictions, or being banned from wearing religious clothing items. Jews were often denied police protection at times when they were confronted with property damage and physical violence, which sometimes escalated into attacks by mobs or individuals that resulted in death.
refugees reported that they were regularly defrauded as they attempted to resettle, and one observer attested that the “proscribed Jews are hunted from pillar to post until the last rouble [sic] has been drawn from them by the insatiable police officers.” Although Jewish women were undoubtedly raped or sexually exploited as was the case with women from other racial minority groups, this was rarely discussed in nineteenth-century newspapers. German-Jews experienced increasingly oppressive circumstances in the 1830s, and by the 1870s Russian Jews were confined to an area known as the Pale of Settlement, where they were exiled to starvation. At that time there were roughly 2,158,619 Russian-Jews, and 752,467 Polish-Jews that lived in under circumstances that were described as “pregnant with future peril.” Conditions in Austria, Germany, Hungary, North Africa, the Middle East, Eastern Europe and parts of Asia were often severe enough to prompt Jews to relocate to British-governed cities where they hoped life would be safer. Jews residing in France, Holland, and at certain times in Vienna experienced greater social equality. Australia, Canada and Jamaica were reported to provide Jews with the fullest levels of social and political emancipation.

Australian-Jews also faced anti-Semitism. In 1866, several thousand people were gathered near Sydney’s Hyde Park, near the future site of the Great Synagogue, to listen to several Jewish men lecturing on the subject of Jewish persecution. Jews were derisively referred to as ‘beardies,’ and their gathering was disrupted by non-Jews to the extent that the police were unable to quell the discord that nearly resulted in a riot. In 1896, Sydney columnist ‘Judith’ observed that Australian-Jews were still “ashamed of their nationality; and think to hide it by conforming in all respects to the Christian customs,” which she thought was as helpful as an “ostrich burying his head in the sand to hide his body from observation!” Jewish newspapers in England and Australia repeatedly pointed out that Jews were not to blame for their mistreatment and urged that providing assistance to their fellow co-religionists was a mitzvah, or
good deed. It also was an action that sparked pride in their Jewish heritage.

Jewish newspapers were vital because they deflected negative or anti-Semitic criticisms that were regularly circulating in non-Jewish newspapers. *British Jews Through Victorian Eyes* provides an exhaustive number of these non-photographic images of Jews from sources published outside of the Jewish community, particularly after the 1870s, as migrants from around the world arrived in England. Jews suffered from economic exclusions, but some were part of the emerging middle-class, and a few families that were among the top wealth-holders in England. Although Jewish bankers were derided, London’s wealthiest banking family, the de Rothschilds, were more often depicted as sharing the same hair and clothing styles as other white-skinned Christians of the same status. Jews were castigated for being too closely associated with “urbanism, industrialism, and capitalism,” which was the outcome of their tendency to work as money-lenders and retailers, but not as often in trades that required hard labor or professional occupations that required university training or apprenticeships. In Australia, author Marcus Clarke (1846-1881) published anti-Semitic remarks in Sydney’s *Bulletin*, after he borrowed money from Jewish money-lenders in the early 1880s. Russian-Jewish migrants were often depicted with exaggerated features in non-Jewish newspapers, but were described by their clothing styles instead within the Jewish press. Russian-Jewish girls were distinctive because they wore coral earrings and necklaces and boys wore “quaint Russian blouses.” Jewish newspapers counterbalanced negative images by providing readers with respectable role models, and by depicting Jews in images and words that were realistic rather than stereotypical.

In spite of an awareness of the harm caused by discrimination, there was a tendency for Jews to uphold social and racial hierarchies within London’s Jewish population. The Ashkenazim were known to be particularly poor during the early part of the century, and it was the Sephardim and Jewish migrants from the West Indies who were the most affluent. The Sephardim had a long history of rejecting
marriages with the Ashkenazim just as they did marriages with non-Jews. Aguilar recalled in 1847 that these marriages had in the recent past been regarded as a "domestic calamity." In the 1850s, about thirty-eight percent of Sephardic spouses had married Ashkenazic partners and this increased to fifty-seven percent in the 1880s. Resistance to these marriages was due to a collective desire to uphold varying cultural traits, and to maintain differing languages and liturgical preferences in the synagogue, but was also reflective of economic, educational and racial stratification. In the 1850s, six percent of marriage partners registered at the Sephardic synagogues were illiterate compared with twenty-eight percent of the Ashkenazim. German traveler Johann Wilhelm von Archenholtz (1741-1812) expressed his opinion that the Ashkenazim were unwelcome in England because of their clothing styles, level of cleanliness, the languages they spoke, and their ideas about what it meant to be polite conflicted with the views of well-established Londoners. Differing levels of politeness and cleanliness reflect that some Jews in London grew up in environments where they were taught to avert 'the evil eye' by avoiding direct eye contact upon meeting, and by eschewing ostentatious displays of success, wealth, health and beauty. Londoners found that direct eye contact upon meeting others gave the impression of being honest, and English society was based on flaunting markers of success, such as clothing, jewelry, stylish hats or a strong body. One writer in 1864 insisted that English-born Jews and poor Christians shared similar hygienic norms, but found it "impossible to imagine anything more filthy in their habits than many of the foreign Jews, especially the German and Polish." The author then reminded readers that the "number of foreign Jews in London is very great," which suggests that native-born Sephardim had a feeling of being invaded by the foreign-born Ashkenazic migrants in the area. Within London, a variety of cross-cultural tensions were exacerbated as the most vulnerable Eastern and Central-European migrants escaped areas where they had few civil rights. Although many of them had been confronted with
violence, it was difficult for English-Jews to truly comprehend and respond empathetically to the needs of these recent migrants.

British-Jewish charities often co-funded individuals and family groups who wanted to migrate out of London in the hopes of improving their health, to reunite with family members or to find employment, and it the migrants who accepted this assistance who were often foreign-born Europeans who did not wish to return to countries they previously escaped. Migrants developed complicated coping strategies when they moved between successive social and physical environments, adapting to differing life-ways in each society. This influenced the way families practiced Judaism, perceived their level of safety, as well as reducing their finances as they replaced material goods that were abandoned in previous locations. Migrants who felt a sense of loss were sometimes relieved by adhering more carefully to religious rituals, and religious activities promoted interconnections with co-religionists who were often in a position to help newly arrived migrants find the resources they needed to survive in new environments.

The following three experiences of Russian-Jewish migrants illustrate some of the difficulties that arose as refugees sought relief from host-communities after anti-Semitism became increasingly institutionalized in Russia. Jews were highly mobile, and it would seem unstable, after they left abusive circumstances in Russia. In 1881, Isaac Baliban, his wife, their seven-year-old son and five-year-old daughter abandoned the public house they ran in Russia because conditions were unsafe. Initially they went to Germany, and then spent two months in New York. After less than two months in San Francisco they went to Sydney. The Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society provided Baliban with funds to begin hawking, however the "conduct and language" of the family was "so rude and unbecoming" that the society returned the seventeen pounds that had been raised for the family and gave it back to the donors. After a cooling-off period, they agreed to send the family to Melbourne, but the Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society discovered that the family intended to redirect the funds to move to Palestine. The two charity
boards considered this a breach of trust and agreed “the time had come for a stand against such imposition.” The money was again withheld and Baliban continued to be abusive. After “annoying” Sydney’s committee-members for several days, he left for Melbourne and upon arrival the charity refused to help him. Host-communities were in an awkward position when they were taken advantage of by people who had escaped harsh political conditions.

In 1894, sixty-four year old G. M. Halbertstadt fled Russia with his wife and two children after being accused of associating with Nihilists. When he reached Melbourne he looked for his brother-in-law who had written to him three years earlier from Paris that he was on his way to sell jewelry in Australia. They learned from another Russian migrant that his brother had already relocated to Calcutta. Since they were without financial means at that time, Halbertstadt reluctantly accepted the funds offered by the Sydney Philanthropic and Orphan Society “on account of his wife and children.” The Halbertstadt family provides an example of serial migration or family migration.

Solomon Cohen was a Russian hawker in 1882 when his goods were destroyed in what he referred to as “the last Persecution.” He went to England first, and after two months the English Relief Committee paid his travel costs to Sydney where he expected to locate his uncle. When he initially approached the Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society he had three ideas about his future. He was willing to return to England, or move to Adelaide, and was also interested in remaining in Sydney and starting a business. They decided he should go to America. Before this plan was acted on, he reunited with his brother in Mudgee New South Wales. His brother was unable to support him and he returned to Sydney asking for further assistance. He had a health problem and was given a free appointment with their physician, Dr. Hunter, but after Cohen refused to take the prescribed medicine, they were unwilling to provide him with further assistance. Several years later he returned to Sydney from Singapore and requested further assistance. They provided a small amount, but then refused further requests. The presence or absence of marriageable Jewish women in Sydney was a secondary
consideration for men who could not afford to sustain themselves, let alone support a wife and children, and Cohen may have been old enough that he was no longer interested in marrying.

It was difficult for the above refugees to regain stability after they left abusive circumstances, and making a new start necessitated moving through a number of cultural contexts that contrasted with what they had known in Russia. Their Russian language-skills were not appreciated in British settlements, which increased their difficulty in starting and sustaining businesses. Most of the Russian-Jews in Sydney that were not fluent in English became hawkers, which was a low-paying and poorly esteemed occupation. Although anti-Semitism in British cities and colonies was less severe than in Eastern Europe, migrants from that region arrived after having lived in severe conditions and they needed a variety of types of assistance to survive. Because of the difficulties that arose when migrants who lacked English language-skills attempted to find work in London and British colonies, persecuted Jews were encouraged to remain where they were in Europe, so that financial assistance could be sent to them without them being uprooted. Those who arrived in London were often deliberately routed to locations outside of Britain and its colonies in order to avoid draining resources of London's overburdened communal organizations. Being a bachelor within Jewish society added a layer of stigmatization to the marginal status of Russian-Jewish refugee hawkers in English-speaking countries.

In the late 1890s, Zionism was a widely-discussed alternative for Jews who needed safety from anti-Semitism. Dr. Theodor Herzl (1860-1904) wanted Jews to be accorded civil rights in their native countries, but saw colonization as an opportunity to provide safety for Jews. He understood that only the poorest people would be willing to work under such hazardous conditions since they had the most to gain and the least to lose initially. He justified his strategy of sending the poorest Jews by saying that “Only desperadoes make good conquerors.” His plan was that after the poorest Jews had created a utopia, then the wealthiest Jews would migrate and find “the new country as pleasant as the old, or even pleasanter.” He called this
dream society an “aristocratic Jewish Republic.” A crucial flaw in his plan was that Eastern-European Jews who needed the most assistance did not have strong agricultural skills because of discriminatory practices and legislation that excluded the possibility of owning, renting or remaining on specific land sites for prolonged periods of time, which was required for farming. In spite of this, Jews from all over the world promoted a variety of schemes to settle persecuted Jews into agriculturally-based societies in America, Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, Mexico, New Zealand, Palestine, and South Africa. The reality was that newly colonized areas had high death rates resulting from starvation, poor sanitation, contagious diseases and clashes with people already living in these areas.

Zionism was not promoted by London’s Chief Rabbi Hermann Marcus Adler (1839-1911), who was concerned about helping refugees, but expressed his view in a sermon that “Even if a band of adventurers were to succeed in reconquering Palestine for the Jews by means of arms,” or if they regained “the Holy Land by purchasing it from the present owners,” it was unlikely to result in “the consummation of our hopes.” Others in England saw Zionism as a “perilous political experiment.” Percy Marks of Sydney, brother of Hilda Marks who was one of Sydney’s devoted communal workers, was an active supporter of Zionism even though it was deemed to be contrary to the “interest of British Jewry” at the time. Zionism was not well-accepted in Australia until the late 1920s and early 1930s and women were not initially involved in the management of Zionist organizations.

The Jews’ Emigration Society of London showed a marked preference for sending migrants to America rather than Australia after 1857. One reason was that the expenses related to travel to America amounted to the cost of the bedding passengers required on their trip to Australia. California and New York had established Jewish communities that were expected to provide work opportunities for Jewish migrants. This was crucial for refugees who often worked in factories and as tailors, types of work that were available in American
cities. By 1885, at least 6,077 Jews had been assisted by the Jews' Emigration Society of London in the previous thirty-two years. The society was successful partly because they screened migrants and only sent those with trade skills that would be accepted by American immigration authorities. America was expected to provide migrants with a safe and tolerant environment similar to England, Australia and New Zealand.

In addition to changing locations and sending funding, Jews fought anti-Semitism by arguing against persisting stereotypes, such as that Jews were inclined toward criminality. English attitudes linked racial traits and poverty to criminal activity. Minorities have a long history of being disproportionately harassed by police and incarcerated by the courts, which justified further accusations that the group was innately prone to engage in undesirable activities. Toward the end of the century it was more common that environmental factors, rather than innate characteristics, such as racial traits, were attributed to a person's economic success or failure. Aboriginal-Australians were subjected to genocidal attacks by British authorities and settlers, especially during the years when the majority of settlers in the area were convicts and they were not given equal protection by police. Jews in England and Australia rarely complained of police brutality, and they actively resolved their problems with the assistance of police and the local courts in Sydney. When unfounded cases were brought against Jews they were resolved fairly.

The overall rate of crime committed by Jews, as reflected in criminal records, was low, and public perceptions to the contrary are indications of stereotypes rather than hard evidence. Throughout the century Christians and Jews frequently attested to the law-abiding nature of London's poorest Jews, particularly when compared to Christians and Catholics. Jewish juvenile delinquents in London were also rare. In East London, the overcrowded areas around Dean and Flower Streets were known to be dangerous. This neighborhood was almost entirely Jewish but was surrounded by streets with very few Jewish residents. Jews may have been disproportionately
burglarized by non-Jews who came into their neighborhood and then blamed them for the high rates of crime in the area. In 1898, the United Synagogue reported on the cause of death of members of the Jewish community that year. In spite of reports that Jews lived in areas prone to violent crime, of 1,523 deaths there were only eight that resulted from violence. Working-class Jews were known to avoid becoming “mixed up with riots” and they were not perceived of as ‘wife beaters.’ This was attributed to their adherence to Jewish religious norms that prohibited such conduct.

Jews were among the first fleet of convicts sent to Australia, and as founding members of the colony of New South Wales, many transformed themselves into prominent members of Sydney society. Not all criminals were sent to Australia to serve their prison sentences, and only about one percent of those transported were known to be Jewish. In 1858, about 700 of the 145,000 convicts transported prior to that year were known to be Jewish. They were most-often convicted of petty crimes rather than violence. In 1830, only one Jewish woman was transported to Australia. In 1870, Jews who were incarcerated within England were transferred to the Portsmouth prison because it had a synagogue. There were only fifteen men at the facility, and less than half of them were native-born. When Jews were found guilty of crimes, it tended to be associated with those who were “addicted” to gambling, had stolen something or engaged in prostitution. In spite of reports that there were Jewish women prostitutes, the “oldest and most intelligent prison matrons” only recalled one female inmate who was Jewish. In Bavaria, Jews were rarely convicted of crimes and Dr. Karl Majer found only sixty Jewish inmates living among 25,100 Catholic and 5,343 Protestants prisoners. Grace Aguilar’s insistence in 1847 that a “Jewish murderer, adulterer, burglar, or even petty thief, is actually unknown” was clearly an overstatement. Aguilar countered stereotypes and advanced the view that Jews were religiously distinctive, but difficult to distinguish from Christians in many respects. She responded to the need of religious minorities to affirm their self-worth and counter dehumanizing images, which has
always been a necessary step in asserting that individuals from the group deserved full social participation, citizenship and political rights.

Jewish criminals certainly existed in London prior to the increased migration of poor refugees. However non-Jewish writers regularly depicted Jews inaccurately as the cause of their social problems. Aguilar was probably the first Jewish woman to publicly defend Jews against the literary stereotypes contained within the pages of Charles Dickens' (1812-1870) writing. She raised awareness that his books "fuelled popular prejudice" and insisted that Fagin "exists only in the imaginations of the readers of Oliver Twist- the Jewish population of London being, in fact, remarkable for its integrity." The character of Fagin was based on Isaac (Ikey) Solomon (1784-1850), who lived in the same neighborhood as Dickens for two decades. Solomon was convicted and transported to Australia in the early 1830s, and was later reunited with his wife Ann, who was also transported. Their criminal lives were the central focus of Bryce Courtenay's Potato Factory (1995). Aguilar's perspective, and even her wording, related to Dickens' portrayal of Jews continued to reverberate in the editorials written by Jewish women in the 1870s. Dickens responded to their complaints by asserting that his portrayal in Oliver Twist was accurate because "that class of criminal almost invariably was a Jew." However, he added that "all the rest of the wicked dramatis personae are Christians." He also called attention to the perspective that some individuals were categorized as Jews not on the basis of their religious beliefs but because of their race: "I make mention of Fagin as the Jew because he is one of the Jewish people, and because it conveys that kind of idea of him which I should give my readers of a Chinaman by calling him a Chinese." As a token of his esteem, he subscribed to the Jewish Chronicle and assured its readers that he had "no feeling toward the Jewish people but a friendly one," insisting that "I always speak well of them, whether in public or in private." He outspokenly opposed the "cruel persecution" of Jews. His rebuttals were not accepted by a woman who responded that there were positive Christians within Oliver Twist to offset the Christian criminals
depicted. However, Fagin was the only Jewish person in the book and it seemed impossible to her that a Jew would ever train young people to become thieves. She expressed her gratitude to Sir Walter Scott (1771-1832) for his favorable depictions of Jews in *Ivanhoe* (1819), in which the main female character Rebecca refused to convert in order to marry a Christian man. Irish authoress, Mrs. S. C. Hall (1800-1881 Anna Maria Fielding) expressed similar appreciation of Aguilar’s writing, because she provided realistic Jewish role models. Dickens may have observed high rates of crime in London because Ikey Solomon and his wife were Jewish criminals who lived in his neighborhood, but Aguilar’s image of the Anglo-Jewish community, although idealistic, holds the potential to be more accurate than Dickens’ biased image based on these infamous individuals.

The women in the Montefiore and de Rothschild families were wealthy women who kept journals detailing their cross-cultural, trans-regional and inter-faith friendships, as well as their opinions of the books they read. Louisa de Rothschild opposed several books that provided negative characterizations of religious minorities, including Jews and Unitarians who were depicted as “unprincipled, vulgar, heartless beings.” She felt this perspective was aligned with the prejudices of the Tories, a view that was shared by John Toland when he published *Reasons for Naturalising the Jews in Great Britain and Ireland* (1714). When Lady de Rothschild met author William Makepeace Thackeray (1811-1863) while traveling in Germany in 1848, she did not approve of his attitude toward Jews, but described him as “an honest man, with a kind heart” and enjoyed their conversation about politics, art and literature. Their families traveled together in Italy twenty-one years later, which suggests that his attitude about Jews was not severe enough to present a social barrier given the number of other interests they held in common. Thackeray also appreciated Scott’s book *Ivanhoe*. Images of Jews in newspapers did not have the same level of permanence and respectability that novels did, which made it particularly important for Jews to challenge anti-Semitic literature.
Anglo-Jewish women writers in the mid-nineteenth century often responded to the 'Orientalism' of non-Jews. While some novels accurately observed Jewish family life, it was more often the case that authors developed their Jewish characters in relation to the desires of mainstream society. Christian and Catholic authors often described Jewish women as dark-skinned, sexually-expressive 'others' who were pliant enough that their non-Christian religious-beliefs could be converted to Christianity. Sephardic women were also vulnerable to this criticism because it was still within their collective memory that during the Inquisition, Crypto-Jews had adopted a surface appearance of Catholicism while they continued to practice Judaism in secret. As a result they were often viewed as being less-authentically Jewish because they had a strong understanding of Catholic doctrines.

Aguilar was one of several women who wrote counter-narratives in order to counterbalance Romantic novels with conversion themes. Historian Michael Galchinsky finds that Jewish men were not motivated to adopt this style of writing, since novels tended to be written by and for Christian women. Instead, they continued writing in styles that corresponded to Jewish sacred literature, which they viewed as being the most desirable and effective writing style to counteract the social problems they observed. Missionary writers understood that turning Jewish women into Christian wives required a carefully constructed, highly manipulative fictional environment, so that Christian husbands were seen as financial providers who offered Jewish women greater intellectual stimulation and a more integrated experience within the church than Jewish men. Children in these stories were shown to follow a paternal pattern of influence that was the opposite of 'Jewishness,' which is traced through mothers. These story-lines critiqued Jewish women's placement in the women's gallery in the synagogue and their discouragement from studying the sacred literature to the same extent as men. These plots underestimated the value women had within Jewish society. Since 'Jewishness' is traced through mothers, themes involving women who intermarried were deeply problematic, because the Jewish population in the British world was small.
British Jews felt conflict over their links to 'the East,' partly because The London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews used the same tactics to convert Jews as they did "Orientals." When Jews lived in "Eastern Nations" they provided women with better treatment and fuller rights than other women living near them, and did not accept traditions such as female circumcision or the Indian practice of sati, or 'wife burning.' Jewish fashions were linked to 'the Orient' not only due to the choice of colors in the fabrics but also due to the abundance of ornamentation with their garments. George Eliot's (1819-1880 Mary Anne Evans) often quoted line that Jewish roots in 'the East' meant that they had "Oriental sunshine" flowing in their veins, carried the dual meaning of being excessively ostentatious and wealthy, as well as having regional connotations.

In England and Australia, Jewish fund-raising groups held Oriental Carnivals and Bazaars. These were somewhat theatrical events with women at the center of attention, wearing ethnic-style costuming and selling their wares at ornate vending booths. Jewish newspapers printed drawings or photographs of the styles of dresses they wore as they mimicked and mirrored their cultural roots, firstly to themselves and secondly to Christian onlookers who were a substantial source of the income earned at these events. Some of the tensions Jews felt about the "East" can also be viewed as 'Orientalism' that hinged on fears that they would be further excluded from Christian social networks if they identified with their roots in the Middle East.

Theatrical productions were a favorite leisure activity of the middle and upper-classes in British society. The ability of actors and playwrights to influence the audience to treat Jews as valued citizens rather than as scapegoats was enhanced by the wide range of senses that are stimulated at the theatre. Theatrical plays not only appealed to the audience on an intellectual level, but also through scents, the sight of colors, the movement of the actors on stage and the social interactions in the audience, such as laughing or crying at particular scenes. When Constance de Rothschild attended a performance of William Shakespeare's (1564-1616) Merchant of Venice, her experience of sitting in the audience knowing she was one of the few Jewish
women present and that she was surrounded by Christians probably influenced her to feel more troubled that “English people are too prone to believe a great deal against the Jews”\textsuperscript{222} than if she had stayed at home and read negative depictions of Jews within copy this book from the safety of her home when other Jews were present. Her mother Louisa de Rothschild and Charlotte de Rothschild also had negative experiences at the theatre as a result of the portrayal of Jews on the stage. After they attended \textit{Gold}, Louisa was unsettled that it brought “forward a \textit{good Jew} as a \textit{phenomenon}.” She felt certain that “No one would dream of introducing in a play a \textit{good Catholic}, or a \textit{good Mahomedan} even” and she concluded “it is thus a proof that prejudice still exists.”\textsuperscript{223} By 1872, attitudes had changed somewhat and \textit{Ivanhoe} was transformed by Andrew Halliday (1830–1877, Duff) into a play \textit{Rebecca}, that was presented at the Drury-lane Theatre. Authors Thackeray and Dickens both appreciated his productions.\textsuperscript{224} The play elicited a reaction of “indignation at every piece of injustice” toward Isaac and his daughter Rebecca, and “enthusiasm for every kindness toward them.”\textsuperscript{225} In the 1870s, written and verbal attacks on Jews were still common.\textsuperscript{226} However, toward the end of the century the increased presence of Jewish actors and actresses, play-writers, writers, readers and paying members of the audience helped to promote images of Jews that reflected a more balanced perspective.

This chapter demonstrates that the status of Jews in English society was distinctive and that it changed as a result of colonialism, partly because it could no longer be argued that the British dominions were based on Protestantism, and more broadly on Christianity. Christians were always in a position to grant Jews greater economic, political and social freedom within the British Empire, and it is not surprising that some Jews wished to improve their relations with them. Jacob Katz, author of \textit{Out of the Ghetto}, argues that “If Christian society wished to embrace Jews as an integrated group, it had to overcome its stereotyped associations and prejudices against things Jewish.”\textsuperscript{227} Jews also had to overcome prejudices about living in religiously and racially integrated communities. Jews wanted to be known as ‘British’ because it signaled full equality, but it was not a
label that was easily adopted until the Christian orientation of the term was significantly altered after the middle of the century. Once the most daunting stereotypes Christians and Jews had about each other were identified, questioned, and somewhat resolved, Jews hoped that equality would be maintained through a process of integration, rather than assimilation. Jewish women knew that stereotypes, violence, legislative discrimination and a lack of political representation existed in Britain and Australia, yet they still expressed their gratitude that these societies were ‘tolerant’ and ‘enlightened.’ This attitude was sometimes rooted in family memories of Crypto-Jewish relatives who escaped the Inquisition and “sought and found asylum in England,”22 but more often it was in relation to news that European-Jews were confronting devastating circumstances. Anglo-Jewish women’s observations about Jewish Emancipation, and their quest for enfranchisement as women, are vital components of the history of the United Kingdom and of democratic societies more broadly, yet their perspectives are in need of further research.
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Chapter 2: Religious Considerations of Jewish Colonists Migrating from London to Sydney.

In 1848, the remote city of Hobart, in Tasmania, was raised as a model Jewish settlement, possessing "perhaps the finest - climate in the world," with many respectable Jewish families who enjoyed high quality schools, access to kosher meat and a synagogue.\(^1\) The mainland cities of Sydney and Melbourne were also attractive destinations for English-Jewish migrants. Sending England's unmarried and unemployed women to Australia seemed to be an obvious match for numerous single men in the colonies, their need for skilled workers, and the desire of colonists to increase their population through family migration.\(^2\) The reasons and resources that anchored Jewish women in England, or lured them to Sydney, are poorly understood and were distinctive of Christian women. In her book *Leaving England*, about British migration in the nineteenth century, Charlotte Erikson asks: "Is it possible to find evidence of an informed rationality on the part of the majority of immigrants?"\(^3\) In order to address her question in relation to Jewish female migrants, this chapter delineates many of the predicaments related to gender and religious practices that inhibited Jewish women from traveling the long distance to Australia on their own. Sydney's least affluent women were represented in the minute-books of two of Sydney's Jewish charities. Wealthy women's views, such as those of Constance de Rothschild are brought into view in this chapter to demonstrate their common concerns and varied responses to the possibilities that life in Sydney could offer Jewish women. In the second half of the nineteenth century, 'Britishness' was still based on Christian norms and laws and this discussion of nineteenth-century attitudes about Jewish identity and Jewish religious laws unsettles existing narratives about single female migration to Australia, which are based almost exclusively on the experiences of Protestant and Catholic women.

New South Wales included the land in Victoria and Queensland until 1851 when Victoria became a colony. Queensland became an
independent colony in 1859. At the 1901 census, the Jewish population of New South Wales was estimated at 6,447 people. Australian-Jews maintained a population that was around half of one percent of the overall population for most of their history in Australia. This was a small number given that six-million migrants were routed from Britain to Australia in the last three decades of the nineteenth century. At least eighteen-thousand single British women were assisted to New South Wales between 1860 and 1900, and for fourteen of these years, England’s government-assisted migration schemes favored female migrants. Men outnumbered women on most ships arriving in Sydney. Census numbers were misleading since the higher number of single males in Australia did not mean they were of an age to be married and starting families as was more common for female migrants who were young and seeking husbands. Male migrants often lived roughly, with four or five men per boarding-house room and only a few could afford the rent on a single room to share with a wife. They were not seeking wives until after they were financially stable. The population imbalance affected family life, the division of household labor, religious observances and working conditions.

Jewish settlers reported that their reasons for changing locations fell into five potentially overlapping categories of motivation. Migrants from all social classes changed locations to be reunited with family and friends, to improve their health, to find employment, and change climates. The upper and middle-classes also traveled for leisure. Protestant and Catholic migrants reported another motivation, which was that it was more likely they could find a husband in Australia than if they remained in England. Jewish women were not given this expectation and were encouraged to migrate after they married. This was one of the most important reasons that Jewish women did not migrate to Australia in large numbers along Catholic and Protestant women from Britain.

Australia, like India, was recommended as a place for men to go and make their fortunes so that they could return to a comfortable life in England. Family migration was galvanized by gold discoveries in
Although Jews often migrated with a desire to increase their civil rights, especially in the workplace, they participated in colonizing inhabited land when they moved into newly forming Australian towns as miners, merchants and services providers. Migrants contributed to the disruption of, and at times the genocide of, Aboriginal-Australians who were regularly starved, exposed to contagious diseases and displaced from their land. They were usually pressured to abandon their languages, alter their gender roles, religious lives, the education of children, their marriage customs, their views on medical care and a variety of other social issues that contributed to intergenerational tensions. Rabbi Abraham Abrahamssohn's writing offers a disturbing account of his impression of Aboriginal-Australians and his sense of racial and socio-economic superiority in relation to them. However, Mrs. Henry Moss provides evidence that she assisted fellow settlers and was also a “good friend of the Aboriginals of the district,” according to her husband's close associate geologist Reverend William Branwhite Clarke (1798-1878). Historian Tom Griffiths observes that historians of Australian life have not sought to “display” the intimate complexities of colonial and settler relationships and that our present assumptions may be challenged by future research. His observation is applicable to Jewish settlers who left few written records related to their personal contact with Indigenous-Australians and non-Jewish settlers.

Factory and sewing jobs, occupations that were commonly sought after by Jews, were not as easily obtained by workers in Sydney due to the high number of qualified workers competing for a limited number of positions. Although the most competent workers in England “found little to attract them to the colonies,” Sydney did provide Jewish merchants, such as the Hoffnungs, with more affordable and commodious housing and commercial spaces. Although Christian domestic workers were in demand in Australia and women's moral influence within the home was highly valued, Jewish women rarely worked in domestic service because they found it undignified and undercompensated. Jewish workers were alerted by F. H. Lewis in
1857, and Walter D. Benjamin of Melbourne in 1887, that Australia’s Jewish employers did not necessarily employ workers unless they worked on the Jewish Sabbath, which was a common predicament in London. The difference was that in London, workers had a wider range of employers to choose from and they were surrounded by a stronger network of Jewish social services, friends and extended family members.26

In order to draw successful, healthy and moral Jewish migrants to Australian colonies, Jewish passengers needed strategies in advance of their departure to assure that they could maintain their usual religious practices during the voyage and as they initially sought work and housing.27 This was an important consideration in areas where there were few other Jews to rely upon for guidance or tangible assistance, such as help finding safe lodging and borrowing work tools. Caroline Chisholm (1808-1877), a Catholic reformer who founded the Family Colonization Loan Society promoted Jewish migration to Australia. In Douglas Jerrold’s Weekly Newspaper she addressed the needs of male migrants with recommendations of what migrants might expect in the first few weeks after arriving in the colonies. She advised colonists when to cut their hair, how to survive in the wilderness, care for their bedrolls and arrange their finances throughout the migration process.28 In 1853, she gave a lecture encouraging Australian migration at London’s Sussex Hall. A crowd of several hundred Jews attended and hundreds more were turned away that night. She told those in attendance that Sydney offered reasonable wages and had better housing than Melbourne. The audience was impressed by Chisholm’s efforts and recommended her well-regulated ships, known for their wholesome social environment, which included matching single females with chaperones.29 At that point Jews favored paying their passage-fees privately or by borrowing loans, through schemes such as Chisholm’s, rather than relying on assistance from the government.30 Her ships were approved of by the Jewish Emigration Society. In 1857, their organization had strong female support, with thirty-two patronesses and twenty-four patrons at their annual fund-raising ball.31 In the previous three years they
assisted 380 migrants, and of the nineteen single females that were sent to Australia, mostly to Adelaide and Melbourne, sixteen of them traveled on Caroline Chisholm’s ships.32

When the weather in London was cold and disagreeable it promoted a desire to travel, especially among those who were house-bound with health problems. The cost of travel to Australia was high, the voyage was as long as one-hundred days in the 1850s, and the prospect of returning was unpredictable, which meant that cities in Europe were more likely to attract upper-class Jews with health problems that were expected to be resolved by a warmer or drier climate. Women’s choice of cities was often linked to preexisting social networks as well as financial considerations.33 In 1887, Louisa Samuel went to Nice in France for the benefit of her health after a particularly hard winter in England. She knew another woman there, which influenced her choice of this city.34 Gold-miners influenced the perception that Australia’s climate was beneficial for the recovery of consumption, a common illness among London’s poorest classes who spent most of their time in inadequately ventilated spaces. Australian cities were perceived to have fewer “germs”35 than London because of the smaller, less urban population that produced less sewerage and industrial pollution.36 London’s Jewish charities often aided the poorest Jewish migrants with health problems so that they could relocate in Australia, and a large number of them needed further financial assistance in order to survive after they arrived in Sydney.37 There was less overt anti-Semitism in Australia, making it a safer environment than in areas of Europe, but Australian doctors were known to be expensive, “unscrupulous,”38 and they were rarely Jewish, whereas in Continental Europe Jewish doctors were more common. When Sarah Isaac, a singer in Sydney’s Great Synagogue choir visited London, she developed minor health problems as a result of the cold rainy weather and felt immediately relieved upon her return to Sydney.39 When the Chief Rabbi in London wrote to Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis about a job offer in Sydney, he assured Davis that that the climate would be beneficial for his wife Blanche
Annie's health.\(^{40}\) When the Davis' moved to Sydney, they became prominent members of the community.

Australia was also described as a place where illness “struck down” thousands and the seasonal temperatures fluctuated by one-hundred degrees, making it the worst climate known by those who were skilled travelers. Hundreds of disappointed men returned to England and were indignant over the glowing one-sided accounts that had lured them to Sydney, mostly in non-Jewish newspapers.\(^{41}\) Married women with children were reluctant to go to areas where there was a sense of impending danger, or the likelihood of becoming fatally ill.\(^{42}\) Frances Vogel observed that “people are fearful to go abroad on account of the Cholera.”\(^{43}\) In 1854, Sydney resident Myer David Isaacs, lamented that a newlywed Jewish woman caught a cold and died while on the *Great Britain* headed for Sydney. This was the most prominently advertised ship traveling to Australia within the pages of the *Jewish Chronicle* and this report likely discouraged others who were considering the voyage.\(^{44}\) Annie Sampson wrote from Darlinghurst Sydney, not far from the central business district, that her family were relieved by the change of climate after being in Melbourne, a city with weather so fickle it is known for having ‘four seasons in one day.’ She explained to Mary Vogel that they “were all so ill in Melbourne” but they were “much better” and Vogel’s uncle was in “much less pain.” However, Sampson worried that the summer months would change this: “I fear it will soon be too hot for us and Horace scarcely knows where to go I say England.”\(^{45}\) The air quality in Australia was pure compared to England, but the climate was often too hot for the comfort of English migrants during the summer months and the ship voyage presented the potential for contagious illnesses that were difficult to control.

A number of dangers existed in relation to ship travel that deterred Jewish migrants from moving to Australia in the early part of the century. After the 1850s, the route to Australia was less hazardous because captains were more familiar with how to avoid dangerous areas. In 1854, the *Great Britain* had an accident, and although the crew were found blameless,\(^{46}\) it was only three years later, in 1857,
that the *Dunbar* was wrecked as it arrived in Sydney. Only one of the 131 passengers survived. Several Jews died, including Isaac Simmons, Abraham and Julia Myers, and their six children, all of whom were returning from a trip to England. These accidents provided additional reasons that Jewish migration to Australia was significantly curtailed in 1857. In the 1860s, shipbuilding technology advanced and steamer ships could travel from Britain to Australia in nine weeks. The number of spaces on ships had previously been allocated based on the idea that that children required half of the oxygen required by adults. The health of passengers was jeopardized by the presence of small children who had high mortality rates resulting from contagious childhood diseases that were easily spread in oxygen-poor environments. Emigration reformer Maria Rye helped introduce changes in the late 1860s that limited the number of children that an emigrant couple could bring with them, in addition to reducing the overall number of children that were permitted to travel on a particular ship. Shipwrecks continued to deter passengers throughout the century. In 1868, Jewish passenger Jacob Bentoletta survived the wreck of the *George Marshall*, but was crippled by his injuries. In 1877, Levi Meener was traveling to England from Rockhampton Queensland when his ship wrecked. In Sydney he requested financial assistance to become a hawker, a type of work that was often accepted by individuals with injuries. In 1886, Anne Samson of Melbourne described a stress-free passage in a new ship that “behaved well.” Generally, Jewish ship passengers had the same complaints as Catholics and Protestants. Similar to Solomon Joseph, they disliked being seasick, they found the food distasteful, their boots and clothes became moldy, and their boredom alternated with terror as storms, people’s drunkenness, and incompetent crewmembers, added to the irritations caused by fellow passengers.

The image of Australia as a “rogues’ paradise” lingered even after transportations ceased, partly because former convicts remained after their sentences ended, and free-settlers married and interacted with them on a regular basis. By 1830, free-settlers outnumbered convicts, and convicts ceased to be transported to New South Wales in 1840.
Some convicts were Jewish, but the prospect of living around criminals was unappealing to most religiously observant Jews. Writers from Australian gold-rush towns in the 1850s provided unfavorable reports that Jewish merchants in Sydney lived in degrading physical and moral circumstances.\textsuperscript{55} California's gold rush was thought of not as a "blessing, but a curse\textsuperscript{56} in 1853 because authorities were unable to protect settlers and their property from lawlessness, which manifested in forms of public 'justice' that amounted to murder. This writer presented Australia as a "British colony," which "speaks its praise," even if lawlessness existed. Both societies viewed women as providers of social morality.\textsuperscript{57} While the use of obscenity and slang was commonly heard in London, one disgruntled Jewish man complained that the type of men who could tolerate the physical extremes of the heat and cold in Australia were also the type who habitually used profanity, and he strongly disapproved of the way some Jewish migrants drank excessively, which was uncharacteristic of English-Jews.\textsuperscript{58} The second wave of Jewish migrants to America was between 1820 and 1880, but Jewish migration to Australia followed a different course because of the country's history of transporting convicts to the colonies.\textsuperscript{59}

An unspoken variable that influenced Jewish migrants to select Australia as their destination was that there were reports that it was a place where they would experience greater religious tolerance and egalitarianism.\textsuperscript{60} After being assisted by Caroline Chisholm, one non-Jewish migrant gave a favorable report of the social atmosphere by saying he "never saw a fight between a Catholic and a Protestant here on the score of religion.\textsuperscript{61} In her promotional material, Chisholm quoted a clergyman in New South Wales who wanted to live among people from his own religious group. However, he qualified this by explaining that his "idea of a good neighborhood is not so contracted." He explained that he had "lived happily amongst pagans and heathens, Mahometans and Hindoos" and that he had never experienced them being intolerant of his religious beliefs, nor was he offended by theirs. He questioned why he, or anyone else, should forgo this "privilege."\textsuperscript{62} In 1878, at the consecration of the Great
Synagogue, Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis reminded the Christians and Jews in attendance that "Christ was a Jew" and that the two religions "held so much common ground" that they "can worship together," a perspective that had been raised years earlier by English authoress Grace Aguilar. In rural New South Wales, Maitland's Rabbi S. Levi promoted inter-faith relationships and provided charity without discrimination. The positive experience of migrating to an area that lacked overt religious tensions could prompt a person to regard their Jewish heritage with greater respect and provided an attraction for religious migrants.

Prior to 1853, it was difficult for Jewish migrants to pass the government's selection criterion in order to be given an assisted passage, which meant that they had been unable to partake of funds that were available to Catholics and Protestants. This was primarily because Jews needed a referee certificate from London's Chief Rabbi Dr. Nathan Marcus Adler (1803-1891) to partake of government funds. He only provided referee letters after 1853 once kosher provisions were available to passengers during the voyage. That year Grace Josephs, a London Jewess working with the Jewish Emigration Society, had convinced colonial official S. Wolcott to help Jewish passengers bring their own kosher meat on government ships. This crucial step facilitated greater religious equality and meant that Jews were able to maintain their religious practices as they traveled.

Kosher provisions were difficult to sustain on long ship voyages. Catholics and Jews often formed their own separate messes at meal times, and many Jews were only willing to sail when there were enough passengers to share kosher meals. In 1853, one group of Jewish passengers resolved this issue by advertising in the Jewish Chronicle for five more people headed to Sydney on the Atlanta. A decade later, the Bishop of Melbourne was traveling to England with several Jews and shared an evening meal with them. They wanted to join him in "asking for a blessing from our common God," however, they objected to his usual blessing of "our Lord Jesus Christ." He responded by modifying the prayer to be "for thy Name's sake," and as a result they shared a pleasant evening together. In 1869, Rabbi
Abraham Tobias Boas (1842-1923) sailed on the Temesa after arranging for fresh kosher duck, chicken, lamb, and smoked beef. He was one of the only Jewish passengers on the ship and was permitted to do his own cooking, which meant that he did not have to compromise his routine of eating kosher food. It wasn't until the 1870s that kosher tinned-meat was obtainable. In 1883, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Silberman, farmers from Odessa, took their four young children to Palestine to work on a land grant, which turned out to be "a deception." They were then misled when they were in Singapore, and were further abused on board the Crusader as they traveled to Sydney. They were given "bad food" and meat that was "putrid." When the husband "went out for drinking water for the children" he was "taken by the throat by the second mate and thrown down." They arrived in the hopes of reuniting with Joseph Silberman's brother, Wolf Silberman, who lived near Sussex Street, but at the start of their time in Sydney, Joseph was hospitalized because of these injuries.

With so few surviving accounts of the experiences of Jewish passengers, it isn't clear if this sort of violence was common against Russians or Jewish passengers. Even in 1886, Anne Samson complained that as they traveled, they only had "mouldy" poultry that had been "badly frozen" and almost no fresh meat was available.

Supplying passengers with kosher meat was a crucial factor in drawing religiously-observant migrants from the United Kingdom and Europe into the Southern hemisphere.

In 1853, the first year that Jews could partake of government assisted passages, a published letter signed by Lily asserted that for single Jewish women, a move to Australia was a "fate far worse than poverty and privation at home." She lamented that "Government emigration ships are the very worst kind for Jewesses," and although she did not wish to be viewed as "illiberal" for her comments, she felt that Jewish females were "nurtured and brought up in a modest privacy unknown among Christian females." She disapproved of the thought of "Jewesses huddled together upon a voyage of discovery," to a place "gorged with dissolute, bad characters." Insisting that the "time has passed for going there," she urged that Palestine was a
superior destination. This was probably because Jews were not isolated or pressured to assimilate there and there was little temptation to abandon religious practices. Lily was not alone in her distrust of government ships. The editor of the Jewish Chronicle was criticized because he disapproved of Jews traveling on them and responded at the end of Lily’s letter that he felt vindicated by the widespread abandonment by English Jews of this method of travel. This suggests that it was only a brief period of time between when the Chief Rabbi provided letters of reference for passengers to travel on government ships and when interest in this mode of travel was disregarded in favor of privately-funded ships.

In 1857, a Jewish writer from Melbourne encouraged his coreligionists in London that they should take advantage of £250,000 of funding that was allocated to assist poor people from the United Kingdom so that they could relocate in Victoria, which would have indirectly increased migration into New South Wales. He recalled England as a place of stress, where single people were “doomed to pine away,” and where poverty made it so that children were “intolerable burdens.” He inadvertently started a controversy by glorifying life in Australia and recommending its abundant resources that made it so people could give to charity rather than receiving it. This signaled that the environment was conducive to family migration or chain migration. He saw Melbourne as a place where marriage and children were transformed into blessings, “which, like certain mirrors, condense and reflect back the rays received.” His views were not shared by Rabbi Emanuel Myer Myers of the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, who quickly refuted these comments. He discouraged single females from migrating since there were insufficient opportunities for their employment and in the absence of their relatives and friends there was a strong possibility that they would resort to immoral means to sustain themselves. Myers recommended that money should be reallocated into a school to teach London’s poorest Jewish girls domestic arts so that they could find work without leaving England. This generated a protracted debate because he insinuated that the Jews’ Emigration Society in London
had been careless with the lives of young Jewish women. After Myers' sanity was questioned, and it was pointed out how few single women had been sent by the society, he admitted that he had made a generalization based on the actions of one woman who may not have been assisted by their society. After these 1857 articles related to Myers' comments, the *Jewish Chronicle* discouraged Jewish women from going to Australia with the expectation of finding employment or husbands.

In 1858, the Jewish Emigration Society continued to refute allegations that they were careless with women's safety and they affirmed that the single women they sent had married or found employment and no longer required assistance. The men they sent were also successful because they had adequate trade skills. They admitted that they had "strenuously resisted" sending unmarried single women to the colonies, and regretted that women "continually" departed on emigration ships after disregarding their advice on the matter. Rabbi Myers was correct that migrants were easily disoriented and taken advantage of during the first year after they arrived in Australia. The Jewish Emigration and Loan Society had a policy from the start of their organization that they would only assist females if they had friends or family to receive them upon arrival and facilitate their adjustment. Around 1857, American cities became the preferred destinations for Jewish migrants leaving England through their society, partly because America "did not reject destitute aliens," which contrasted with the careful screening procedures that migration to Australia entailed. That year they sent twenty-eight people to Sydney, 108 to Melbourne and 237 to America. In 1866, they only sent three unmarried women to Australia. As a former British colony, urban cities and rural areas in America provided unmarried Jewish women with greater potential to find factory and sewing jobs as well as husbands than Australian cities.

In order for the Australian colonies to thrive and survive, male settlers needed to be financially stable and women needed to have a strong moral character and be able to live safely in the areas where they settled. Single Jewish women who considered migrating were
frankly advised that men in Australia wanted "domesticated wives" and that they were smart enough to notice a disreputable woman when they saw her.90 Women who lacked domestic skills often emphasized their virtue, which was highly valued.91 In 1861, the *Jewish Chronicle* indicated that there were a few respectable upper-class Jewish men looking for wives in the colonies,92 but the misperception that most women would marry if they migrated to Australia persisted. Frances Vogel of London commented in 1884, "What a pity Mabel is so plain- but I daresay she will marry, it seems most girls do in the Colonies."93 By the 1890s, migration to Australia was no longer expected to result in marriage among non-Jewish women, especially those in the middle and upper-classes.94 The type of women suited to relocate in Australia were rugged and adventurous and potentially less-inclined toward a settled family-oriented life-style. This was one of the reasons Australian colonists often resented the government's efforts to relocate British women in Australia in order to remedy social problems stemming from the gender imbalance.95

For Jewish passengers who did migrate, the confined space of the ship was potentially irreligious and overtly Christian, although few of the surviving diaries and letters indicated that this was a source of stress.96 As Jews boarded ships the reality was that they often found themselves without the companionship and support of their co-religionists. Strictly Orthodox men would have needed to arrange a core group of at least nine other Orthodox males before they boarded the ship to assure they could say their prayers, since females were not counted as part of the *minyan*. The *minyan*, is a group of ten men needed for saying Jewish prayers. Hebrew Almanacs, such as *Vallentine's Almanac*, were regularly advertised as indispensable for Jewish migrants who wanted to keep track of when Jewish holidays were observed.97 At the point of 'crossing the line,' when the ship passed over the equator, the monotony of the journey was typically broken by having the men shave their beards and earlocks.98 Shaving this area of men's faces was prohibited by Jewish law and alarmed some passengers, including Mr. Jacobs, whose protests were ultimately respected by the crew.99 While Jews sometimes attended
services on the Christian Sabbath while traveling by ship, non-Jews were not recorded as attending Jewish prayers in reciprocation on Saturday.

From the 1830s to the end of the century, there were relatively few barriers to prevent Jews from socializing with non-Jewish passengers. In 1886, Anne Samson found most of the travelers on her ship were “nice people,” with the exception of “the Bishop and party,” who were “not popular.” English-Jews were highly sought after as converts, which made them vulnerable while socializing aboard ships. Many of the groups that promoted migration to Australia were Evangelically-based and ships had a chaplain, but almost never a rabbi aboard. The ship was conceptualized as a “moral jungle” due to the corrupting influence of the male ship crew, yet simultaneously as a “floating parish” where religious lessons were taught at points when individuals were frightened by the unpredictable nature of ocean voyages and were more easily induced to alter their religious beliefs. In addition to teaching female passengers practical skills during the voyage, ship matrons, few if any of whom were Jewish, were expected to convey Christian morals to female passengers. This was a major reason why government emigration ships were viewed as a form of “unavoidable contamination” for Jewish women. The ship’s crew often diverted the attention of Conversionists away from the few Jewish travelers. Henry Lippmann, a Jewish passenger headed to Melbourne from Sydney, observed that the crew was composed of forty “Europeans” and “110 coloured people- Indians, Arabs, Chinese and Negroes.” Since they spoke different languages, each language group had a “spokesman,” who passed along orders from the crew. He noted that “Some of the crew walk around completely naked,” which would have been unacceptable to Orthodox Jewish women, as Lily had suggested in her editorial to the Jewish Chronicle. Since the primary intention of missionaries traveling to the South Pacific was focused on the conversion of Indigenous peoples, the crew drew some attention away from the conversion of Jewish passengers. The Jewish passengers who left diaries did not record that they were actively
proselytized on the voyage and their racial, ethnic and religious differences seem to have been overlooked while in the presence of people who did not adhere to the European dress code, were not fluent in English, and had comparatively darker skin.

Ships offered a variety of risks and opportunities for sexual transgressions between men and women, or between passengers and male crew members, which left some migrants apprehensive about a long voyage to Australia. Historically, in Jewish society, women’s sexual passions were expected to be stronger than men’s, and rabbis were not in denial about the fact that men victimized women. Some of the anxiety over sending Jewish female migrants on ships by themselves was grounded in the prohibition against allowing contact between males and females without a chaperone. According to the Jewish law of Yichud, only married couples and very close relatives are permitted to be alone with the opposite sex, unless they were within a space led to a public hallway or if there were at least three men present with a single female. Laws prohibiting contact between men and women were intended to safeguard women and girls from being exploited and they were expected to avoid situations where they would be alone with members of the opposite sex. While Constance de Rothschild of London did not migrate, she described the law of Yichud as being similar to Victorian ideals of womanhood. Neither she nor her sister went out without a chaperone and they dressed simply. In the 1890s, the social atmosphere on ships changed and segregation between the sexes was less vigilantly upheld. Flirting and “harmless romances” made the trip more enjoyable, particularly for those who were not adhering to religious laws that mandated strict gender segregation. Later in the century, single women were thought to be more autonomous and capable of self-protection.

During the time when convicts were transported to Australia, it had been “nearly impossible to keep the women and the sailors apart,” though efforts to do so included punishing women by restricting their movement with iron chains, as well as using thumb-screws. Jewish communal leaders were concerned after a famous incident in 1853, when men dressed up as women while on board the Malvina Vidal, in
order to get closer to female passengers, as it was routed between Hamburg and Sydney. When Jewish passengers Nathaniel Levi and Jacob Frankel observed cross-dressing on their ships, it was by the crew as they provided entertainment for the passengers and it did not appear to disturb them.

Orthodox Jewish couples wishing to follow the laws of Niddah may have been reluctant to migrate to Australia because of the lack of mikvah facilities on the ship and after their arrival in the colonies. There is little evidence to suggest that British-Jewish couples followed these laws strictly in London prior to the 1880s. Orthodox women maintained strict physical separation from their husbands and used separate bedding after their menstrual periods began. After a woman's period ended she was expected to immerse herself completely in a pool of water known as a mikvah, which had to contain a certain amount of fresh water. Given the public nature of ship travel, high levels of sea-sickness, the limited bathing facilities, and the high value placed on modesty by couples adhering to this Orthodox custom, there were probably few instances for mild-mannered married couples to have physical intimacy during the trip to Australia. A wife's visit to the mikvah could have been postponed until they arrived at their destination. Although promiscuous single women were known to have affairs on ships, these women were exempted from attending the mikvah, since only married women were sanctioned to have sexual relations. If women had premarital sex, they would have been in tremendous conflict within the Orthodox Jewish community and would not have been accepted at a mikvah.

Although there were concerns that there weren't enough religious leaders in Australia, for most of the second half of the nineteenth century Jews living in major cities within Tasmania, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia had access to at least one rabbi, a synagogue building, a kosher butcher, mohel and synagogue cantor. Sydney's religious leaders included M. R. Cohen, Alexander Barnard Davis, Lewis Goldring, Solomon Phillips, Abraham David Wolinsky, Jacob Henry Landau and Philip Philippstein. In Victoria, primarily in Melbourne, religious leaders included Moses Rintel,
Emanuel Myer Myers, Joseph Abrahams, Elias Blaubaum and Abraham Abrahamsohn. Although religious ceremonies were often delayed by families in rural areas until a Rabbi visited or they could afford to go to the nearest city, this was only physically detrimental in the case of circumcisions.

Once there was a perception that the ship voyage was safe, that there were enough Jewish people, religious leaders and synagogues in most Australian cities, it was more common that large Jewish families migrated from London. It continued to be rare that Jewish women traveled without the company of their husbands or other male relatives. Charity records and newspaper articles indicate that nearly all of the British-Jewish migrants who arrived in Australia were married or too young for marriage. Three women are known to have arrived in Sydney after migrating from England and were single or heads of their household. In 1878, Julia Abrahams left Birmingham with her child and while she was in Sydney, she sought work in Brisbane. In 1888, Sarah Asher, of London, arrived and waited for her husband to follow. Mrs. J. Lowenthal was assisted so she could return to her home in Notthingham in 1895. At least nineteen male-headed Jewish families migrated from England to Sydney and needed financial assistance, and seven Jewish men arrived from England needing financial assistance and had left their wives in other countries. At least twelve single Jewish men migrated from England to Sydney. It was impossible estimate the number of single Jewish women who migrated and did not receive charity after they arrived because passenger lists did not record religious affiliations and Anglo-Jewish last names were often indistinguishable from Catholics and Protestants.

There were a few stories of success documented in relation to the Jews’ Emigration Society. In 1863, an unnamed resident of George Street, in Sydney’s central business district, wrote favorably of her financial circumstances: "Thank God I am in a position this year to pay for my Passover bread," which was more than she could afford while in London. She was fully adjusted to living in Sydney and remarked, "All I can say about Sydney is that I like it very much, and
never wish to leave it as long as I live." She continued: “I only wish that I could have come to Sydney years ago, but I thank God that I am here now.” She also added that her “husband thanks you a thousand times for the kindness that you have shown to me and my family.” Myer Illfeld, arrived in Australia and expected his life to improve and sent a testimonial of thanks to the wife of Chief Rabbi Dr. Hermann Adler of London. One West End Jewish family had dissimilar experiences after they migrated. One of the Benjamin brothers went and returned without becoming wealthy, while two others returned because they were successful, and another successful relative remained in Australia.

Many English-born Jewish colonists were able to improve or retain their wealth in Sydney and went on leisure or business trips to England and Europe, or to New Zealand and other Australian colonies. Noteworthy examples included Mrs. D. L. Levy, Mauritz Baar, Mrs. Hoffnung, Mrs. Lewis Wolfe Levy (b 1826), Rae Cohen, and Henry Keesing Senior. In 1896, Walter D. Benjamin read a paper at a Sydney Hebrew Literary and Debating Society meeting on the topic of the restless and immortal ‘Wandering Jew,’ in which he referred to the image as a “male Mrs. Harris” who was in a constant state of motion across the landscape. His comment subverted the meaning of this image since Mrs. Harris was likely an upper-class Sydney resident and her travels were likely for leisure rather than an exile due to persecution as the image of the Wandering Jew traditionally suggests. A less-flattering and anti-Semitic stereotype based on this image was aired by a member of Parliament in England, as he revealed his view that “Jews are not much better than the wandering Gipsies.” After arrival in Sydney, many Jewish women and their families changed residences on an annual basis, which was recorded in marriage and birth records maintained by the congregations. This may have been a common practice in England as well, and it may have perpetuated the image of Jews as a group prone to wandering, however there was no observable stigma associated with frequent household changes in Australia within the Jewish community.
In the 1850s, numerous members of the English de Rothschild family promoted Jewish migration to Australia. Leopold de Rothschild (1845-1917) was president of the Jewish Emigration Society and had introduced his cousin Constance de Rothschild to Cyril Flower, later known as Lord Battersea (1843-1907), when the two men were at Cambridge. After sixteen years of marriage, Cyril arrived home at 6:30 in the evening and told Constance, "I have good news for you." She probably smiled in anticipation as he "flung" himself into a nearby chair and continued: "I have been offered the Governorship of New South Wales." Her reaction was not what he expected. She wrote that his news "struck me like a knife," and this was how her "terrible" and "never to be forgotten month" of February began in 1893. Lord Jersey had resigned as Governor of New South Wales, and Lord Ripon had made the offer to Flower. Constance felt it would be like "a sin" to leave her mother, Louisa de Rothschild (1821-1910) in England as she was in her early seventies. The period following the decision to decline this offer was one of the most difficult in Constance’s life. Her mother was aware that Flower wished to accept the position and had given Constance the final decision on the matter. Louisa was pleased that her daughter "had the courage to refuse the five years' crown." On the Sabbath following the offer, Louisa was still anxious about the events of the week and felt uncomfortable about Cyril's attitude. She recalled that he joined their party on the Sabbath and it spoiled her mood. She wrote that his "disappointment and anger" about refusing the Governorship made her "feel most uncomfortable!" She sensed that he was as "disappointed in me, as I am in him!" Constance was just as upset and continued to think about the issue and could "see Cyril performing the various functions so beautifully and enjoying all of it." The following day she reflected on the impact of her decision: "Dare I say that I most profoundly regret my decision?" However, she consoled herself that if they had gone to Sydney it "might have killed my mother." By early March in 1893, Louisa expressed her relief at having heard "many adverse opinions to the advantages (which seem so great in Cyril's eyes) to the New South Wales Governorship."
was hopeful he might “come to see its many shadows,” but feared he might “never own that anything but sunshine would have awaited him at the Antipodes!” The optimistic opinion that nothing bad ever happens in sunny Australia, was still circulating, and being refuted, in 1972 in the famous children’s book Alexander and the Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Day.

Constance had a close relationship not only with her mother, but also with her sister Annie Yorke. They both had difficulties gaining the approval of their parents when they married non-Jewish men. Annie wrote to her brother-in-law Cyril, thanking him and affirming that ultimately it was his decision to spare their mother “from a blow and a sorrow, which I honestly do not believe she could have borne.” She revealed how fond their mother was of him: “you little know how deeply attached she is to you,” and she continued to thank him by writing “God bless you for making this enormous sacrifice for her sake.” Annie believed her mother Louisa had his “interests” in mind. Louisa had high hopes for Cyril’s political career, but had not anticipated that his advancement might involve moving so far away from England. By some accounts he remained a “disappointed man” who subsequently lost interest in his political career, and Constance continued to feel responsible for his loss. Her communal activities in London also would have been severed by a move to New South Wales. However, given that she was accustomed to starting and managing schools and a variety of organizations, there was nothing to stand in her way of creating new affiliations after she arrived in the colony. Her father-in-law’s firm, Flower, Salting and Company, was based in Sydney and would have provided a constructive basis for making social contacts. Constance reflected guiltily that she stood in the way of her husband’s “acceptance of an honorable and useful career,” which was unjustified since Cyril held a position in the House of Commons for thirteen years, having first taken his seat in the House of Lords in 1892, a year prior to being offered the governorship.

In spite of having knowledge and appreciation of the benefits Australia had to offer Jews, the personal choices the de Rothschild
family reflect that they did not always view it as an appropriate location to migrate. Unlike most migrants, the wealthiest English-Jewish families could afford to make return trips from Australia and they had enough money to negate the less desirable aspects of being away from London. Constance and Cyril Flower rejected a prestigious job offer because they had strong family ties in England and were already in a financially advantageous position, with respectable jobs and volunteering responsibilities in their local community. They had no pressing need to migrate. Louisa de Rothschild’s family encouraged contact with non-Jews and accepted “foreign modes of thought” that were associated with travel. Had the job offer been in France, where Constance lived as a child, or Italy where they traveled for leisure and health, it is doubtful that Louisa and her daughters would have seen it as such a ‘terrible’ offer. The distance to Australia was prohibitive, especially for older women like Louisa de Rothschild who was in her seventies. Wealthy Anglo-Jewish women, including Constance, Annie and Louisa De Rothschild often acted as philanthropists and teachers to the Anglo-Jewish poor in London, and specifically supported the needs of females. From London, Louisa rewarded Jewish students by donating funds for an annual prize at the Sydney Jewish Board of Education classes. Working-class females would have benefited from the presence of mature upper-class women in the colony. When middle and upper-class Jewish women declined to migrate in significant numbers to Australia, it had consequences for the working-class Jewish women and girls living there.

Jewish merchants were needed in developing settlements, and it has been observed in the American Far West that their stabilizing presence attracted more women to the area, which was a vital step in expanding the Jewish population. For most upper and even middle-class Jewish women, staying in England was preferable since the larger community provided a base of support from extended family members and Jewish charitable organizations that were firmly established in comparison to their more recently founded counterparts in Australia. Australia provided Jews from Europe and the United
Kingdom with an environment that was not already legislated to exclude them from land ownership, social distinction, and full participation in the labor market. Although frontier towns and cities were notorious for their disorder, the benefits of living in an environment that was relatively free of anti-Semitism outweighed these disadvantages and helped Jews develop and maintain a sense of dignity and self-determinism. However, Jewish migration was significantly curtailed because many religiously-observant Jews were unwilling to move to cities where they could not practice Judaism according to Jewish laws. The maintenance of traditional religious practices helped Jewish migrants by providing them with a sense of continuity with the people and places they had left behind. Historian Julie Jeffrey finds that women living in newer settlements in the American Far West were determined to continue their former traditions because it helped them maintain a feeling of connection to their former homes. Similarly, Australian settlers tried to maintain Jewish and British cultural practices.

An exploration of religious themes that related to Jewish women's experiences provides further evidence of the distinctiveness of Jewish women from Protestant and Catholic women and from Jewish men. A woman's class standing and her connections to family members in England were not always the deciding factors in a Jewish woman's decision to migrate to Australia, since many women migrated with the expectation of finding marriage partners. Migrants from long-established and wealthier English families were less likely to have departed England with the feeling that they were exiles and many returned to England for social and commercial reasons, which blurred the line between migration and leisure travel. Bruce Le Branksy rightly concludes that employment opportunities in America held greater potential for Jewish migrants to improve their lives when compared to Australia, particularly those seeking work with Jewish employers, in the tailoring and manufacturing industries. In spite of a large population of Jewish migrants that had recently entered England from Continental Europe who were in need of steady employment, marriage partners, and a healthy place to live, the reports of a Jewish
gender imbalance in Australia did not stimulate a large number of Jewish female migrants from Continental Europe either. Until Sydney's economy had developed sufficiently to sustain factory workers and tailors, single Jewish men and women considered migration to Australia, and to Sydney, too risky. Without the assurance that their basic necessities could be met, migrants saw little hope of sustaining themselves in less-cramped living conditions in Australia's sunny but unpredictable climate.
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Chapter 3: Anglo-Jewish Women’s Influence in the Synagogue: ‘Fashionable Judaism.’

This chapter links the growth of the Jewish community in Sydney to reforms that were also becoming accepted in England, specifically in relation to women’s participation and influence in the synagogue. When the synagogue is presumed to be the focus of communal life, Jewish women are often mistakenly viewed as being irreligious and Jewish men are sometimes blamed for limiting women’s ability to participate in communal matters because of women’s lack of prominence in this location. Although men are mandated to attend prayers, Jewish women’s synagogue attendance is voluntary. Historian Karla Goldman finds that changes within the synagogue in the nineteenth century, were intended to promote women’s inclusion by allowing them to sing in the choir, or by permitting mixed-gender seating, but did not expand to include women in positions of leadership. She finds that women remained subordinated to the men who supervised their efforts in the areas of education and communal affairs. As their role changed she notices a sharp decline in home-based practices, such as keeping kosher, which left women with “a redefined religious space but little to do.” Some of England’s synagogues adopted the Reform movement, however Australian Jews did not openly adopt this movement until the twentieth century. Instead, congregations accepted reforms and continued to think of themselves as Orthodox congregations. Enlightenment thinking in the nineteenth century had also weakened religious authority and this made it easier for individuals to break from traditions that no longer suited their current values. The need to deflect anti-Semitism has also been a socially legitimate reason to justify divergence from religious tradition. Many migrants altered or dropped Orthodox religious customs in order to fit into Christian social circles. Migrants were also known to increase their religious adherence after they relocated in a new city because they hoped that a shared religious heritage might promote their integration into a social network of
individuals who would support their existing ethnic, religious and cultural values. This chapter evaluates the role of women within the synagogue in order to demonstrate that when women and girls attended synagogue they did more than sit passively behind the latticed partition in the women’s section of the sanctuary, known as the gallery, unable to comprehend the meaning of the inaudible Hebrew prayers spoken in the men’s section below them, which were also presumed to be indecipherable in the prayer books within their hands. This image of Jewish women’s outsider status was often raised by Christian observers who attended synagogues as visitors, and to a lesser extent by Jewish men and women themselves. This view is challenged by evidence of many women who read Hebrew and were active participants in the services at synagogues in London and Sydney, particularly through innovations such as including women in the choir and in Confirmation services for girls.

Jewish communal life does not require that a synagogue exist in order to conduct religious worship. The building symbolized the permanence of the Jewish community and was an important step in solidifying the status and well-being of Jews in any given location. Most communities set about establishing a synagogue when a core group of women joined the men in the area and they were financially able to pay for the land and construction costs. Between the late 1840s to mid-1850s in Sydney, Jews were taxed at church rates but were not supported by the state as churches were. Communal leaders argued that they paid taxes, cared for their poor co-religionists, fulfilled their civic duties and it would only require the removal of one word of legislation in order for Jews to be on equal footing with Christians. Governor George Gipps (1791-1847) responded in 1846 that he did not have the authority to authorize funds to be applied toward the synagogue or the salary of the minister. Their request was opposed on the grounds that if the government provided funding to Jews then “it might next be applied for by Hindoos, Mahometans, and Socialists.” The funds were granted in early 1847, with the understanding that they would be used for ‘public worship,’ as was specified in the Act, and they agreed that to deny access to the funds
would have been an injustice.\textsuperscript{10} In 1850, the governor of New South Wales, Sir Charles Augustus FitzRoy approved the land grant for the Jewish school.\textsuperscript{11}

Communal leaders encouraged people to maintain their religious practices in alternative spaces if they were unable to attend a local synagogue or if one had not yet been built in the area. For example, in the Australian gold rush, similar to Jews in the American Far West and in New Zealand, prayers were initially held in informal settings, such as people’s homes. It was common that for health and safety reasons women, children and elderly people did not attend worship services or the nearest Hebrew school if the walk required for the round trip was impractical. Parents were especially reluctant to allow young girls to travel on their own by foot or on the railways.\textsuperscript{12} Among Reform congregations it was often difficult for families to provide for tram and train costs to send their children to school on weekdays or to Sunday classes at the synagogue.\textsuperscript{13} In 1859, London’s Jewish communal leaders wanted to build “a small synagogue in every neighborhood in which a Jewish population springs up.”\textsuperscript{14} They saw this as the only way to curb “mass estrangement”\textsuperscript{15} and feared that without having formal buildings for worship there would be a significant loss of cultural and religious knowledge.\textsuperscript{16} There was a perception that if Jews worshipped together under oppressive circumstances, they would continue to be religiously observant under more favorable conditions because they appreciated the social support and comfort that being Jewish provided them.\textsuperscript{17}

Historian Rabbi John Levi finds that wealthier Jews had a stronger affiliation to Judaism when compared to those who were poor.\textsuperscript{18} Synagogue-seat rentals were paid annually as a lump sum rather than on a monthly basis, and it was expected that attendees would make donations to the congregation in addition to this fee. These financial expectations favored wealthy individuals rather than pious ones. Jewish men in England complained of their inability to integrate into the local congregations because they were poor. Catholic reformer Caroline Chisholm sought to reverse Australia’s low rates of church attendance by increasing the ability of poor people to attend.
wanted to eliminate the practice of renting seats so that the "word of God" was as easy to access as "the air of Heaven." Men knew that if they sat in an empty seat that was paid for by someone else they could be expelled if that person arrived. Men reported feeling insulted when they were asked to move. London's Margaret Street Reform synagogue was exceptional, in that a "stranger is at all times readily, freely, and courteously admitted." In the 1870s, Esther Stone recalled that Sydney's York Street Congregation had better attendance on Sabbaths than the more "aristocratic" Macquarie Street congregation, which demonstrates that wealth and synagogue attendance were not always correlated. In 1888, there was a proposal to build a synagogue for the fifteen-thousand poor Jews in London's East End, which would have given them access to free seats. Similarly, there were plans at the turn of the century to build a more Orthodox congregation in Sydney for those who objected to the way that "humble Jews" were treated in a "stand-off manner" at the Great Synagogue. One observer of the cultural divisions within the community remarked that even if "some of their parents had been Polish, their money was English" and they expected this to earn the respect of their peers. Synagogues often favored wealthy individuals over pious Jews who were poor, but smaller groups formed in the absence of formal buildings, making it so even the poorest Jews could practice Judaism in a manner that suited them.

Jewish women were more likely to promote the religious observance of men than they were to attend services themselves, which contrasted from the strong attendance of women in Christian worship services. Fathers and husbands encouraged females to attend synagogue by paying the cost of their seat rental. Women in England had a long history of attendance at London's synagogues according to S. Schecter's lecture titled Praying Women. In 1880, there were some synagogues in London where females nearly outnumbered men. In England, Australia, New Zealand and America the increased participation of women in religious services was correlated with a decline in male participation. Upper-class women were more accustomed to standing in for their husbands at social
functions, which may have gradually included representing them in the synagogue. In America, the strong representation of women in the synagogue was attributed to men being away traveling and their wives and children continued attending in their absence. Among Jewish men in New York, religious apathy was so widespread by 1875, that as many as seventy-five percent of men were unaffiliated with a synagogue. American-Jews “structurally reconsidered” their services in order to promote female attendance and as a result women attended more regularly than men. Congregations in the American Far West were often composed of Eastern-European migrants, who were exceptional in that men attended services more regularly than women. In these congregations there was no detectable decrease in male attendance during the summer months, when reforming Jews were often absent on summer holidays. The synagogue is not the only location where men gathered for their prayers and it is unclear from historical sources if they met in other locations, such as in people’s homes. If so, what influenced did this have on women’s participation in the synagogue? Women may not have been invited to join private gatherings where men formed a minyan, which may explain why in some cities women outnumbered men in the synagogues. Men who resented women’s strong presence in the synagogue would have been the most likely to form private prayer meetings. A variety of factors influenced synagogue attendance and declining attendance meant that the congregations struggled to pay for basic costs related to the salary of the rabbi and to building maintenance.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, many Jews feared that cultural and linguistic traditions had become so diverse and divergent that the next generation might not be able to understand each other. For example, Jews from Liverpool and New York were just a ten-day ship voyage from each other, but their grammar and word usage had been altered to the point that communication was sometimes awkward. When women were not taught Hebrew it reduced their ability to integrate into local Jewish social networks and when they traveled to cities where their native tongue was not
generally spoken they were less likely to be able to integrate into the group than men whose Bar Mitzvah training included Hebrew instruction. Louisa de Rothschild’s remarks indicate that without a strong knowledge of Hebrew she felt estranged when she attended services in London and in other cities where she did not speak the language. She wrote: “Perhaps if I understood Hebrew I should find the service more beneficial,” but she confessed that in her “present state of ignorance, the noise, senseless to me, only confuses me” and it prevented her from “paying attention either to the prayers” or to her “thoughts.” Perhaps more significantly, differing levels of Hebrew fluency limited communication between Jewish men and women within a community.

Most synagogues in the nineteenth-century had a separated area of the synagogue building, known as the gallery, where women sat with their daughters and youngest children during the services. It was typically partitioned by a lattice-like screen from the men’s sanctuary below and was considered a necessary component of “modern synagogues.” Goldman finds that some American women clearly preferred to have the partition because they saw it as a “sign of respect.” However, the partition was often eliminated by reformed synagogues toward the end of the century because it was perceived by them to be an outdated custom. This was partly because women’s faces were obscured, as was their view of the services. Esther Jacobs of London referred to the gallery as a “hen-coop” and felt that the railing represented the way men begrudged women’s presence in the synagogue. In 1877, a member of London’s United Synagogue referred to the partition in the Hambro Synagogue as a “hideous railing” that gave the impression of being a “dingy den, in which the lady worshippers were penned up like so many sheep.” Although there was a discussion that the railing should be reinstalled, it seemed backward and incompatible with Judaism and a component of the congregation wanted to refuse the order that it be replaced. The Chief Rabbi Dr. Adler ordered the East London Synagogue to replace their railing after it had been removed, because women were concerned that it provided a measure of safety for the children that
accompanied them. They were aware that a boy had fallen to his
death at the Sheffield synagogue. The railing allowed women with
toddlers and young children to relax, and even close their eyes for a
few minutes, without fearing their children might crawl up onto the
balcony ledge while they were focused on their prayers. J. Salmons of
the Hambro Synagogue found there was support for replacing the
partition because its absence had diminished the “devotional feeling”
of the services, presumably due to the distraction of the opposite sex
being able to view each other. Christian politicians also employed the
use of screens for gender segregation and Constance Flower (formerly
de Rothschild) attended a speech given by her husband in 1880 at the
Wellington Hotel in Brecon Borough from behind a screened area.

The Great Synagogue in Sydney, was not built with this style of
partition, but women were still in a separate space where they were
physically, as well as symbolically located above the men, and they
were visible and well-integrated with them.

Anthropologist, Susan Starr Sered has noted that sex segregation
may have divided women from “culturally esteemed spiritual venues,”
but it provided women with their own space where it was possible to
subvert, create or adapt traditions to their own needs and ideals. In
1871, it was observed that the rabbis were the only men sanctioned to
look at the women in the gallery. American reformers argued in the
1850s that the arrangement with ladies in the gallery, held the
presence for distraction since there was “the opportunity of a constant
telegraphic communication, at the twinkling of an eye,” to the
balcony above. American reformers suggested that having men sit
with their female relatives might quell this “vertical flirting.”

Alterations to women’s role in the synagogue led to negotiations over
dualistic beliefs that women’s presence had the potential to either
incite or diminish men’s sexuality and attentiveness to their prayers.
Although women’s presence may have instigated strong feelings in
men, wisdom handed down from generation to generation reveals an
underlying perception that men could and should remain in control of
their own sexual desires.
Women's complaints about conditions in the synagogue were taken seriously by communal leaders and men also had legitimate complaints about the conditions in various synagogue buildings. Jewish women across the world complained that their elevated position in the building within the gallery was too hot in the summers. Men were seated on the ground level, which would have been cooler since heat naturally rises. Women in many synagogues complained of cold drafts in the winter, but at this time of year they would have been warmer than the men below. Frank Haes of London's Bayswater Synagogue was deterred from attending at the holidays because he felt there were consequences from breathing so much "impure lung food" in overcrowded conditions. The ventilation in Sydney's Great Synagogue was poor and on holidays like Yom Kippur people complained of having headaches, which may have partially resulted from fasting on these days.

Religious reforms interested Jews who were concerned that people had become indifferent to Judaism. The Reform movement originated in Germany in 1819, and was influential and widely debated in England in the 1830s. It took another decade before Americans became accepting of it in the mid-1840s. England's synagogues were reported to be more strictly observant of the "letter of Judaism." However, there was widespread agreement within the de Rothschild family that the services in London lacked the "spirit," and "inward beauty," that they thought should be characteristic of the "soul and the solemnity of Judaism." Disagreements over innovations led to schisms and to new congregations that were based on the Reform Movement, such as the Berkeley Street and Margaret Street Synagogues in London. As a small population in most cities, Jews needed to pool their resources in order to gain equal political and civil rights, and this was potentially hindered by a schism. A Jewish population with more than ten-thousand individuals was generally large enough to withstand the less desirable aspects associated with internal divisions, including the difficulty of who had authority over communal resources and responsibility for providing sustenance to the needy. In 1845, Horatio Montefiore formed the Burton Street
Synagogue in West London following a schism over reforms within his former congregation. In 1871, James Parton (1822-1891), a famous English-born biographer, thought that one third of Jews were Orthodox, another third attended the services at the High Holidays and another third attended synagogues that had adopted reforms. In the 1890s, the Reform movement still did not have adequate support in Australia, likely due to the small population of Jews who could not risk dividing their numbers though a schism. The first census year in Sydney to show a population of over ten-thousand Jews was in 1921, and it was after this point, in the early 1930s that Ada Phillips was credited with promoting formal acceptance of the Reform Movement.

Some Londoners, including members of the de Rothschild family, complained that the rabbis were "idle," and saw the synagogue as spiritually "drowsy" and apathetic. They found the services to be "encumbered with ordinances which are repugnant to the feelings of its faithful followers." As a result, religious reformers wanted the services to be shorter, less repetitious, and to start later in the morning. They also wanted to alter the system of financial offerings. When synagogues described wanting to increase the equality of Jewish women, this included the introduction of mixed-seating where men and women were not only on the same floor of the building but sat in integrated family groups. Reforms were also related to the style of music in the services, such as the introduction of an organ, harmonium, or other forms of instrumental music. Sidney Moss was willing to resign from his role as choir master in 1879 because the congregation opposed the introduction of musical instruments into the service. Reforms also included the formation of all-male choirs that were thought to closely resemble Christian services, as well as choirs that were composed of mixed-gender groups. Some Orthodox-Jews found the prospect of women singing in the synagogue unacceptably distracting to their concentration. However, these innovations were expected to increase the 'decorum' or 'solemnity' of the services, and these words signaled that reforms had been accepted and were in practice even if the congregation
continued to indicate that it was an Orthodox rather than Reform synagogue. Reforms were also expected to resolve problems related to men and women who showed up late or departed prior to the end of the services, and they wanted to reduce the number of disruptive conversations between neighbors. Reformers wanted to diminish the authority of the Talmud and align Jewish life more closely with the values in the Old Testament. This may have been because Christians and Jewish laity were more familiar with the Old Testament, whereas the Talmud was studied primarily by the most religiously observant men, such as rabbis. Nevertheless, the teachings within the Talmud promoted equality for women and provided insight into a wide range of subjects and included "historical and biographical notices, legends, astronomy, ..., sympathetic medicine, ..., parables, ..., sermons, ethics, and rules of practical wisdom," which were likely to be of interest to everyone. There were some reforms that were too radical for Orthodox congregations to accept because they required musicians to perform work on the Sabbath, which was prohibited by Jewish law. Although religious leaders from Orthodox and Reform synagogues wanted their congregations to follow their guidance, individuals blended the two traditions in order to suit their personal beliefs. As one example, Anna Maria Goldsmid attended the West London Synagogue and the Margaret Street synagogue almost without fail on Friday evenings and Saturdays. Although these were both Reform synagogues, she opted to continue following the Orthodox custom of maintaining a kosher kitchen.

In the last few decades of the century, adherents of Orthodox and Reform Judaism tended to accept and promote biased opinions of each other. Reform-Jews were criticized in 1873 for adhering to what was termed "fashionable Judaism." This was defined by one writer to consist of tardiness to the synagogue, avoidance of prayer, apathy toward religiosity that was expressed in the home or outside of the synagogue, as well as a desire "to stigmatize observers of the Law as bigots, and shun their contact" in order to remain stylish and to blend in with Christian society. These individuals were considered too
interested in “convenience,” and being “fashionable,” which led to too much “pride, and selfishness.” They were accused of placing greater value on keeping their “hands white and soft,” without caring if their “hearts may be black and vile.” Mothers were implored to teach their daughters not to be frivolous, and specifically not to “use the synagogue as a vehicle for the exhibition and criticism of new clothes.” Reformers were equally caustic in their remarks about Orthodoxy. In 1882, an Australian remarked that “For many ears the word ‘orthodox’ has a very disagreeable sound,” because it was too closely associated with individuals who were “bigoted, narrow-minded, or even fanatic,” and it was “considered the greatest enemy of free thought,” to the extent that it was “calculated” to make people into “blind slaves of forms and ceremonies.” Christians and reforming Jews were critical of the morning prayer said by Orthodox Jewish men each morning in which they thanked God for not making them a woman, a slave or a heathen. A non-Jewish critic considered it a “blasphemy against the fountain of human life” for a man to thank God that he was not a woman. Controversy over this issue led to the counter-assertion that this prayer was actually about men being thankful that they had been commanded as men to follow the divine precepts that women were exempted from fulfilling. Although Reform services appealed to the spiritual needs of women and children, they were not as successful at drawing men to the synagogue.

In England, reformers introduced sermons into synagogue services in the 1840s. They were often delivered in English, rather than in Yiddish, Hebrew, Polish, German, Spanish or Portuguese, which was viewed as a radical departure from tradition. A few Jews rejected the use of Hebrew and English because Latin and Greek-Aramean were thought to be more traditional. Louisa de Rothschild shared a feeling of dissatisfaction with the services when she attended synagogue. At Passover in 1854, she wrote: “What a pity that our Service is not of that impressive, solemn kind,” which would “chain the attention of all those who assist at it.” She wanted the service to provide the congregation with “good thoughts” and to “be beautiful,”
but instead she felt it was “not only tedious but often ridiculous.”

She indicated that this was partly because she did not understand the Hebrew and was not fully satisfied with the English translation. She asked herself “It is not, however, a profanation of sacred things to read prayers which one feels to be absurd?” She concluded: “We are indeed in much need of reform.”

Although English sermons were not entirely accepted in British colonies, they were a regular feature of the services at Sydney’s York Street Synagogue. This was the language most people were fluent in, and communal leaders felt it would keep Judaism “full of life” in the “hearts and minds” of their congregation. Sermons had initially been resented for their likeness to Christian traditions, but by the 1870s they were an anticipated component of services in England, which meant that synagogues in British colonies had the sanction they needed from the London Beth Din to include sermons in English within their synagogues.

Traditions dictated that a public reading of the Torah by a woman would be immodest and was considered undesirable because it displaced men from their traditional role and diminished the time women spent at home with their families, which was similar to the argument that was advanced against women’s engagement in politics, higher education, or public causes such as the Temperance movement. Jewish men strived to reduce the “atmosphere of frivolity” in the synagogue, so that they could be fully absorbed in their prayers. Women provided a distraction and caused some men to feel self-conscious. As a result, it was controversial for females to be at the center of attention within the services, and they were not counted as a part of the quorum for prayer, known as a minyan. Women also wished to reduce the distraction of the opposite sex and were not always comfortable in public religious settings that were primarily oriented toward men.

Historically, Jewish leaders, such as the influential reformer Moses Mendelssohn (1729-1786), upheld the view that men should be in positions of authority in public spaces, while women should be given domestic authority. This view prevailed in the nineteenth century and provided a model for how men and women were expected to provide
each other with mutual support. In 1848, the Breslau Conference called for greater equality for women. Many reforms were made within the synagogue to appeal to women and Reform Judaism made fewer demands on men, which gave the impression that women's status was more similar to, and equal with, men than in Orthodox congregations. In 1888, Rabbi D. Fay told the St. John's Wood Synagogue in London that he thought it was important to include women “more fully into the congregation.” Rabbi S. Singer shared his view. He wanted to provide women with a “heart service” that would meet their spiritual needs. He was also a strong supporter of girls' clubs. In 1891, Louisa de Rothschild recommended his plans to initiate services for poor women in London's East End, in order to encourage attendance among those who were disinclined to join in the existing services. That year in London, the Sabbath services were also conducted by Emily Marion Harris (d 1900), at the Hanway Street School. She addressed women's needs specifically, provided light refreshments for attendees and even set up floral arrangements that added to the 'decorum' of her services. She remarked that a “cup of cocoa and a half-penny bun are given to each girl 'ere she treads her long way homeward,” which provided the extra support for young women who might have been otherwise undernourished. Services held specifically for women were generally well regarded except “by those who are alarmed at every innovation.” G. J. Emanuel of Birmingham felt that the “worship fit for men is the worship fit for women,” and he opposed the idea of separate services, believing it to be “fraught with danger,” even though Judaism had always upheld different expectations for men and women. The custom of separating women from men with special services or by having women sit in the gallery was criticized as being “an orientalism altogether unworthy of this age,” since women's status in 'Eastern' societies was thought to be inferior to men's. Orthodox-Jews and reformers both valued women's equality within the synagogue but disagreed as to how it should manifest. Reformers saw women's segregation in the gallery as insulting to women, while Orthodox-Jews were offended at the prospect of services that were held by women in the absence of men.
Several women from the wealthy De Rothschild family in London were interested in the religious practices of the Quakers and Theists. In 1854, Louisa de Rothschild wrote that she was “Much pleased with some of the Quaker doctrines.”\(^{111}\) As a young adult, Constance de Rothschild, described herself as searching for a “true, bright, simple-eyed faith,”\(^{112}\) but felt that “nothing but controversy,”\(^ {113}\) could be found. She was frustrated that “no two people, of whatever faith they may be, can worship together”\(^ {114}\) which left her feeling “very wretched.”\(^ {115}\) She attended services in Whitehall Chapel and Westminster Abbey in addition to synagogue services. She was dissatisfied with her experiences in the synagogues because of experiences such as this one: “heard a bad service, horrible singing, inferior sermon- in short, we were not edified.”\(^ {116}\) In the early 1870s, she met Frances Power Cobbe (1822-1904), a Theist who was an advocate of women’s rights, and an anti-vivisectionist activist,\(^{117}\) who lived with sculptress Mary Lloyd as her “companion.”\(^{118}\) At the time of when they met, de Rothschild found Cobbe to be a “genial woman” with a “splendid head, a good countenance and a delightful voice,”\(^ {119}\) and their long-lasting friendship included discussions on Theism.\(^ {120}\) Cobbe respected de Rothschild’s attachment to Judaism and asked her to write an article about Judaism a few months after they met. De Rothschild’s published “Hebrew Women” in *New Quarterly.*\(^ {121}\) When de Rothschild was thirty, in 1873, she visited Nathaniel Montefiore and his wife at Coldeast where she continued her studies in Jewish history. She concluded that she was “Jewish by race, not by religion or by doctrine”\(^ {122}\) and felt she lacked the feeling of “pride and isolation”\(^ {123}\) that was characteristic of Jews. She observed that she no longer felt “impregnated with Jewish doctrine”\(^ {124}\) and instead described a consciousness that was non-denomination: “My Church is a universal one, my God, my Father all of mankind, my creed charity, toleration and morality.” She felt she could “worship the great Creator under any name.”\(^ {125}\) She opposed the “narrowing of our affection,”\(^ {126}\) that resulted when Jews focused on the “improvement of the race,”\(^ {127}\) and instead she wanted to make “the good of man”\(^ {128}\) a priority over the “glorifying of our Priesthood.”\(^ {129}\) In the following years, she
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struggled to reconcile these ideals after she married a non-Jewish man, Cyril Flower, also known as Lord Battersea. At the end of 1881, she wrote that she wanted to have "the strength of mind to cling to my purpose, but I have dissipated my power on small objects." Her perspective was that this was difficult for her because "Life is so complicated in all its bearings and relations." By the end of 1890, she still had a great respect for Christianity and described Jesus Christ as "the most divine character in history." That same day she reflected that: "It is not true that the Jews possess the whole of God's Word," although "it is true that they possess a great part of it and ought to possess themselves of the other part," rather than "beggar themselves spiritually." She continued to feel frustrated that she could "not lift Judaism up into a wider sphere" and again found it too "racial." At Cobbe's death, de Rothschild felt detached from Judaism, however she continued to position herself on the "outer edges of Christianity," which she said she would never "enter, though it attracts me." Although she recognized that she had been influenced toward Theism, she did not remain where Cobbe had "led" her. After acknowledging that she needed "more doctrine, more creed, more help in life," she admitted that her religious life was a "difficult and very complicated business." In 1910, long after the Reform Movement provided a wider range of worship styles, de Rothschild summarized her ongoing attachment to organized religion. She had attended church and wrote in her diary: "I hope I am not doing wrong, Sometimes I think I am acting a lie, because I am not a Christian." She continued: "I am a woman with spiritual longings and I love public worship." She appreciated the Sabbath for providing a "day of rest," and enjoyed "the pause in the week," which gave her "time to think, to put away worldly things, to deny oneself some amusement." In her view, reforms resulted in a "broader but not less spiritual view of Judaism." Until historians evaluate the perspectives of more middle and working-class women it will remain unclear if Constance de Rothschild's views reflect a unique vantage point based on her status as an intermarried woman from an extremely wealthy family.
As a result of concerns over the religious apathy of Jewish adults, the benefits of giving children a proper education became more highly valued. The ceremony for confirming boys and girls was seen as a remedy. It was hoped that the preparation for this rite of passage would place girls on equal footing with boys, so that as adults the girls could influence the religious adherence of the men and children around them. French and English synagogues offered children the opportunity to be confirmed in the 1840s. Even in 1864, the Chief Rabbi Dr. Adler gave the impression that he only “half sanctioned” the ceremony. After his approval of Confirmation at the Bayswater and Birmingham congregations in 1865, it was argued that if it was lawful there it should be accepted everywhere. British congregations were more innovative than some European congregations, such as that of Munich where girls were not confirmed prior to 1896.

There were a number of reasons that Confirmation was contested. One of the most difficult objections to overcome was that women had never before been permitted to speak to the congregation from the bimah on the main floor of the sanctuary where the men prayed. Conservative individuals found it immodest and distracting to have young unmarried females speaking directly to the congregation during the services. Some English-Jewish mothers rejected the ceremony of Confirmation because of the “innate modesty in Jewish women which forbids them from making public the feelings of the heart.” Another complaint was that the Confirmation veils worn by girls too closely resembled those of a bride, and was thought to confuse the meaning of the ceremony. This objection was quickly countered as “scarcely a reasonable one.” Others complained that the name was “illogical” since no event preceded it that could be considered completed or confirmed. People also argued that the amount of religious instruction that went into preparing for the event was insufficient and it was better to educate children, girls specifically, over a longer period of time. Boys prepared extensively for their Bar Mitzvah ceremony, but it was well-known that their lessons were easily forgotten after the ceremony, and it was expected that this would also be the case for girls. The most often cited criticism was...
that the name of the ceremony was too closely associated with Christian worship. They were proud of this innovation and urged Orthodox congregations to reconsider their objection to it. Jews wanted equality for women and girls but they were less inclined to support innovations to tradition when they resembled Christian worship, even if they wished to be closely affiliated with Christians in other areas of life.

The names of children who went through the Confirmation ceremony in London were included in the Jewish Chronicle, which was distributed throughout Jewish communities in the English-speaking world. When the West London Burton Street Confirmations took place in 1862, the ladies’ gallery was “crowded to inconvenience” in order to view the Confirmation of five girls and six boys. Girls living in British colonies were probably inspired by this form of equality. Sydney’s Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis confirmed fifteen boys and fourteen girls in 1867, not long after it was sanctioned by the Chief Rabbi in London, but the ceremony was discontinued because there was insufficient interest in it. Confirmation was not often practiced in Australian congregations until after the turn of the century. Confirmation provided girls with the skills they needed to become educators of children in the home, but also put them one step closer to being qualified as rabbis. The total number of children confirmed in British and Australian congregations in the nineteenth century was small and boys outnumbered girls. This contrasted with American synagogues where girls were the “preponderant majority” of those confirmed. It also contrasted with Christian and Catholic traditions, in which Confirmation was sanctioned by the laity and clergy as an accepted rite-of-passage for girls.

In 1878, the Great Synagogue building was completed. This impressive building is still in use and was built in Sydney’s central business district, on Elizabeth Street across from Hyde Park. When it was built, it was the largest synagogue in the southern hemisphere. It provides seats for 420 men and the upstairs ladies’ gallery has an
additional 358 seats. Since attendance by females was less expected at the synagogue, there were fewer seats provided for them. Seats were rented individually rather than as a pair, which was the practice in other synagogues. Renting seats individually encouraged women's attendance since it allowed widows and single women to attend in the absence of a male chaperone. Ladies' seats cost one pound and one shilling and there were three types of men's seats that varied in price between two pounds and two shillings and four pounds and four shillings annually. In the 1890s, the number of seats that were rented fluctuated, partly due to the economic depression. There were an average of 233 to 290 women's seats and 340 to 389 men's seats that were rented. In most years it was rare that the ladies' or the men's sections were rented to capacity, with the exception of the High Holidays. The Great Synagogue welcomed and encouraged female attendance, and the rabbis of the congregation conducted home visits that the board of management stated were aimed at increasing religious "obligations" of "both sexes, who hitherto have sadly disregarded these important duties of life." Widows and single women at the Great Synagogue regularly paid for their own seats in the ladies' gallery and occasionally they paid for the seats of others, presumably as heads of their household. Women and girls had the option of maintaining their religion from within the home and their regular presence in the synagogue suggests that the services and social atmosphere appealed to them. The Druitt Street Synagogue was open in the late 1870s to 1888, and the Western Suburbs Synagogue, located in Newtown on Georgina Street, was open in 1883. However, they were not within easy walking distance for most people living in the central business district and their congregational records did not survive. If women were dissatisfied with the content of the services or their place in the synagogue gallery at the Great Synagogue, they could have declined to attend, or could have attended services elsewhere. There were few complaints by women in Sydney and London in relation to their synagogue attendance, and in most cases the issue also was a source of complaint by men, such as the air flow in the building, or too much talking by late-comers.
There was a general agreement that women were capable of providing sound advice and performing the administrative work involved with being a voting member of the board of the synagogue. It was not expected that women's assistance to Synagogue councils would result in any “roofs” collapsing, yet women in Sydney and London, as in most areas of the world, did not vote as members of the congregation’s board of management, even after their disenfranchisement was an issue that England’s Jewish M. P., Sir Julian Goldsmid sought to remedy in 1888. At that time in New York, women were the main group attending religious services and enough men had abandoned their traditional role that it was suggested that women ought to be allowed to become voting members of the congregation so that someone from the family was taking an interest in communal matters. About a decade later, at a newly formed congregation in Chicago, married and single Jewish women were given “equal membership with men” for the first time. At that time, in Ballarat Victoria, women attempted to vote as members of the board of management for their congregation, but their efforts were blocked on the grounds that they might be exposed to “some disagreement that would be unbecoming for ladies present to witness.” This was viewed as a weak argument since women’s presence at meetings was known to curb “unpleasant incidents.” Another argument was that women should be given the right to vote in the synagogue based on the cost of their seats and the widely accepted idea that equal taxation should equate with equal representation. In London, members of some congregations found it perplexing and inequitable that women were excluded from voting, but they observed that Wesleyan’s had “definitely refused to admit women representatives.” Esther Jacobs of London provides the reason that likely accounted for men’s reluctance to enfranchise women. She felt that if women had the right to vote they might become Wardens of the synagogue and in this role they would either move the power associated with this position to the women’s gallery or else it would require a woman to stand in the men’s section on the main floor. In
other words, it would have undermined the gender segregation that was traditional in the synagogue.

Women were often responsible for assuring that the Synagogue had a welcoming feeling and donated special items to the congregation, such as covers for the Torah scrolls, known as mantles, and other types of religious paraphernalia. Mrs. Moss and her sons loaned their harmonium for use with the Great Synagogue choir, which her husband directed in the 1880s. In 1878, Mrs. Benjamin Francis of Sydney collected nearly £400 in order to purchase decorative items from London. The Great Synagogue thanked her and the ladies who "so liberally seconded her endeavours" and they hoped the items would arrive before the High Holidays. In 1879, Mrs. David Barnett was memorialized by her sister Mrs. Sigmond Hoffnung, who paid for a silk mantle that was purchased by her husband when he was in London. He selected a white satin mantle with silver embroidery and also brought back other items paid for by the "Jewish Ladies of Sydney," including three sets of velvet and silk gold-embroidered curtains for the ark, three matching covers for the reading desk and eight matching mantles. These items were "universally admired for their elegance and beauty." Mrs. Lewis Woolf Levy provided a gift of a mantle and reading desk cover in honor of her late husband, and provided a carpet in the ladies' gallery in honor of her grandson Leslie Cohen's Bar Mitzvah. Although the cloth and metal items women contributed were highly valued at the time they were donated, curators find that cloth pieces, such as mantles, are not as carefully cared for by museums and are less likely to survive points of crisis than metal candlesticks, for example.

England's Chief Rabbi Nathan Adler gave his approval for mixed-gender choirs after 1892. In 1855, the York Street Synagogue had expanded the ladies' gallery to seat ninety women, the expense of which was associated with providing a space for the choir, which was still considered innovative, but was expected to increase attendance and revenues. In 1875, Orthodox Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis of the Great Synagogue sanctioned their choir. As with other reforms, women's participation in the choir was viewed by some Jews as too
closely resembling Christian services. Davis was publicly chastised by an English Jewish man, B. L. Mosley, who complained that Davis' actions were "infringing" on the religious customs of the Orthodox community. The Talmud was usually invoked in discussions related to women's participation in the choir but was not the final word on the matter. Rather, the desire for decorum and order were the crucial determining factors. The introduction of mixed-gender choirs was contested since the voice of women singing was thought to be extremely distracting to men who were praying, which was based on the laws outlined in the Schulhan Aruch. Another argument was that 'two voices are not heard' so if a man and a woman sing in harmony the woman's voice is considered sexually neutral. When women and girls were included in the choir they remained in the women's gallery, which did not substantially compromise the gender segregation within the synagogue. Boys were too young to be familiar with all of the musical pieces sung in choirs, but their feminine-sounding voices were found to be more pleasing and appropriate to the synagogue than those of women and girls. Others disagreed and found that women's voices added to the strength of the choir. A man from London's wealthier West End, felt that when it came to the issue of women singing in the choir the "Jewess has a right to serve the Synagogue, and the Synagogue a right to the services of the Jewess." Another writer's comments on this matter defended women's participation in the choir by stating: "We are convinced that a woman does not become less womanly because she does public work in a womanly spirit." England's Chief Rabbi provided the formal sanction Australian congregations needed to form choirs and when it was provided, women were active singers.

After women were permitted to join the Great Synagogue choir, it was composed primarily of women and girls. The few married women that participated usually sang with unmarried relatives, who did not hold synagogue seats in their own name and were likely their daughters. Julia Simmons was offered thirty-two pounds annually for her role singing in the choir and Julia Phillips earned twenty-six pounds annually. Miss M. Levy was the most enduring member of the
choir and sang with the group for eight years. The synagogue rewarded singers by acknowledging them in the annual report and gave them "tokens of gratitude." Maud Rose Menser was given a gift when she left the choir prior to her wedding. When Miss S. Isaacs left the colony she was also given a "small honorarium of ten guineas," which they indicated was below the "true merit of her services."\textsuperscript{191}

Between 1893 and 1900, Sydney's Great Synagogue constantly sought to improve their choir. Even though men were more numerous than females in the congregation, in an average year the choir had about twenty females and seven male singers.\textsuperscript{192} Ongoing requests by the congregation to increase the number of male singers can be viewed as an effort to introduce a more traditional atmosphere within the synagogue, since the cantors who sang the prayers had always been male. The ongoing difficulty the congregation had in retaining male singers may reflect ambivalence on the part of men toward reforms that caused an increase in female visibility within the historically male-oriented sanctuary or a rejection of the choir as an innovation that too closely resembled Christian services. Adult men may also have felt uncomfortable being in the ladies' gallery where the choir usually sang. However, if women's participation consistently outnumbered men and was distracting or viewed with disdain, and men did not join as a form of protest, they could have registered their complaints in the newspaper, which was not uncommon. They could have petitioned for the board to discontinue the choir as an alternative resolution to the issue. However, this did not occur and there is little evidence to suggest that women's presence in the choir was considered a problem. Instead, men's complaints were related to the difficulty of finding enough male singers to equally balance the number of females in the choir, which would assure that women's voices were considered sexually neutral and acceptable within an Orthodox congregation.\textsuperscript{193}

Goldman finds that women's role as singers was a "symbolic" advancement toward their equality with men since it allowed them to contribute more directly to the prayers of the congregation.\textsuperscript{194} Although Rabbi Adler was hesitant to alter ancient traditions based on
the *Shulhan Aruch*, it does not appear that the majority of Jewish men in the late-nineteenth century found the voice of women singing in the synagogue to be detrimental to their ability to pray. The presence of a mixed-gender and inter-generational choir that sang in unison was symbolic of the unity, or integration, that the congregation sought to promote within their synagogue, their families and society, even if the absence of males in the choir overshadowed the continued presence of females. Sydney’s Great Synagogue maintained a mixed-gender choir until 1974, nearly a century after it was formed. For the years between 1974 and 2009, their choir has been composed exclusively of males. While it is remarkable that the choir in the late-nineteenth century was overwhelmingly composed of unmarried females, it is understandable given that female participation in religious services was increasingly desired and accepted across the British world at that time, and the change toward an all-male choir is reflective of changes that resulted from migration in response to the Holocaust in the twentieth-century.

Practicing Judaism was not merely a matter of attending synagogue services, following *kosher* practices and other aspects of Jewish law, there was also a strong spiritual component to women’s lives. By the turn of the century synagogue services in English-speaking countries appeared increasingly similar to the services of local Christians as a result of reforms. In Sydney, women who practiced Orthodoxy and Reform Judaism likely shared the same area of the ladies’ gallery in the Great Synagogue yet tensions between them were not recorded in letters, diaries, congregation correspondence or in newspaper articles. Formal acceptance of the Reform movement signified that Jews had reached a large enough population that it was possible to divide into smaller groups based on special interests. There were many traditional and non-traditional ways that women expressed their ‘Jewishness’ when religious reforms were being introduced and the Jewish population in Sydney was expanding. There were competing ideas about what women’s equality and empowerment meant. Jewish women entered into public matters whenever they found an opportunity to do so. With a few exceptions,
women in London and Sydney did not actively request changes to their position in Jewish society, yet it is evident that their status was not static in the last few decades of the century. Women remained relatively silent on matters related to their feeling of equality or inequality, partly because they valued being modest and understood that women had highly-prized religious responsibilities within the home. Since men cooperated with women in order to include females in public religious activities and the synagogue, it was rare that women openly criticized men over this issue. Women at the Great Synagogue were highly integrated into the public life of the congregation, which mirrored the stance of many of their British co-religionists. The public sphere had become an accepted, if not preferred, location for many women to express their religious devotion. It is unlikely women and girls would have expended so much effort toward the financial well-being of the congregation at the Great Synagogue if they were dissatisfied with the way men treated them. However, as Suzanne Rutland, Karla Goldman and others observe, women did not significantly alter men’s power or central position within the synagogue. Orthodox and Reform-Jews shared a desire to view Judaism as a modern religion, but they had differing attitudes about what it meant to be modern. Religious reforms provided women with the power to decide for themselves how they would participate in the social and financial life of their congregations.
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Israel Zangwill’s popular novel *Children of the Ghetto* (1892), about British-Jews, was influenced by the views of Sydney’s Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau. It remains difficult to evaluate the accuracy of his views, because there are still too few observations related to the intricacies of nineteenth-century Jewish family life in England or Australia for a sustained comparative analysis. This chapter provides a foundation for further investigations of family life in Sydney and London, by evaluating issues related to Jewish law and family life that were not based on fictional sources, which are known to have biases related to Jewish authors countering the efforts of missionaries to convert Jewish women. The courtship and marriage practices of Jewish couples were distinctive of Christian couples living in England and Australia, and in this chapter I provide a basis for understanding the differences between Jewish and Christian social, ethical and legal traditions in relation to arranged marriages, marital compatibility, attitudes about marital abuse, divorce and women’s status when they were deserted but unable to acquire a divorce contract known as a get. The source material for this analysis was based primarily on over 3,000 issues of Jewish newspapers, the published writing of women from the wealthy de Rothschild family, the minute-books of two charities in Sydney and private letters received by Mary Vogel from Jewish women in London.

Without a Jewish mother it was believed that Jewish traditions would not be learned by children when they were young and Judaism would cease to be central to the lives of adults, causing the community to diminish in strength. Jews feared they would lose their way of life. Historically, a Jewish man marrying out of his faith renders himself nonexistent in the Jewish community, because the couple’s children would not be considered Jewish. Intermarriage was discouraged based on Exodus (34:16), out of a fear that women who
worshipped other Gods would cause a man’s children to worship other Gods as well.

As a result of the small number of Jewish women in Australia, even in the later period of the gold rush, many individuals married partners who were deemed inappropriate by members of the Jewish community, in terms of their age, class standing, national background, religious upbringing, convict status or ethnicity. This was also the case in New Zealand and the American Far West, where men living in frontier towns with few unmarried Jewish women in the population had to decide if they would remain bachelors, or if they could find the resources of time and money to make a trip to their birthplace or a larger city to find a Jewish bride. Intermarriage with a woman from another religious upbringing was often their best option for starting a family if they were not affluent. When the number of Jewish women in Australia increased, men were pressured by their families and communal leaders to stop intermarrying. Intermarriages continued to be commonplace in the nineteenth century.

Jews, Protestants and Catholics in English-speaking countries practiced ‘compulsory heterosexuality’ in the nineteenth century, which meant that women were limited by an expectation that they would find their personal fulfillment almost exclusively through a marital relationship and activities linked to child-rearing. Husbands were expected to work and provide an income to support their families, while women were discouraged from working outside the home or from advancing their studies. Similarly, men were discouraged from remaining at home as care-givers to children. Marriage, rather than employment, was the best way for women to escape poverty. With the exception of the wealthiest women, spinsters were at higher risk of living in a state of poverty than married women. After the 1880s, the uneven number of men and women within the English population affected women from most religious backgrounds, and promoted greater acceptance of women who worked in order to support themselves. Prior to this point, English women often had to resort to prostitution in order to survive independently of men. Individuals were stigmatized and considered ‘unnatural’ if they went
against these norms and remained unmarried or were intentionally childless within their marriages. Remaining single in Jewish society was not a desirable way of life for most men and women.5

Jews often felt their perspectives were 'antithetical' to those in Christianity, and contrasted their beliefs with St. Paul's values in the New Testament. In their view, he influenced Protestants and Catholics to believe that celibacy rather than marriage was the preferred path to a pure religious state.6 Jewish marriages were expected to offset deep loneliness, and there was a common belief that male Jewish adults became 'men' only after they were married and that women could not find "tranquility" without husbands.7 Prior to the twentieth century, Jewish men without wives were not anticipated to know real happiness, and were expected to take the initiative to find a wife since the non-financial benefits of marriage were more valuable to them than to women.8 In 1858, when Constance de Rothschild was fifteen, her opinion was that remaining single would be an unsatisfying and superficial way of life, even for women who could afford to remain permanently single. She noted in her diary that "some fortunately are married but others drag on in a wearied existence and are devoted votaries of fashion." She observed that to these women "admiration is as necessary as food," and that "they thrive upon it but when it is withheld they droop and fade."9 She was aware of the difficulties an acquaintance, Joseph Montefiore, had in finding a wife at a time when so many Jewish women were single and looking for husbands. She commented to herself: "Poor fellow, he certainly has not had much luck in marriage and now I suppose he will remain a bachelor."10 In 1885, Frances Vogel of West Kensington conveyed an associate's opinion of her sister-in-law Mary Vogel, that "there are no eligible marrying young men amongst the Jews."11 Their friend Ellen Isaac, a middle to upper-class Jewess from London, was resigned to the situation that "nearly all the eligible young men are used up."12 She did not view celibacy as an appropriate life-style for a Jewish man and commented that some of her male acquaintances were "of good age to settle, before bachelor habits become too confirmed."13 Women in
their social circles were often unable to find husbands, even when they were friendly, attractive, youthful, and financially secure.14

Homosexuals received little communal support in societies where it was presumed that everyone should be heterosexual. The life histories of women in same-sex-relationships can provide a basis for viewing 'compulsory heterosexuality' from an outside vantage point. By reflecting on the experience of lesbians across a long period of time, from Sappho to the present, the emotional, social and financial situation of unmarried women also becomes clear, especially because lesbians were often excluded or voluntarily separated from their family of origin. Since Judaism takes a different view of lesbianism than it does of men's homosexuality, it was probably somewhat easier socially, although not financially, for lesbians to remain single if they were not openly flaunting a same-sex relationship in the nineteenth century. Jewish men were commanded in the Torah to have children, whereas Jewish women were not, and lesbianism does not 'waste seed' the way gay men's sexuality was presumed to, which also meant that lesbians were more likely to be ignored than attacked or chastised by Jewish religious leaders. In some ancient Jewish texts there is a belief that lesbianism simply did not exist, and therefore women's same-sex relationships were less stigmatized because their sexuality was not expressly forbidden. Within this research there was not a single reference in public or private records of anyone in the Jewish community in Sydney who was thought to be in a same-sex relationship prior to 1901. However, with a gender imbalance in Britain and America, more women were single and without the possibility of finding a husband to be a provider for them, and some of these women likely shared households and undoubtedly formed romantic attachments. Nineteenth-century British and American women were known to have 'raves,' or 'romantic crushes' on each other, and they often maintained their relationships over long periods of time,15 as was the case with Frances Power Cobbe and her partner Mary Lloyd. In England, Amy Levy provides a tragic example of a Jewish lesbian who took her own life after having a career as a published writer.
Rabbis who shaped religious laws were aware that women were not empowered enough to modify or interpret laws, and they aspired to be sensitive and considerate toward them in order to avoid disadvantaging them. When Rabbinic laws related to women were altered, it was most often to improve their quality of life. Jews across the world have asserted their belief that they treated women with greater regard than their Christian or Muslim neighbors, by not demanding women's isolation or expecting girls to undergo circumcision. When Mrs. A. A. Goldsmid of Sydney presented her paper *Women of Israel* in 1888, at the Sydney Hebrew Literary and Debating Society, she affirmed that the role of Jewish women was one of honor in the *Old Testament* and in Jewish society as she knew of it. Her discussion highlighted that while certain aspects of Jewish custom appeared to reflect social disabilities for women, closer inspection revealed protections for them. Goldsmid also promoted the less radical and more common perspective that women's “duty to God” was to raise their families and care for their homes. She admired the benevolent associations in Sydney and London that were sustained by the efforts of Jewish women. She praised her co-religionists in England, by specifically naming Lady Montefiore and Baroness Nathan Mayer de Rothschild (1777-1836) as strong female role models who were devoted to the welfare of their families. Her final remarks reflected back upon the writing of Grace Aguilar, whose influential book the talk was named after. Sydney's Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis (1828-1913) was among those present and expressed his appreciation of Goldsmid's thoughts, and to the many women in the audience. He regretted that the lecture had not been longer, given how many Biblical women deserved to be honored. The opinions raised in Goldsmid's lecture are still discussed by rabbis in the twenty-first century, and they typically share her views. Rabbi Gershon Winkler, for example, praises the determination of rabbis as they maintain social regulations that “keep women's dignity intact against an almost universal male attitude that considers women more as objects than subjects.”
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While Jews, Protestants and Catholics shared a desire to sanctify marriages with formal written agreements, the rights and obligations within their contracts varied. A Jewish marriage contract is known as a ketubah and it outlines women's rights in marriage. One of the oldest examples dates to 440-420 B. C. E. In spite of the many social changes that have occurred throughout the Jewish Diaspora since that time, the wording of that contract, and others found in archaeological contexts, are similar to the contracts in use today. Christians view marriage as a sacrament, while Judaism views it as a contract. A ketubah is only legitimate when it is a unilateral contract that obligates the husband to his wife and does not obligate her in return. Bilateral contracts, such as those in English law, included reciprocal obligations between spouses. Bilateral contracts were not valid in Jewish courts even if the wife had agreed to the terms. This was intended as an assurance that Jewish women were always treated equitably within marriage, regardless of the values held by religious groups around them.21 According to Sephardic Rabbi Moses Maimonides (1138-1204), one of the most prominent scholars on the subject of religious laws, married men were expected to provide their wives with a number of safeguards. Husbands were to provide their wives with food, housing, clothing, medical care, conjugal relations, and funds to care for the wife and her daughters if the husband died prematurely. If the wife died first, her ketubah sum was to be returned to her sons, and she was to be given a proper burial. It was expected that in the unlikely event she was held captive, her husband would provide the ransom. Under certain circumstances women were expected to provide their husbands with their earnings from paid labor. Any land owned by wives was passed to their husbands upon their death, however, within their lifetime women retained control of it and were expected to share any profits earned from its cultivation. Any resources that were found by wives were considered communal property. Husbands expected fidelity and the assurance that they were the father of all of his wife's children.22 After 1873, one writer Jewish writer asserted that "Marriage ... is a sacrament: a religious contract."23 That year London's Chief Rabbi Dr. Nathan Marcus Adler
(1803-1891) described Jewish marriage contracts as civil contracts that had an "essentially religious character." Percy J. Marks of Sydney found these views to be the prevailing ones among Australian Jews in 1896. The alignment of Jewish values into language that mirrored the Christian majority is often cited as a sign of assimilation. In 1892, the ketubah of a Sydney couple, Violet Sarah Mears and Ernest Roos, was written in Hebrew and was also translated into English within the original document. This bi-lingual tradition developed as a result of English-speaking Jews who wanted to retain the traditional Hebrew script on the contract but needed it translated because they lacked fluency in Hebrew. They also wanted the contract to be understood by non-Jews who did not read Hebrew. Mears' contract outlined her rights and detailed the property they contributed to their new household. They signed a declaration before Sydney's district registrar, showing that their marriage was viewed as legitimate not only within the Jewish community, but also by the colonial government.

A woman's ketubah was so important that wives were expected to have a copy of it available at all times. If it was lost, tradition dictated that the couple were prohibited from living together until it was found or a replacement was created. In the event of a divorce, if it could not be found, the conditions of the contract were to be honored. The indispensability of keeping a copy of the ketubah was evident in Sydney in 1882, when Mrs. Comer's husband deserted her for the second time in two years. They had four children, including a nine-year-old son and a fifteen-month-old baby. She wanted assistance from the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society so that she could rent half of a stall in the market to support her children in her husband's absence. When he sent her a telegram from Rockhampton Queensland, she requested funds so that she and the children could move to be with him instead. When the charity board contacted him about this, he denied that they were married and the board refused to assist her until she refuted his claim by showing them a copy of her ketubah. She explained that it was already packed it in her boxes and could not easily find it. They later noted that if she
had returned with a copy of it they could have assisted her.²⁹ A number of couples, including Sarah Louisa Isaacs and her husband H. Woolfgang Jacobs, were denied aid from Sydney's Jewish charity boards because they did not produce a ketubah showing that they had married according to "Jewish rites."³⁰

Under English law, which was based on Protestant values, a woman was regarded as a femme couvert, which meant she was regarded as the property of her husband, who had the legal right to control her body and regulate her activities. Judaism had always protected married women's property rights, however, it was not until 1883, when the Women's Property Bill passed, that English wives could retain their own property.³¹ Prior to that point, Christian husbands were empowered to say to their wives: 'what's yours is mine, and what's mine is my own.'³² The New Testament repeatedly instructed women to remain silent and obedient to their husbands which was incompatible with Jewish values, since the Old Testament does not mandate wives to take a subordinate role in marriage. The Hebrew word kenegdo in Genesis is translated by Jews to mean ‘opposite him’ and implies a balanced partnership. The Hebrew word kedusha, meaning holiness, has typically been associated with Jewish marriages and equates to a "holy covenant between man and woman— with God as the intermediary."³³ These perspectives were embedded in Jewish society prior to the founding of Christianity, and the Talmud did not require the bride to vow that she would 'obey' her husband as was later directed by Paul.³⁴ Instead, a Jewish groom placed a ring on the bride's finger in front of at least three adult Jewish men who acted as witnesses and he repeated the benevolent vow: "Behold thou art married to me by this ring according to the law of Moses and of Israel."³⁵ In actuality, some Jewish husbands found ways control their wife's property and abuse them physically or sexually, and Christian men did not all debase the autonomy of their wives simply because the laws sanctioned it. However, Jewish women experienced greater degrees of legal equality within their marriages for most of the nineteenth-century, when compared to the non-Jewish women around them. Just as Jews could not accept bilateral contracts for their
marriages, Protestant and Catholic husbands, who were accustomed to having significant control over their wife's body and property under English law, probably would have declined to marry women with unilateral contracts that provided wives with enhanced rights.

Women and Protestant religious leaders have often sought to control and limit male sexuality in order to improve women's quality of life and reduce violence against females, which often results in the censorship of sexual images, ideas, as well as literature on reproductive health and birth-control methods. Although there was an ideal toward 'companionate marriages' in this period, many women were severely abused in their homes by the men they were dependent upon for their basic subsistence, including the wife of Rabbi A. A. Levi in Sydney. Nevertheless, a Jewish husband did not have the sanction of religious law to "act as a tyrant nor cause himself to be unduly feared in his household." In 1865, Rabbi Abraham Barnard Davis, of London and Sydney, raised the commonly cited opinion that Jews were different from Christians because they were not brought before the courts for being disorderly, beating their wives, abandoning their children to the orphanages, or being intoxicated. In the Talmud Jewish husbands were discouraged from aggravating their wives because it was believed that women's "tears will open the gates of heaven" and God would respond to men's misbehavior. The Talmud also urged men to take greater care of their wives' emotional needs and "guard against vexing" them because women were more sensitive to insults than men. Rabbis were reluctant to allow women to forego their sexual satisfaction within marriage because of the value placed on sexual communication, and they granted divorces to incompatible couples. A wife's ketubah sum could be reduced if she refused to have sexual relations with her husband. If he refused to have sexual relations with her then the value of her ketubah could be increased. If a husband neglected his marital obligations or if she could not stand to "be possessed by him sexually," then her husband was expected to grant her a divorce. Maimonides upheld women's welfare by providing a ruling that a wife "isn't like a captive that she must have intercourse with someone who is hateful to her," and she should not
be required by him to do anything that left her feeling violated. Rabbinic lawmakers stipulated that a man must pay reparations if he caused his wife shame and pain by physically hurting her. Wife beating and marital rape were valid grounds for divorce, yet "dangerous, aggressive, or 'insane' behavior" was not. Divorces were granted by Jewish courts if adultery had been proven on the part of the woman, or if the couple "could not live together in harmony, and peace, and must be separated." The perceived absence of divorce and spousal abuse by Jewish couples was attributed not only to restraint on the part of men, but because women were "gifted with natures which do not admit of their being easily trampled upon or ill-used."

The courtship patterns of Jews who lived in London and Australia in the mid to late-nineteenth century has not yet been studied by scholars. Synagogue records reveal a pattern of Jewish men who lived in rural New South Wales and Southern Queensland that married women living in Sydney. It was rare that Jewish women living in rural areas married men from Sydney. Young women appear to have been left on their own to find their husbands, which contrasted with the customary assistance Jewish mothers provided their daughters in France and other European countries. Most single people probably relied upon introductions provided by their friends, family members, and acquaintances they met at the synagogue or other Jewish social activities. The Sydney Jewish Social Club filled this niche and was modeled after similar Jewish groups in America and England.

Jewish parents in English-speaking countries, provided their children with a great deal of freedom and were criticized for having "no control whatever" over their children's activities. One Jewish writer from Sydney observed that when couples decided to get married they didn't bother to consult with their elders: "What do they want their parent's consent for? They have never asked for it in any other matter." The writer questioned why they would suddenly want permission related to selecting a marriage partner. If their parents sanctioned the relationship it was "well and good," but "if not, they are quite able to take care of themselves." In 1874, Herman Graupner of Melbourne
objected to his daughter’s suitor and she ignored his wishes by eloping after she crawled out of her bedroom window.55

The route of unconstrained romantic love did not always lead to satisfying partnerships. In the 1880s, Rosetta Frankel (b. 1861) and Sidney Algernon Marks were together as an unmarried couple for about six years and moved between Sydney, Melbourne and New Zealand. They had many unhappy, even abusive, episodes that they referred to as being in “the tantrums.” She finally called off the engagement and returned his diamond rings through the mail.56

Arranged marriages were not uncommon among nineteenth-century Central and Eastern-European Jews, even after they moved to Australia, England and America. The value of hiring Schadchanim, also known as matchmakers or “matrimonial agents,”57 was raised in Australia and England in the late 1870s, at a time when there were more Eastern-European Jewish migrants in these areas. One writer asserted that couples who married because of romantic attachments were likely to be incompatible after the initial “poetry of marriage” dissipated.58 The protection offered by matchmakers was that their “unbiased argus-eye” could spot “at a glance the radical uncongeniality of the couple despite the surface fitness.”59 Arranged marriages were thought to be less thrilling at the start, but over time were expected to “exhibit the sterling poetry and the mellow fruit of a happy married life.”60 This was primarily because couples who married for romantic reasons quickly discovered their partners’ flaws and were disappointed, whereas couples who became acquainted after they made a decision to marry, “discover in each other every day new and amiable traits of which they had no idea; and the satisfaction they give is so much greater, the less they were expected.”61 Couples with arranged marriages were expected to became increasingly attached to each other.62 The process of relying upon a matchmaker was also intended to protect women from protracted courtships, such as was experienced by Rosetta Frankel.

Synagogue marriages were generally “unpopular”63 because brides preferred to have the event at their homes,64 which was perceived by some to be an ‘Oriental custom.’ Synagogue marriages gained
acceptance among members of London’s Berkeley Street Synagogue, but there was still a belief that it was proper for the husband to “go to fetch his blushing bride from her father’s home rather than that she should go forth to meet him”65 in the synagogue. This was considered “indelicate”66 by traditionalists. Synagogue marriages were popular, and although a few brides likely asserted their independence by arriving at the synagogue to meet the groom and his family, there was nothing to stop grooms from picking their brides up on the way to the synagogue, as was traditional. The tradition of having the groom break a wineglass and of carrying the bride around in a chair were rarely mentioned by Jewish people in London and Sydney, however, there were long detailed descriptions of the festivities at weddings, including the clothing styles and colors worn by guests. The ‘traveling clothes’ worn by the couple as they left for their honeymoon were also described in detail. Marriage announcements often included long lists of the presents received by the couple and listed who had given the gift, a practice that would be considered indelicate by today’s social norms.67

British-Jews adhered to the rulings of London Beth Din to resolve legal matters and regulate marriages. This court’s legal rulings were applied uniformly, which provided continuity to Jews living in cities across the British Empire. Lord Hardwicke’s Act passed in 1753 to reduce the number of clandestine marriages in England. Permits and banns that were mandatory for Catholics and Protestants were waived for Jews and Quakers so that they could uphold their own religiously-based legal systems.68 In 1870, England’s Marriage Act allowed Jews to continue contracting marriages according to religious customs, provided they also notified the registrar. For most of the century, between six and eight percent of native-born English-Jewish couples were estimated to be consanguineous relationships, usually with partners who were distant cousins, such as Charlotte and Lionel de Rothschild.69 Jewish families in Sydney also accepted consanguineous marriages.70 At the time England’s Marriage and Divorce Bill was under consideration in 1857, the subject of adultery was briefly raised in the Jewish press. Alderman David Salomons
(1797-1873) wrote: "If the adulterer and adulteress desire to marry they would have to marry out of the pale of the congregation." He observed that the "synagogue might get rid of them," although the "community would still have to bear the scandal and the sad consequences of such deplorable impiety." In 1892, there was speculation that irregular marriages resulted from ignorance or an inability to pay the required fees. The London Beth Din reported that neither of these factors had been associated with the cases they were familiar with and instead the situation resulted from couples forming unions that were not religiously-viable or were otherwise immoral, such as in the case of adultery. Another example is that men who were kohanim, born into families that were considered the 'priestly caste,' were forbidden to marry women who were previously divorced. There were many kohanim in England and Australia, with the most common last names being Levi, Levey, Levy, Cohen, and less commonly, Kahn. However, because divorce was still rare in Jewish society in the nineteenth century, there were only minor concerns over irregular marriages.

It was most common that Anglo-Jews were able to find marriage partners within their lifetime, however, global events, such as the Crimean war were attributed to couples to remaining single. Many parents felt their daughters had limited options for becoming married in London, and there was a perception, perhaps a mistaken one, that it was easier for women to find suitable marriage partners in Australia. Between 1850 and 1858, there were about 203 Jewish marriages celebrated in London, and another sixty-three outside the metropolitan area. These figures were slightly higher than the rates a decade prior. Between the years of 1886 and 1893 the comparatively small Jewish population in New South Wales averaged around two marriages per month. In 1901, a year with the most marriages since the formation of the colony, there were still less than forty marriages registered by Sydney's Great Synagogue.

The Torah established the age of eighteen as the ideal age for a couple to marry, and spouses were expected to be close in age, with the man often being slightly older than the woman. Marriage at a
young age was one of the best ways to prevent premarital pregnancies in the nineteenth century. Early marriages maximized the lifetime fertility rates of couples. Rabbinical rulings existed to prevent men from coercing young and impressionable women into marriage. Brides had to be old enough to say "he is the one I want." English and Australian Jews were critical of the way Jews from the Middle East and Eastern Europe married their daughters when they were as young as twelve, to husbands who were their same age or significantly older. Jews in British society did not want to emulate these societies where parents who failed to arrange marriages for their daughters at this young age were "subjected to relentless persecution." Jewish women in Eastern Europe tended to marry in their early twenties, but Jewish women born in Central Europe often postponed marriage until they were in their early thirties. Men in their thirties were financially more stable than when they were in their twenties when many men were still mastering the work skills necessary for their careers. The ages of English and Australian couples of all religious backgrounds can be difficult to determine at the time of their marriage. When this data was available, the general trend in Sydney was that women married between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, while men postponed their marriages until they were older, often in their thirties. At least thirty-two Jewish marriages included a husband that was between twelve and thirty-two years older than the bride, which clearly indicates that the age of eighteen was not an age when young men found it possible or desirable to marry. Only a few Jewish women married men who were more than three years younger than themselves. The situation in Brisbane and the American Far West was similar. Ellen Isaac of London wrote to Mary Vogel in 1886 about the unusual situation of a twenty-two-year-old man they were acquainted with who had become engaged to a thirty-four-year-old woman. His mother was "in a state of great disappointment," possibly because she anticipated that this marriage was unlikely to provide her with many grandchildren, which Historian William Toll found was a consideration when Jewish wives in the American Far West married later in life.
Women who married men who were significantly older than themselves reaped some economic benefits in the early years of their marriages when the husband presumably had the greatest earning potential. However, these marriages may have provided less autonomy for women, in comparison to women with husbands closer to their own age, which was what Toll found among Jewish couples in the American Far West.\textsuperscript{84} When men started their families in their thirties they often encountered financial difficulties toward the end of their child-rearing years as the husband reached retirement age and their children were still young enough to be dependent. In 1880, this was the situation of sixty-four-year-old William Pool, a tailor by trade, who brought his family from Melbourne to Sydney and sought financial assistance over the Passover holiday. He had reached retirement age but had a family with four children who were aged between three and eight years old, who could not have made financial contributions to the family. Since their children were young and required their mother's constant attention, it limited her potential to work outside of the home. Given his older age, these may have been his step-children and their maintenance costs at this point in his life may have contributed to family tensions.\textsuperscript{85} In another similar case, Abraham Pelz brought his wife and two sons from Brisbane to Sydney. He was in his mid-fifties and they could not afford their living expenses and requested funds to start a business.\textsuperscript{86} Even when the oldest siblings in the family attended to the younger children, mothers were rarely able to earn incomes that could sustain the whole family if her husband was retired or could only work part time due to illness, injury or premature death.\textsuperscript{87}

There were sustained critiques by Jewish men that Jewish women were materialistic. Jewish women living in London's East End were known to spend the Sabbath 'out shopping.' Purchasing goods on Friday night and Saturday during the daytime was prohibited since it involved financial transactions that were considered a form of work, which was forbidden on this day. Orthodox women were probably 'window shopping' rather than buying goods.\textsuperscript{88} Lady de Rothschild, one of London's wealthiest Jewish women, was criticized for being
materialistic. In her private writing she considered herself to be a moderate: "I who am so anti-luxurious in tastes and habits am made to appear fond of show and glitter." She reflected that was "one of my vexations and I must try to bear it patiently." In 1864, Baroness Charles de Rothschild conveyed to the girls at the Bell Lane Free School in London that people who "gaudily adorn themselves for the mere gratification of foolish vanity, often grasp at the shadow, while they overlook the substance." Rabbis hoped to stem the rise in materialism and they gave sermons about the dangers of "extravagance in dress," which they felt had become "conspicuous among us to a fearful extent," particularly among people who could not afford expensive clothing and jewelry. Poor Jewish children were criticized for dressing in a gaudy manner, "in all the colours of the rainbow," but at the same time Jewish parents were praised for buying fancy and colorful ribbons for their children instead of spending their money on alcohol. Poor Christian parents were accused of not clothing their children at all because they spent their paychecks on too much "beer and gin." Abraham Davis, of Spitalfields remained neutral about Jewish women's materialism and thought Christian and Jewish female employees dressed similarly. Jewish families who were poor or newly-rich appear to have been the most ostentatious dressers, while wealthier women were more conservative and discrete, declining to flaunt their wealth. Perceptions of Jewish women's materialism varied considerably, but the complaints made by Jewish men that they could not financially sustain the expenses associated with satisfying the fashionable tastes of the average Jewish wife were probably well-founded in London and Sydney in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Jewish men in America, England and Australia criticized women for their expensive tastes and blamed them for the decline of the Jewish family. Non-Jewish men were also known to complain of this, however, Jewish women's materialism was thought to exceed the tastes of Christian women of the same class. Jewish women in England were known to look "above their social rank" in order to marry "money, not men." This was in line with the popular axiom in
the nineteenth century that when poverty arrived at the door, love went out the window, except when couples had “strength enough to rough it.”99 Young Jewish couples were hindered from marrying when they were poor, particularly when they had no assistance from relatives, which was a fairly common situation among migrants in Australia. Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis started a society in Sydney, based on a passage in the Mishna, in order to assist Jewish girls so that they could marry “respectable” men. The society provided them with a gift of at least fifty pounds so that they could buy household necessities. Davis started the fund because he knew several young women who had attended the Sydney Jewish Sabbath School and then taught there, but were still too poor to marry without financial assistance.100 This form of aid also acted as a safeguard against elopements, cohabitation and intermarriages with affluent Christian partners. After Flora Montefiore married Mr. Long in London, her friend Matilda Isaac reported that she seemed happy with her attractive husband and small house in London, with just one servant. She added her own perspective on the relationship between wealth and contentment, which suggested that Mary Vogel of New Zealand, the recipient of her letter, was quite status conscious: “My idea of happiness does not think that it is necessary to be rich,” however, she reminded Mary that “you and I are as opposite in opinions as black and white.”101 In another case, Hester Samuels described Gertie Joel’s upcoming marriage in London and intimated that while the couple had “known each other from childhood,” and her fiancé Maurice had been “in love with her a long time,” she had not shown any overt interest in him. This changed when his financial situation improved: “his father left a lot of money, and there are only two sons, the other one is a barrister,” which meant that Maurice had the “business to himself.”102 She felt that the couple were “both sincerely attached to each other,”103 and saw it as “the best match that has taken place in the family, for many years.”104 After the Joel’s wedding, Matilda Isaac shared her positive impressions of the couple’s compatibility, since his family loved music, and he was “an excellent linguist.”105 She was equally impressed by his wealth and with Maurice’s brother’s career
as a barrister. Florence Marion Emanuel, a young Jewish writer from Goulburn New South Wales wrote a poem about being satisfied with an hour of holding hands that concluded with “just a kiss,” rather than wanting jewels, such as diamonds and rubies, or objects made of carved ivory from her suitors. Jewish bachelors who feared they could not afford to maintain a wife and children in the manner that was expected had to decide if they wanted to postpone marriage until they could afford to provide such luxuries, or if they preferred instead to find a bride who was happy with a plain dress as long as her husband and children were at her side.

Victorian-era fashion was highly voyeuristic and Victorians were not as passionless as is often suggested. When feminists define gender segregation and highly-defined gender roles as degrading, they overlook crucial aspects of human psychology and sexuality. What rabbis observe to be the most enticing about the opposite sex is their ‘difference’ not their ‘similarity,’ which is why many religions stress the value of avoiding sexually ambiguous clothing. When religious groups highlight differences between men and women, even if it is for the sake of modesty, there is an endless potential for what is hidden to be revealed, and this is inherently attractive to humans. This is why clothing, fashion accessories, pigmentation and hair styles are crucial in the construction of gender identity. Historian Sharon Marcus analyzed women’s images in Victorian fashion images and finds that women dressed themselves with the intention of being viewed, not only by men, but almost more significantly by other women shown in the pictures, which is also true of women from other religions and cultures. In the Victorian era, women’s bodies were concealed by voluminous crinolined skirts or carefully displayed hour-glass waistlines, which attracted men’s attention, and also highlighted for women how different men were from themselves. If men’s ties, pocket watches, and breast pocket handkerchiefs seemed understated by comparison to women, it only accentuated the contrast between themselves and the women who were nearest to them.

Elizabeth Hale and Emma Floyd argue that the markers of gentility, such as clothing and jewelry, that had functioned to define a
person's class standing in the earlier part of the century were less-potent status markers once newly-rich and upper-middle-class families, particularly those who were racial minorities, could afford to purchase similar items. Markers of wealth did challenge the social hierarchy\textsuperscript{110} that was often based on racial traits and religious attitudes. In 1891, Mr. Israel Abrahams provided a lecture at the Jewish Working Men's Club in London on the topic of fashion, in which he reminded the audience of the "Oriental proverb" that "a man's shirt does not change the colour of his skin,"\textsuperscript{111} suggesting that the way people were treated still had more to do with traits people were born with than their learned manners, educational attainment, wealth or other aspects of their appearance that could easily be altered, such as hair color. In 1896, in addition to being a "slave to fashion,"\textsuperscript{112} Sydney women were known to change the color of their hair. Some women lightened their hair, while others darkened it and it was not uncommon, though it attracted attention, to see hair in unnatural colors, such as "venetian red."\textsuperscript{113} Sydney's Jewish women were typically photographed with stylishly braided hair-pieces that were customary for married Orthodox-Jewish women who were expected to cover their hair in some way in order to demonstrate their modesty and piety, which reflected upon their class-stand and level of 'respectability.'\textsuperscript{114} Jewish women's materialism may have been a way of offsetting racial discrimination or anti-Semitism because women faced double or triple layers of discrimination that could not be openly confronted with the same strategies that were employed by Christian women and Jewish men.

Ancient Jewish texts encouraged husbands to consult with their wives in order to promote harmony and stability.\textsuperscript{115} Jewish men often made the final decision on matters that connected the family to the wider community,\textsuperscript{116} which was similar to patriarchal authority within most non-Jewish families in English-speaking Protestant countries. Wives hoped, if not expected, to be consulted about issues that affected their lives.\textsuperscript{117} Nathan Mayer de Rothschild's wife Hannah (1783-1850, formerly Cohen), was instructed in his will that if any of their daughters married without her permission they would not be
able to access their inheritance.\textsuperscript{118} She and her sons were expected to consult with each other on crucial matters and he respected the counsel she provided.\textsuperscript{119} Her relative Joseph Montefiore wrote to his highly Orthodox uncle, Sir Moses Montefiore (1784-1885), describing a conversation where he had consulted with his aunt, Mrs. Nathan Mayer de Rothschild, regarding his desire to become a barrister. She discouraged him from this career since she felt his education was unsuited to it and he took her opinion seriously. He later rejected her assistance to help him become a partner in one of the families businesses since she expected him to change his name from Montefiore to de Rothschild.\textsuperscript{120} Although Jewish men maintained their status as patriarchal authorities, their wives, mothers and extended female family members contributed to their decision-making. Upper-class women often wielded considerable control over men’s financial lives.

Some non-Jewish women wanted to convert to Judaism in order to marry Jewish men. The procedures for conversion to Judaism were intentionally strict in order to discourage those who were only interested in converting to marry Jewish spouses.\textsuperscript{121} Under the laws of England in 1873, it was “practically impossible if the blessing of Heaven be desired” for a marriage to occur between a Jew and a Christian.\textsuperscript{122} Marriages with a partner who converted to Judaism were rare, but were speculated to be an “antidote” to intermarriages with partners who continued practicing Christianity.\textsuperscript{123} One argument against conversion to Judaism was that it would lead to men marrying Christian women that had converted for insincere reasons and it was feared this would cause the “fair daughters of Southern Judea” to “languish in single blessedness.”\textsuperscript{124} The Chief Rabbi of London did not want conversion to be easily obtained.\textsuperscript{125} Correspondence with him in London took over a month from Australia due to the slow nature of written communications.\textsuperscript{126} Prior to the formation of the first Australian \textit{Beth Din} in Melbourne in 1864, and in Sydney in 1875, rabbis in these cities had to consult with the Chief Rabbi’s on a variety of issues. Sydney asked for permission to form a \textit{Beth Din} for a number of years, and their request was denied until after a marriage
took place between the children of rabbis in these cities. The availability of Australian-based courts reduced the hardships caused by long delays in communication with London, but even after they were formed conversions continued to be rare because the Chief Rabbi disapproved of them. Initially, it was the non-Jewish wives and children of Jewish men who converted in Sydney. Mrs. Nathan and her children converted at the Great Synagogue, and the board reported that “the happy results” of their decision provided the “whole community” an “occasion to rejoice.” Other conversions in Sydney included Jane Cantor, Mrs. R. E. Isaacs, and Mrs. Maurice Sichal, who regularly attended synagogue services. Mrs. Rogers asked to convert in 1874 in order to get married at the York Street Synagogue, but their board of management did not assist her. She later converted and married, and was a singer the Great Synagogue’s choir.

In Australia, Jewish men often married non-Jewish women whose male relatives they knew through commercial relationships. In 1891, there were 842 married Jewish men in New South Wales, and 675 of them were married to Jewish women. Twenty-eight men married Catholic women and the rest were married to women affiliated with Protestant denominations. In the American Far West, Jewish men often married Native-American women, and in New Zealand they married Maori women, but for reasons that are unclear, they rarely married Aboriginal-Australian women. I noticed there were very few references to Jewish merchants having regular trading and commercial contacts with Aboriginal-Australian men. Aboriginal-Australians experienced higher levels of poverty than the Maori, and I speculate that this contributed to the low frequency of intermarriages to Jewish spouses, many of whom were materialistic and looking to marry wealthier spouses than themselves.

In Sydney, intermarriages with Jewish partners may have been more common than is revealed in statistics. One writer insisted that in 1880 they were “all the rage,” and by the end of the century they were expected to remedy anti-Semitism. One writer attributed intermarriage to something as basic as sharing meals at the homes of
Christian friends and attendance at “their picnics,” and queried “What can possibly result from this but marriage?” This writer seems to have held views that were atypical when indicating that intermarriages were deemed “as legitimate as between Adam and Eve.” At the Sydney Jewish Social Club Ball in 1898, Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis made a speech in which he encouraged those present to continue to socialize in “an exclusive manner,” with other Jews, because he believed that “most of the troubles of the community arose from inter-marriages resulting from intermixing at social functions.” In the late 1870s, there were concerns among English-Jews that children of intermarried parents posed a problem for society since they tended to be religiously ignorant or were confused by being provided with conflicting religious values if they accompanied one parent to Synagogue on Saturday and the other parent to Church on Sunday. When intermarriage was given a negative review, it was referred to as a “contagion” or a “subtle poison” that was “introduced into the frame of a family, slowly but surely disintegrating and unspiritualising it, digging the grave for all higher morality.” As mentioned above, many of the poorest intermarried couples sought relief from Sydney’s Jewish charities and were refused assistance under the by-laws, which further weakened their social standing. Julius Vogel, an English-born politician, was criticized publicly for marrying Mary Clayton in 1867, who was not Jewish and also for not raising their children to be Jewish. In London, his sister Frances Vogel made a reference to her acquaintance Lydia, who had delayed her marriage for four years because of her father’s disapproval of her fiancé, who was not wealthy or Jewish. She decided to marry him by registrar and Frances acknowledged that it was not Lydia’s intention to “vex” her father. She felt his opposition to the marriage was “absurd,” partly because of the scarcity of men in England, which led her to believe Lydia would not have another chance to marry, and that her fiancé could provide her with more happiness than if she remained “single all her life.” For many couples, the consequence of intermarriage may have consisted of critical comments from friends and family, but for others it included a
loss of connection with family members, an inability to be assisted by
Jewish charities, which contributed to a decline in the social standing
and financial stability of interfaith families.

Negative attitudes toward intermarriage were buffered as the
wealthiest Jews, including the de Rothschild and Montefiore families
in England, married non-Jewish partners. They brought an air of
respectability to intermarriages since the activities of these families
and the weddings themselves were highly publicized. Constance
and Annie de Rothschild (1863-1925) of London both married non-
Jewish husbands. Although Constance believed in the 1860s that she
and her sister were “free” to “marry whom we like” and they saw “no
limit put upon us,” it was clear from their mother's reaction that
she had not expected this freedom to lead to intermarriage. In 1872,
Eliot Yorke and Annie de Rothschild were about to become the first
intermarriage of her family that did not involve the wife’s adherence to
Christianity, as well as being the first time that an English Peer's son
married a Jewish woman. Yorke was the fourth son of Lord and
Lady Hardwicke, and he visited Australia and New Zealand with the
Duke of Edinburgh in the 1860s and 1870s. There were
considerable tensions between the two families over the prospect of
the intermarriage, which manifested in many of them losing their
appetite and having insomnia because they were in “a most miserable
state.” Following Yorke’s proposal and leading up to the point of her
father’s initial rejection of the marriage, the families “were almost
crazy from morning till night.” The wedding was finally agreed upon
and took place in the private chapel at the Hardwicke's family
estate. By the time Annie’s sister Constance de Rothschild was
thirty-four and married Cyril Flower in 1877, her mother had adjusted
to Annie’s marriage. Louisa found a second intermarriage in the
family “more or less agitating and alarming,” but she trusted that
her daughter was an adult and supported her decision. She
appreciated that Flower had a “kind and generous nature.” Wealthier families influenced perceptions of intermarriage and
refashioned their relationships toward the end of the century so that
the religious needs of both partners were addressed through separate
attendance at Jewish and Christian congregations. Intermarriages were often childless, which may have been a strategy for avoiding tensions with extended family members as well as a way of avoiding disagreements over the religious orientation and education of children.

When family conflicts existed, women were vulnerable when there were no extended family members in the local community to protect them physically and financially, or to assist them by pressuring husbands to behave responsibly, to stop drinking, or financially support their families. As of 1822, Jewish husbands in England were prosecuted by Jewish courts if they attempted to leave their wives without financial support.\textsuperscript{161} Jewish men on charity boards encouraged women to seek resolution to their marital difficulties within the courts or more informally through mediators linked to local communal organizations. Even though the Board of Guardians and other Jewish charities in London were aware of many legitimate cases where women had been deserted by their husbands, they feared that if they regularly provided assistance to wives, then husbands would “have no compunction in deserting them.”\textsuperscript{162} If a husband who was unemployed made an application for relief the couple was more likely to be given aid if the husband had left the area to seek work and the woman made the appeal to the charity board while he was away.\textsuperscript{163} In 1896, Mrs. Silberman felt she could “not live any longer with her husband” and she brought one of her three children to Sydney from Melbourne. She earned enough money as a machinist to financially care for the two of them.\textsuperscript{164} The charity board disagreed with her decision to live apart from her husband and they provided her with ten pounds, but told her “not to come again.”\textsuperscript{165} Her case was exceptional in that she could afford to live independently of her husband. In another case, Mrs. Lewis Davis, left her second husband at age seventy-three, after two years of marriage because she said he was “a bad man to her.”\textsuperscript{166} He had migrated from New Zealand in 1876, and was impoverished and in need of financial help in order to become a hawker. She was permitted to stay in the Sydney Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home for a week, but they indicated that since the husband was “alive they could not aid a separate existence.”\textsuperscript{167} Many
Jewish couples lived apart, not because they were incompatible, but because men traveled for commercial reasons. In London, Mrs. Rogers and her eight children were “deserted” by her husband after they were refused an assisted passage to Australia. He worked his way there and a member of the Jewish Ladies’ Benevolent Loan Society insisted that he did this with his wife’s consent, in order to improve their financial prospects. A variety of circumstances promoted Jewish couples to live apart, including financial distress, incompatibility and abuse.

Jewish women in Sydney did seek legal actions through the civil courts in order to protect themselves and their children. In 1880, Mrs. Jacob Marks of Sydney had four children and a protection order against her forty-five-year-old husband, who had lost all of their money because of his drinking habit. She was not the only Jewish woman in Sydney to take a stand against marital abuse, particularly by a spouse with a drinking problem. At the end of 1887, Mrs. Tompowski was the head of her household, which included herself and ten children who were aged between four and seventeen. Dr. Brownless, a local physician, advised her to get a protection order and “live away from her husband,” because he was physically violent. He observed that her husband was “slightly deranged,” which meant that she may not have had valid grounds for a divorce case under Jewish law, since women could not demand divorces of ‘insane’ husbands. However, he was a hawker and could have been pressured to grant her a divorce since he was sane enough to manage fifty pounds worth of jewelry. Her husband and eldest sons provided her with some income, but she needed further assistance to survive independently of him and found that the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society was reluctant to assist her because they believed she and the children had “united in opposition to the father.”

Women from the Sydney Hebrew Ladies’ Dorcas Society provided her with some financial support. Even with violence on the part of the husband and orders from a doctor, the communal support she received was inadequate and she was not given the option of a divorce so that she might remain physically safe and potentially remarry.
someone more stable and harmonious. The experiences of the above-mentioned women were not isolated. It is possible that by comparison to husbands from other religious groups Jewish marriages were less inclined toward abuse, however, reports that find no cases of abuse by Jewish husbands in the civil courts in England and France\textsuperscript{175} are probably overlooking whatever cases were brought before the \textit{Beth Din} and were kept confidential, or that were handled without any intervention by authorities. In a number of cases Sydney's Jewish charity boards were more inclined to assist women who were abandoned by their husbands, but when women took the initiative to improve their circumstances by opting to live apart they were usually denied assistance.

Jewish charities in Sydney had a few cases where they thought that married couples were defrauding them by having the wife claim that her husband had deserted her.\textsuperscript{176} In 1879, Jackson Marks requested a loan from the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society in order to continue working as a hawker. He was insolvent and not paid a previous debt of £180, and the board was unwilling to provide the loan since they doubted that he would repay it. Upon hearing their decision, Marks “threatened” to leave his family as a “present” for the board at Christmas time. His request for assistance to remove his wife and children to Melbourne was also declined and the board warned him they would take legal action if he abandoned his family.\textsuperscript{177} The number of married migrants in Sydney who requested assistance from Jewish charities while living in separate households might be expected to have increased during periods when the economy was weakened, such as in the 1890s. However, the majority of couples requesting aid while in divided households during the depression were from long-time Sydney residents, which suggests that fraudulent claims by recent migrants were rare. In 1886, Morris Lubowitch had only been in Sydney about nine months when he requested aid to return to Portland Oregon in order to stop his wife’s efforts to divorce him. The charity board did not grant the funds he needed to return there and it is unclear if this was a legitimate divorce case or an attempt to have someone else pay for his passage home.\textsuperscript{178}
Jewish law offered women some protections but was often complicated by civil laws based on Christianity, and in combination these laws sometimes represented a double burden for Jewish women. When living in a divided household was insufficient to resolve marital tensions Jewish law permitted couples to divorce each other with a document known as a *get*. The process of finalizing a divorce originated at a time when other religious groups divorced their wives by simply stating that they wished to be divorced, and the *get* was intended to protect women from rash decision-making. Wives could not request divorces except under a few circumstances, but were usually protected by courts from husbands who attempted to divorce them without reasonable causes. A *get* had to be signed by the husband in front of two witnesses, and typically stated: "I will release and set aside you, my wife, in order that you may have authority over yourself to marry any man you desire." The contract continued: "This shall be for you a bill of dismissal, a letter of release, a *get* of freedom." Without this contract wives could not remarry even if they knew their husbands had deliberately deserted them and would not provide future support. From the time a woman received a *get*, she was entitled to a return of her dowry and other assets she had when she entered the marriage. She was entitled to financial support for a year unless she remarried sooner. In circumstances where spouses accused each other being physically abusive, courts were more inclined to believe the testimony of the wife because women were assumed to be law-abiding and it was understood that husbands might lie in order to avoid paying restitution if a divorce were granted. In 1864, no Jewesses were known to have sought divorces in civil cases in England. There are no known examples of women in Sydney who were given a *get* prior to 1905. Jewish divorce rates were similarly low in America, where out of ten-thousand Jewish marriages in Cincinnati spanning a forty-two year period, just three couples were divorced. It is unclear at this point if rates of divorce for Jewish couples were so low because of the complexity and expense of needing to have the divorce validated twice, once in a civil court and once through a *Beth Din*. 1853, England’s legislature was in the
process of amending divorce laws in order to protect women and the
government was "greatly embarrassed" by the "brutality of
husbands to wives." At the time, divorce was only permitted if the
couple could get a bill passed through Parliament, which was too
expensive for the majority of couples. In 1857, Jewish leaders
approved of the Marriage and Divorce Act because it did not permit
divorce under cases that Jewish law prohibited; however, Jewish law
permitted divorce under a wider range of circumstances. At that
time, the cost of a divorce was roughly £150, which was still too
expensive for the average Jewish couple to afford. After 1870
English women could sue for divorce in the civil courts on the same
grounds as men. By the 1880s, divorce procedures for Jews living
under British laws were more complicated because some couples had
married under both legal systems and needed courts from both legal
traditions to grant a divorce. Violet Sarah Mears of Sydney, for
example, ran the risk that she might one day be granted a divorce in a
civil court only to be denied access to a get. Jewish courts were
always based on Orthodox principles in the nineteenth century, and a
divorce would only have been final if it had been validated by both
courts. Some reformers challenged religious Orthodoxy in order to
protect women and argued that the get was "superfluous" if the couple
were divorced by civil law.

When a married woman was permanently separated from her
husband, but did not have a get to prove that the marriage had
officially ended, she was known as an agunah. This word can be
translated to mean that she was either 'anchored' or 'chained'
depending upon her particular circumstances. In most cases, the
wife's husband had died under circumstances where there was no
proof of his death, had disappeared prior to divorcing her, or was
mentally incompetent. She was prevented from remarrying, which not
only blunted her ability to find companionship, but barred her from
finding a new husband who would provide for her. Without a get, a
wife could appeal to the local Beth Din, and request assistance in
finding her husband, in order to either persuade him to work toward a
resolution of their problems, or give her the divorce paperwork.
Maimonides ruled that if a husband refused to comply with the Jewish courts they could go so far as to beat him until he agreed to release her from the marriage. In the 1890s, there were so many cases of Russian husbands deserting their wives that the Board of Guardians changed their rules in order to hold men responsible. Some women lost their ability to have children because they could not divorce men who were absent.

Although 'compulsive heterosexuality' continued to be the accepted way of life for women at the end of the century, women's level of autonomy and financial authority within the family had increased. As a result of many years of a gender imbalance in the population in English-speaking countries, it became more accepted for women to remain single and work outside the home in order to sustain themselves. In 1896, Sydney's Reverend George Walters suggested at a lecture to an appreciative Jewish audience that some 'New Women' had become "independent of the marriage market, though not averse to marriage itself," and these women were relieved of the "necessity of taking a mate for the sake of a home." The 'New Woman' no longer viewed marriage as compulsory and the "be all and end all of woman's existence." The wider range of options open to women at the end of the century had come about through subtle incremental developments, rather than highly observable struggles for independence. Annie C. Hyatt-Woolf of London felt that in Jewish society the 'New Woman' was nothing but "the inevitable evolution-of the Old Woman." The main reason that Jewish men objected the image of the 'New Woman' related to women who treated them discourteously. One man even jovially suggested that the "sarcastic maiden should be suppressed by law."

Jewish women in Sydney emulated modern 'New women' less in relation to marriage than through their adoption of the bicycle. City streets in London and Sydney were busy and provided women with what was both an egalitarian social space as well as a place of potential danger from traffic accidents and unscrupulous people. Wheelchairs, 'walking machines,' prams, also known as children's road vehicles, underwent major technological innovations toward the
end of the century, which made life for people with health problems and women with small infants more comfortable and convenient. In spite of occasional injuries, such as Ethel Levien’s mishap that caused her to sprain her ankle, physical exercise on bicycles was expected to be beneficial to women in their role as mothers. Cycling provided people with an ability to travel longer distances around the city and justified modifications to women’s restrictive clothing styles, resulting in fashions that were more masculine and comfortable. There were also connotations of masculinity that were associated with riding forward in the saddle of the bike seat, as was customary when upper-class ladies sat on horse saddles. A woman who called herself Veritas proudly asserted: “Yes, I am a new woman myself.” She defined this by explaining that she was independent when she rode her bike: “I am my own chaperone; I ride a bicycle, and I claim every right and liberty which are good and useful for a human being.” This was her “definition of a new woman.” On one evening in Sydney, the “Government House ladies” arrived “unconcernedly” to an event on their bicycles while “in full evening dress.” Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau’s wife Phoebe, confided in her newspaper column that she was “dying to own a bicycle,” and that the “question of skirt or knickerbocker does not trouble me. I shall wear whichever I think is most becoming.” She didn’t care if it was “rational or irrational” that she longed to be the “mistress of a ‘bike’ and go rushing through the air in the early morning or on brilliant moonlit nights.” Although she acknowledged that society was “submitting to women riding bicycles in a man’s dress without more than amused protest,” she clearly resented that the “whole city howls if women, at starvation’s door, apply for, and do man’s monopolised work,” which she defined as “type-setting or post-mistressing,” for “any price that is offered.” She observed that men still scorned women who left their “conventional sphere,” and viewed it as ‘unnatural’ and complained that it ‘unsexed’ women. Women developed special washing techniques for the white chamois gloves worn when cycling, and had special remedies for baths to ease their aching muscles, which became a part of the routine of a modern independent woman. Rabbi Jacob
Landau’s mother-in-law relied upon pine-needle tea, which is has high amounts of vitamin C, as a common remedy for feeling tired or sore after cycling. The infusion was consumed as a cup of tea with the remainder poured into bath water. In 1896, bicycles functioned as markers of social status similar to the mobile phones of today. In order to be considered among the “creme de la creme,” one exaggerated account suggested that riders should have a “different machine for each day of the week.” Because bicycles were a new invention, women of all social classes learned to ride them as adults and they were generally self-conscious about the learning process. Wealthier women could afford to practice in the “privacy of their gardens,” and were urged to provide their ‘sisters of the wheel’ with old bicycles so that “working girls” could also “enjoy the sensation of cycling.” Frances Vogel explained to Mary Vogel that her sons in London had made boats and when they were all back from school they would go on their bicycles to the Round Pond in Kensington Gardens, which shows that children experienced greater freedom when they had bicycles as well. One of the difficulties raised by the bicycle was that riding on the Sabbath was considered work and transgressed against religious norms. Bicycles were reported to be the most liberating aspect of women’s lives in this period and it was because they were associated with a variety of social innovations that helped women to redefine what it meant to be female.

Compulsory heterosexuality was practiced by Jews, Catholics and Protestants, in the nineteenth century. It was difficult for women to find marriage partners in British society once a large number of men moved into colonial settlements, and it became more acceptable for women to work and live independently of men. In the time period between 1850 and 1900, it was especially difficult for Jewish men in Australia and women in England to find marriage partners who were appropriate to their age, social class, and religious backgrounds, which promoted higher than usual rates of intermarriage. In Australia intermarriage was avoided when younger women married older more financially-stable men. This created difficulties for families with younger children when the husband reached retirement age.
However, children of these marriages had Jewish mothers and were considered Jewish, which was not the case when men married Catholic or Protestant women. Conversion to Judaism was not permitted until the 1870s, and was not easily obtained even at the end of the century. Jewish religious leaders continually discouraged non-Jewish partners from converting in order to marry someone Jewish. The few conversions that took place in Sydney were of women who were married to Jewish men and had children who also converted.

Jewish sacred literature provided a space for women’s empowerment, and I argue in this chapter that the status of Jewish women often declined when they followed civil laws based on Christianity, since they continued to be accountable under Jewish law, which provided women with greater autonomy and protection. Jewish law included protections for women’s physical well-being, their right to sexual pleasure within marriage, their mental well-being, as well as their financial independence and property rights. Jewish law also sanctioned the use of matrimonial agents, which meant that some women were protected from marrying partners who they found attractive romantically, but who were not stable providers for them after the honeymoon. Although Jewish women with abusive or absent spouses were permitted under Jewish law to divorce, women whose husbands were deranged or mentally unstable were bound to uphold their marriage contract, and these women were not given the support they needed in order to live safely, which was demonstrated in the case of Mrs. Jacob Marks of Sydney. However, Sydney’s Jewish communal leaders actively assisted women in holding men financially accountable for their families. Jewish women did not air many complaints about men in the newspapers or private letters, and the image of the ‘New Woman’ was defined not as being about living independently of men, but of enjoying the freedom that came with alterations in clothing styles and the independence they felt when they could move quickly across the city on a bicycle.
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Chapter 5: Anglo-Jewish Family Planning and Observing the Laws of Niddah.

Nineteenth-century English and Australian-Jews had remarkably low death rates, even when living in crowded areas, which has been attributed to the maintenance of kosher dietary practices, cleaning routines at Passover, and to the practice of following Family Purity laws, known as the laws of Niddah. There were hygienic as well as other personal benefits associated with immersing in the mikvah at the end of a woman’s menstrual cycle that are still highly appreciated by women today. For some couples the family purity laws were a pathway to strong marriages, while for others these regulations were perceived to be an outdated menstrual taboo that conflicted with modern ideals, partly because these laws enhanced a couple’s fertility at a time when smaller families were becoming preferred at the end of the nineteenth century. Although Judaism was broadened by the rise of the Reform movement and its rejection of some aspects of Jewish law, Orthodox-Jews felt these regulations were so essential to religious life that the abandonment of some of these laws amounted to reformers dividing “themselves off from the Jewish people.” Jewish newspapers in England and Australia, which were edited mostly by men, were silent on this subject. Even research that is focused on women’s role as mothers, such as Laura Marks’ Model Mothers, does not have a section on these issues even though women visited the mikvah after childbirth. Although scholars are beginning to fill in gaps of knowledge related to these subjects, most of the published sources available today relate to twentieth-century Jewish communities in America or Eastern Europe and are more likely to focus on family structure rather than women’s sexuality, menstruation and contraception use. There are few studies related to Anglo-Jewish women’s use of mikvot that also engage with the question of how the family purity laws influenced attitudes related to a
preferences for smaller or larger families, especially in relation to times when birth-control methods such as 'the pill' were not readily available to couples wishing to limit their family or have more control over birth spacing. An investigation of this occluded and rarely discussed subject is worthy of scholarly attention. This chapter provides a foundation for future studies.

In the absence of direct statements by women about their views on the family purity laws, this area of their lives was reflected in the presence, absence and remodeling of mikvot (pl.) in London and Sydney, which provides a strand of evidence that reflects the shifting communal value of the family purity laws and the associated bathhouse. Additional lines of evidence introduced in this chapter include the spacing of births among Jewish women in Sydney, rabbinical discourses, sermons, advertisements in the pages of Jewish newspapers, as well perspectives of twentieth-century Jewish women who published their attitudes about these issues.

The fragmentary nature of evidence about women's fertility can relate to many different factors during the time when record-keeping was voluntary and the responsibility of individual congregations. The subject of family size was rarely mentioned in Jewish newspapers. There was no overt bias against larger families or a preference for smaller ones in Sydney or London. Historians rarely have evidence indicating if married couples were abstinent, used birth control, had abortions or if they ever resorted to infanticide in the nineteenth-century. Among women who registered their births in Sydney with the Bridge Street, York Street, Macquarie Street and Great Synagogue congregations, it was typical that births were recorded by women at intervals between eighteen months and two years. This was also typical in Brisbane. However, some couples who were known to be in the Sydney area over a long period of time appear to have had just one or two children. It is difficult to determine if the available records provide an accurate reflection of family size. At the start of the nineteenth century, some English couples had as many as eighteen children, but this appears to be uncommon in Sydney where families
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typically consisted of five or six children.\textsuperscript{5} An absence of recorded births could reflect infertility related to health problems, an absent husband, or births that were recorded away from the usual residence because women went to another city to have a relative or midwife assist them with the birth.

Jews in England and Australia appear to have had extremely low rates of premarital pregnancy. A Londoner in 1862 explained that as the guardian of conjugal life, Judaism "hedged" women "in" and "almost isolated" them "in the interior of the family."\textsuperscript{6} Between 1850 to 1900, there were at least nine births in Sydney that I calculated to have occurred within less than nine months of the marriage date. They probably represent premature births rather than premarital pregnancies and were usually within a few weeks of a full-term pregnancy.\textsuperscript{7} In 1870, Berlin's Jewish population had a two-percent rate of premarital pregnancies, which compared favorably to the larger population's rate of fifteen percent.\textsuperscript{8}

Even if premarital pregnancies were not common in Jewish society, efforts were made to limit young single females from having unrestrained contact with men.\textsuperscript{9} In 1857, Jewish parents in London were urged to more carefully guard the morality of young women. One article urged them to find out more about where their daughters spent their time. The accusation was that they were at the casinos and "low dancing places"\textsuperscript{10} and parents were urged to go there and see the "sign of sensuality, burning with the glow of immodest desire."\textsuperscript{11} Parents were asked if their daughters could sneak out of the house without being noticed? Could their daughters "decked out in all the second-hand finery of a duchess," or "bedizened in all the charms of shabby gentility which the tallyman lends, sally forth in the dusk" and stay out all night?\textsuperscript{12} Constance de Rothschild's recollections affirm that young women were not prudish, passionless, ignorant on matters pertaining to sexuality, nor were they confined to their homes. When she was fifteen-years-old she understood the social implications of becoming pregnant prior to marriage. She and her mother Louisa de Rothschild visited a mother and her four-month-old baby who were in
need of financial assistance. When asked, the young mother answered honestly that she had only been married for six months, which indicated that she was pregnant on her wedding day. Constance questioned her mother’s decision to withhold assistance from this woman’s family and recalled thinking that if “Mamma practiced this upon the people there would be few to whom she would give presents.” She also observed that one of her friends was accustomed to the frequency of premarital pregnancies in society and had commented that the “scandal in London was worse than in any village” and if one scorned a “fashionable lady you must pity a poor girl.” Constance agreed and wanted to change this aspect of society. She was already aware of a sixteen-year-old mother “who nearly beat her child to death.” Constance’s subsequent involvement in rescue work with young and poor women grew out of her desire to reduce this kind of distress and abuse.

Fanny Silkman (b. 1867) was one of the few Jewish teenagers in Sydney to be documented for her rebelliousness. In 1882, Fanny was a fifteen-year-old Jewish orphan who whose father Elijah had died, but her mother Sophia (d. 1900) was alive and often in need of financial relief. Sophia was known for defying male authority and had once thrown Elijah out of the house because he was “lazy” and “annoyed her.” Fanny lived with her older sister and Mrs. Alexander and was apprenticed to be a dressmaker with Mrs. Beattie. The Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society became aware of complaints that Fanny had stayed out late while in the company of men, and Mrs. Beattie was not impressed with her conduct. Fanny was called to a special meeting and was warned that “strong steps” would be taken if she didn’t improve herself. They had the option of returning her to the custody of the State, which might have caused her to be placed in a Christian home since the board regularly struggled to find Jewish foster parents. She agreed to “behave better,” but within a few months, she resumed her habit of “staying out late at night and stopping away from work.” She was placed on probation for three months with the promise that if she remained at her
apprenticeship she might be paid a salary thereafter. In mid-1884, there was a further complaint that she was “too gay in going to balls,” and had attended one on the Sabbath after being specifically forbidden. Although the charity board did not put her into the custody of the State, they discontinued her allowance in an effort to regain control over her actions. There were no further incidents reported prior to 1901. When she was twenty-three, she married Ephraim Michael in Sydney’s Great Synagogue. She did not register the birth of a child within the first six years of her marriage and it is impossible for historians to evaluate if this represented an intentional strategy to limit the size of her family. She might have remained in Sydney and had children at eighteen-month intervals without registering their births because she had a past disagreement with the men on the charity board, who were also prominent in the Great Synagogue where the birth register was maintained. She may have registered their births with another congregation, or in another city.

In Sydney, larger families could be considered modern as well as traditional because of the value placed on ‘colonial motherhood,’ with its imperative for populating the colony with British settlers. Working-class families had an incentive to have large families, since at the age of twelve or thirteen children often earned an income or provided household assistance. Catholics and adherents of some Christian denominations retained their high fertility rates because they rejected family planning and the use of birth control. Successive pregnancies were detrimental to a woman’s health and women who had more than five children were at an increased risk of experiencing a miscarriage or stillbirth. Lowered fertility rates also corresponded favorably with lower child-mortality rates. When mothers and female siblings in smaller families were relieved from some of the “burden of expectation” to care for a large number of children it reduced stress on their bodies and provided them with more unstructured time to earn an income, study or recreate. Lower birth rates increased the amount of time a parent could invest in each child, and upper-class and middle-class families were also able to curb the costs of domestic
servants related to rearing their children when they had smaller families. Migrants often had fewer children because of financial constraints related to being in less-stable circumstances as they adjusted to life in a new country. As European-Jewish couples moved to England and America they reduced their family size within a few generations. Fertility rates were also observed to decline within two generations after public education became available. After 1886, fertility rates in New South Wales declined by a third. Between 1891 and 1900, the number of registered births at Sydney's Great Synagogue ranged between forty-one and seventy-eight, but the boys births were registered more frequently because parents were prompted to follow up on registering births when they had their sons circumcised eight days after they were born. Toward the end of the century, it was increasingly common for couples to have fewer than five children, and it was respectable to have between one to three children. Between 1820 and 1870 fertility rates in Western Europe and other English-speaking countries declined rapidly, making this part of a broader trend.

The decline in fertility rates in the nineteenth century most likely resulted from couples practicing abstinence, but vaginal douching, condoms, abortion, and extended periods of breast-feeding, along with other methods of contraception were likely practiced by couples. Religious groups in the nineteenth-century were influenced by sacred texts such as the New Testament and Old Testament even if they were no longer strictly abiding by the social regulations derived from these texts. Jewish wives were given choices about their fertility because their lives were placed at risk by childbirth. Women were permitted to drink herbals that were referred to as a 'cup of roots,' which inhibited pregnancies or that induced miscarriages in the early phase of pregnancy. Women could also use contraceptive devices described in the Talmud. Prevention of pregnancy was typically the responsibility of Jewish wives, rather than husbands, which is still true today. In the absence of direct evidence, we cannot assume that nineteenth-century Jewish couples were fully aware that Judaism promoted women's right to control their fertility, but after the 1870s, advice
literature on the subject of reducing fertility was generally available in England. Contraceptive methods were available in urban areas and through mail-order companies after the 1880s in Australia. Birth-control methods that had to be purchased were more likely to be used by wealthy and upper-middle class couples. The larger size of working-class families may have resulted from their inability to purchase prophylactic products. The use of birth-control methods in the twentieth-century has generated some controversy within Jewish society because it is thought to interfere with the intimacy of the couple, which is known to contribute to the marital rifts that lead to divorce. When contraception was perceived to contribute to the breakdown of the family unit, it is more likely to be opposed. Under Jewish law, a wife could initiate divorce proceedings if her husband insisted that she use contraception, as it was considered her 'natural right' to conceive even if she wasn't commanded to procreate. This was based on Rachel's suffering in the Old Testament, which caused her to feel that she would die if she could not have children. In the Torah, it was Jewish men who were commanded to have children and they were prohibited from using barrier methods, such as condoms, and the early withdrawal method, known as coitus interruptus, was also prohibited on the basis that it 'wasted seed.' Jewish newspapers in London and Australia did not advertise contraception methods, as was common in Protestant newspapers, and there were no articles or letters from the Jewish public or newspaper editors suggesting that they opposed or encouraged the use of such products.

Under Jewish law, the right to sexual gratification belonged primarily to wives, whereas the reverse situation existed in Protestant and Catholic society and wives were expected to be more passionless and virginal even within marriage. According to the Laws of Onah, husbands were obligated to be sensitive to the sexual needs of their wives. Jewish social norms sanctioned married couples to engage in non-procreative sex, such as on the Sabbath, when one partner was barren and throughout the entire cycle of pregnancy. Jewish law opposed chastity within marriages except in times of famine or crisis, or while a woman was waiting to go to the mikvah, which will be
discussed later in the chapter. Among non-Jewish religious groups in England and Australia, husbands resented abstinence within marriage, since it denied them access to their legal and socially accepted expected 'conjugal rights.' At the end of the century, Protestant women's attitudes toward sexuality had changed and they professed to derive little pleasure from it, which is not surprising since abstinence was the most reliable way of limiting births and couples had reduced their family size. Abstinence posed a greater problem in Jewish society when compared to the use of contraceptive methods by females.

Family size was also reduced through abortions. Jewish attitudes about abortion originated in the Torah and were sustained by rabbinical lawmakers who determined that abortions were acceptable under certain circumstances. The fetus was not considered a nefesh, a human life, until it was more than half way out of the birth canal. In cases where the labor was difficult and a mother's life was endangered, it was permitted to take any necessary measures in order to save her life. If the birth process was farther along, then this was not permitted since it is 'not allowable to take one life for another.' Some lenient and innovative lawmakers felt that abortion should be permitted in order to avoid harm to a woman's economic or mental condition, as well as to prevent harm to her body. While general attitudes about abortion suggest that it was acceptable, there was no evidence that Jewish society held strong views on the matter in the nineteenth century, as is common today.

In 1857, England's Jewish communal leaders openly prided themselves that infanticide was not practiced by Jews. Rates of infant mortality are difficult to calculate but stillbirths were registered with the congregations. There were consistent reports that Jewish women had lower rates of stillbirths and infant deaths than their non-Jewish neighbors. Mothers were inclined to breast-feed their own infants rather than relying upon wet-nurses, which is known to promote the health of infants. Among English-Jewish mothers it was reported that it was "only when it is absolutely impossible, and
without distinction of rank, that a Jewish woman does not suckle her child. 27 Ellen Isaacs told Mary Vogel that Maud was nursing her baby, and that it was "apparent to everyone, as she has become so full in figure that she cannot wear anything she had before" the baby was born. High survival rates were attributed to the great care Jewish mothers invested in their infants and breast-feeding was the norm. 28

The laws of Niddah are based on the Torah, the Talmud and other sacred writings that govern women's immersion in the mikvah, which is a bathhouse used for purification. For most women, a visit to the bathhouse following the end of her menstrual period signaled that a pregnancy had not occurred in the previous month. The name of the bathhouse translates in Hebrew to mean 'hope.' This reflects that for many centuries women hoped that conception would occur in the following month. 29 Historically, it was customary for a mikvah to be provided to women prior to building a synagogue or purchasing a Torah scroll for the congregation. It was believed that women would not want to live in an area without a mikvah, and without women there was no hope of sustaining a religious community, which provides another reason the word mikvah translates to mean 'hope.'

Prior to entering the mikvah, a woman observed an elaborate process of bathing, trimming her nails, cleaning her teeth and ears, and removing all forms of adornment, cosmetics, and bandages. She then immersed herself completely in non-stagnant or 'living waters,' without touching the sides of the bath, which is why a standard bathtub was not suitable for this arrangement. There was an appropriate prayer for this occasion. Any number of technicalities could render a woman's immersion 'invalid' 30 and women were discouraged from making unsanctioned arrangements in privately owned pools, streams, lakes or the ocean. A 'mikvah lady' witnessed women's immersion and consulted with rabbis to be certain the process was completed correctly.

In nineteenth-century London and Sydney, a typical man's visit to the mikvah was related to purification on Sabbaths and the High Holidays of Yom Kippur and Rosh Hashanah. 31 Men who converted to
Judaism were also expected to immerse themselves. In 1871, the *Australian Israelite* explained the process in masculine terms and the arrangements were probably altered somewhat for female converts. In Melbourne, the convert met with three Jewish men who were well-versed in Jewish matters and formed a “court” that explained to him what his duties and rights were once the ceremony was concluded. After immersing in the water, a blessing was recited by the converted man, a process that was referred to as being ‘baptized.’ Thereafter he was considered “a member of the synagogue.”

The choice of the word ‘baptized’ was less-common in the early part of the century and reflects a high level of integration with, and mimicry of, Christian society. In Sydney, the *mikvah* may have been used primarily by male Rabbis and converts rather than by women, as will be discussed later in the chapter.

Unmarried women immersed themselves in the *mikvah* just prior to their wedding night, or upon converting to Judaism. Divorced and widowed women did not use the *mikvah* because they were not expected to be sexually active with men. Married women were considered ‘ritually impure’ after they experienced uterine bleeding, such as from menstruation, childbirth or other medical conditions. On a couple’s honeymoon, if there was any blood resulting from their initial sexual relations then the couple had to be physically separated until she had waited the correct number of days and immersed in the *mikvah.* Once a woman determined that she was no longer noticing any signs of uterine blood, she then counted either five or seven consecutive ‘clean’ or ‘white’ days, depending on local custom. She then made arrangements to visit the *mikvah.* If a woman only experienced one day of menstrual blood, she still had to wait a minimum of five days before counting the seven additional ‘clean’ days. This meant that women’s cycle of immersing was fairly regular even if her periods were not.

Over many centuries rabbis maintained that when husbands became too close with their wives they began to find fault with them or became disinterested. One solution to this was found in the *Torah,* in the idea of ‘letting her be forbidden’ for several days of the month. This
was intended to help couples re-experience the excitement and commitment that was presumably present on the day they were married.34 A woman's status as a niddah was potentially observable to anyone who detected subtle changes in the body language of women as they interacted with their husbands. Once wives noticed any menstrual blood their husbands were prohibited from 'drawing them close' and they were expected to sleep separately. They could not touch each other or sit close, even while in public, or upon receiving happy or tragic news. If they wanted to hand a child or an object to each other they had to set it down first so that the other could pick it up. Even women's laundering techniques changed at the time of a woman's period and she was expected to wash bedding and clothing in a different manner depending on if items had been in contact with blood or not.35 Greenberg suggests that even if the laws sometimes failed to diminish the tendency to treat women as sex objects, they at least "minimized those times when this attitude could be acted upon."36 When couples followed these guidelines they developed self-discipline and strong communication skills. Couples adhering to the purity laws were known to benefit from the hygienic and spiritual aspect of the customs and reported fewer instances of infidelity and divorce,37 which may suggest Orthodox couples had happier marriages than Reform-Jews were willing to acknowledge.

Individual attitudes about female sexuality have always varied. There have always been men and women who were uncomfortable with aspects of women's bodies or were offended by the translation of Hebrew into English suggesting that menstruating women were 'ritually impure,' and should be considered 'forbidden' in an undesirable sense, rather than that they were temporarily separated and independent of their husbands. Jewish attitudes about 'ritual impurities' changed over a long period of time and the laws of Niddah originated at a time when only 'ritually pure' people were permitted to approach the Temple. Feminist scholar Chava Weissler's article Mitzvot Built into the Body presents evidence of some of the most negative perceptions around women's niddah status by drawing from the daily prayers known as tkhines that were written for women,
usually in Yiddish. These inspirational prayers probably had a limited influence on Jewish women in England and Sydney since the number of Yiddish and Hebrew readers in these cities was limited in comparison to America and Central Europe. Weissler admits that the *tkhines* she cited were obscure. Her analysis of their content was not counterbalanced by more positive attitudes toward women, their bodies and their spiritual empowerment that men, often rabbis, invoke when they write about these same subjects. This negativity may more accurately reflect the sentiments of feminists since the 1970s than women in the 1870s. In spite of a surface appearance that society, and academia more specifically, has adopted gender-neutral and ‘sex-positive’ values, her analysis may be symptomatic of society’s current tendency to be ambivalent about women’s bodies and sexuality.

When viewed in the most positive light, the experience of going to the mikvah was expected to provide women with a form of social contact with other women, as well as providing a form of physical and spiritual renewal, and sexual anticipation. One nineteenth-century writer felt that Jewish women were to be honored because they were “bound to preserve an exceptional physical purity” that was symbolic of their mental “purity.” Jewish feminist Blu Greenberg suggests that the elaborate hygienic routine that preceded the immersion is evidence that the ritual was primarily a spiritual one. Some women describe the experience of regularly going to the mikvah as having an ongoing ‘appointment with God.’ Women who visited clean and well-attended mikvot reported feeling more positive about this aspect of their spiritual lives. Some communities had ornate facilities with clean warm water, yet women also reported that in some places the water was cold, and the bath was in a state of disrepair or was unpleasant in other ways, such as finding broken glass at the bottom of the pool from where dishes had been *koshered.* Twenty-first-century Rabbi Meiselman explains another value of the laws of Niddah, which is that they brought the “Divine Presence into a sphere where it can too easily be forgotten,” which serves as a “reminder that there is no area of life from which God is absent.”
Rabbinical commentaries contain advice and medical lore about women's health, and women were expected to consult with rabbis about their status as a niddah when they needed advice. Women were encouraged to provide samples of blood or vaginal discharges on a white cloth used for checking for blood, or described what they had seen, if they encountered circumstances that were unusual. Although this may reflect that women lacked knowledge of their own bodies and needed to defer to men for this information, it also reflects a degree of openness with men about subjects that may have been too taboo for Christian women to discuss with their clergymen. Jewish women's reproductive health may have been improved by this vigilance and openness since menstrual irregularities often signaled more severe health problems and would have been observed, reported and potentially alleviated before conditions became advanced and complicated. For example, anemia is often signaled by long, heavy and frequent menstrual periods, and can easily be alleviated by an increase in red meat or iron tablets. Women today might be more inclined to consult a female friend or relative than a male religious leader who was not medically trained, or to refer to exhaustive books such as Woman’s Guide to the Laws of Niddah. In the nineteenth century books such as this one were not available to women on this subject. Girls at the Sydney Jewish Sabbath School were given some instruction on the laws of Niddah as part of the school's usual curriculum in 1898. This basic education may have meant that they were less ignorant and estranged from this aspect of their health in comparison to non-Jewish women or Jewish women who were part of Reform congregations that did not expect women to follow these religious guidelines.

An early mikvah in London was excavated from the cellar of a house on Milk Street and dates to the period prior to the expulsion of Jews by Edward I in 1290. There is a long span of time with little evidence about this religious ritual, but in the 1850s a number of advertisements appeared in the Jewish Chronicle and they reveal a time of heightened competition between mikvot service providers who had renovated their facilities to make them more luxurious,
comfortable, modern and appealing. In 1853, Mrs. Jacobs advertised the completion of renovations to her establishment in Aldgate, and assured her usual clients that the Chief Rabbi had approved of the remodeling. Each customer was promised “good personal attendance” as well as a fresh supply of water in the warmed, yet well-ventilated environment around the marble-lined bath. A month later Mrs. R. Woolf’s renovations at Leadenhall Street were advertised with nearly the same wording. Later in the year, Mrs. Raphael’s daughters’ advertisement appeared aside the others, informing their deceased mother’s clients that they were continuing her business in Leicester Square. Their family business had been in service for forty years, but they had not advertised prior to the renovations and it may be that the other businesses were similarly well-established.

In the 1890s, the cost of attending the ‘Russian Vapor Baths’ in London’s East End was roughly a shilling for the first-class accommodation and sixpence for the second-class room at Rabbi Benjamin Schewzik’s facility on Brick Lane. His sign indicated that Wednesday was “Ladies only” night. Turkish baths existed in several neighborhoods and also advertised their services to Jewish customers.

Irrespective of gender, in the nineteenth century, Central and Eastern-European Jews were more likely than Anglo-Jews to adhere strictly to the family purity laws and use the mikvah. Russian artist Marc Chagall’s (1887-1985) wife Bella Chagall (1895-1944), wrote in Burning Lights of her happy memories while at the mikvah in Russia where she felt supported by other women. After the 1870s, some Australian communities in Victoria, such as Ballarat were composed primarily of Central and Eastern-European Jews. Their mikvah was established in 1868 and was supervised by Mrs. Franks. In 1872, the Australian Israelite of Melbourne advertised that ‘Jewish Baths’ had been repaired and were available with six hours notice for a moderate price. No address or proprietor was linked to the advertisement, suggesting that the location was probably well-known to local women and may have been confidential in order to enhance women’s privacy and safety since it was preferable to go to the mikvah at night. Similar to Ballarat, Melbourne was strongly influenced by
Eastern-European traditions, particularly when compared with Sydney residents. In Melbourne women had immersed at the beach in tents that were set up. Rabbi Abraham Eber Hirschowitz's (b. 1845) contact with observant Jews in Sydney and Melbourne led him to vocalize his “concern” over the absence of mikvot. He reported that the “modest” women of Sydney found it unacceptable to immerse in the ocean, except during the summer, and they wanted new arrangements made, however, it wasn’t clear if he was advocating for a few highly-Orthodox women or if he might have been encouraging women who were otherwise disinterested.

The absence of a local bathhouse does not necessarily indicate that alternative arrangements were not in use, just as the presence of a mikvah does not necessarily indicate that it was used extensively. Jewish women had been in Sydney since 1788 when the first ship of convicts arrived. It wasn’t until the last third of the nineteenth-century that the Beth Din was formed and needed a mikvah for converts to Judaism in Sydney, which may have created more interest in the issue at that time. Jewish residents requested a mikvah in 1848, yet even in 1878, when Sydney’s Great Synagogue was built as the largest synagogue in the southern hemisphere, provisions for a mikvah were not included as a component of the building plans. In 1898, there were several rabbis in Sydney, and they may have needed each other’s support to raise enough funds to build a bathhouse and may have wanted to utilize the arrangement for themselves at the High Holidays and Sabbaths.

Historian Rabbi Raymond Apple finds that after the 1890s, Sydney women frequented the facilities owned by the Sydney Bathing Company, Coville’s Bath, and the Bondi Bath when they needed a mikvah. Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler’s advice for other outdoor arrangements was that women should “wear a loose, wide garment without sleeves but should raise the garment just before the immersion.” In 1900, Mr. and Mrs. Elliot Meyer of Potts Point Sydney, who were long-standing and prominent members of the Jewish community, had a mikvah in their home. They also had a ballroom attached to their residence, and this may have been one of
the only privately established home-\textit{mikvah} in Sydney. Mrs. Myer was an active member of the Sydney Hebrew Ladies Dorcas Society, a group that assisted poor and pregnant women. She may have permitted women to access her pool after they gave birth in order to encourage women to maintain this religious ritual even if they were too poor to afford the cost of visiting a \textit{mikvah} elsewhere. This arrangement was probably more conducive to women's spiritual needs than the public baths since it had the greatest autonomy and women could focus on the religious aspects of the ritual in a more private environment that could be tailored to their individual preferences.

Rabbis strongly discouraged women from delaying their immersions, particularly as a way of postponing sexual relations with their husbands when they were having arguments, or for the more often cited reason of trying to heighten sexual anticipation. Upon returning from the \textit{mikvah} in a purified state, wives anticipated that they would physically reunite with their husbands. Women were often at the most fertile point of the month when they went to the \textit{mikvah}, which was favorable for couples wanting to conceive. The most effective way for couples to limit or postpone pregnancies was to abstain from having sexual relations during the wife's most fertile days, which meant that they were defying one of the religious commandments women were expected to fulfill. While today Jewish women take contraceptive pills to avoid pregnancy, in the nineteenth century, large families were an overt manifestation of a couple's adherence to this tradition since men were prohibited from using barrier methods. Although women occasionally needed to consult with rabbis about their menstrual cycles, wives were expected to be vigilant and provide their husbands accurate and timely updates about the status of their menstrual cycle, since her 'impure' status was thought to be transferred to him through physical contact. If she delayed going to the \textit{mikvah} and she then conceived a child, her 'impure' status was believed to be transferred to her their child as well. Jewish women negotiated with their husbands and Jewish society over the status of their bodies, their fertility, and aspects of Jewish religious law that gave women the right to conceive or use
contraception and to enjoy sexuality as an expected component of their marriages. The idea that contact with menstrual blood could render a person ‘ritually impure’ seemed superstitious to nineteenth-century Jews who were reforming traditions, and often wished to keep their family size small. This helps to explain why a tradition that was rich in health and social benefits for women was not adapted to suit modern life and was instead maintained only by the most Orthodox Jews. At the end of the nineteenth century, historian Barbara Caine asserts that it was no longer possible to “put forward any single idea of women’s sexuality.”66 An investigation of Jewish women’s engagement with the family purity laws and the mikvah provides an additional line of evidence supporting her assertion. Jewish women emulated different ideals of womanhood, sexuality and female empowerment. Some women viewed large families and Orthodoxy as the most desirable model, while others preferred small families and freedom from the strict religious regulations of Orthodox Judaism.

Knowledge about the family purity laws was known to have declined until the last few decades in the nineteenth century in response to reforms.67 The presence of a mikvah is not necessarily the best indicator of women’s adherence to the family purity laws, particularly in cities where women had access to warm ocean water where they may have made informal, though perhaps technically imperfect immersions in water on their own. Available evidence strongly suggests that many women in Sydney did not limit their fertility and this pattern does not exclude the possibility that these couples practiced some aspects of the family purity laws, even if they did so in a less formal sense than couples had in the past or in the present. Although the ideas and customs associated with the family purity laws were distinctly Jewish and would not have been shared or easily understood by other religious groups in London and Sydney, there were no comments in the newspapers suggesting that Jewish men or non-Jews criticized women for their decision about following the family purity laws, or visiting the mikvah, nor are there references to women being praised for doing so.
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Chapter 6: Anglo-Jewish Women’s Culinary Traditions and Holiday Observances: Women as ‘Priestess of the Home.’

There have always been variations in what it meant to follow the laws of kashruth, known more commonly as ‘keeping kosher.’ In the last third of the century Judaism solidified its reputation as a religion and a “hygienic code” that was as modern as it was ethical. Yet in 1889, authoress Anna Maria Goldsmid of England was rare in that she ate strictly kosher foods. The American Jewess reported that by 1898 in America, women no longer faithfully maintained this aspect of their religious lives. Historian Karla Goldman indicates that the decline in kosher cooking could have been an exaggeration, which demonstrates the importance of an exploration of this aspect of women’s lives outside of America.

In this chapter I discuss Jewish gender roles and their influence on Jewish women’s engagement in the home, and outline some of the crucial distinctions between Christian and Jewish cooking traditions. Women’s knowledge of domestic science and the sanitation methods used to control food related bacteria, or ‘germs,’ influenced women’s attitudes related to the preparation and consumption of kosher foods. In the 1890s, the Jewish Chronicle’s column “Kosher Dinners for Middle-Class Families” provided menus for dinners suitable for six guests, and can be considered an effort to revitalize interest kosher cooking after there were more Eastern-European migrants in England who followed Jewish dietary laws. These recipes were presented with simplistic instructions, and were based on a wide range of ingredients and cultural traditions, including recipes that were distinctively Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, Jamaican, Brazilian, German, Polish, Syrian and Russian. Catholic and Protestant cooking traditions from the British Isles also strongly influenced the cooking techniques and recipes of Jews who lived in Sydney and London. The endnotes for this chapter contain references to specific recipes and their dates of publication. The chapter expands our knowledge of how women prepared for holidays, particularly at Passover, and examines
the way the scarcity or high cost of food ingredients, particularly fish and kosher meat, influenced the variation in women’s cooking traditions in London and Sydney in the second-half of the nineteenth century. The aim of this chapter is not to explain the nuances of Jewish holidays and Sabbath observances, but instead to highlight selected aspects of tradition that were distinctive for British-Jewish women, which were mentioned within public discussions.

Family life is central to Jewish society, and males and females filled different roles based on their gender. Many nineteenth-century women in England were focused on the religious and spiritual life within their homes, where the family unit presumably provided members with physical security, emotional nurturing, and a space for negotiating social status. The family is the “most potent socializing and civilizing force available” and is believed to be the “strongest determinant of religious commitment, values and educational achievement.” Through advice literature published in the nineteenth century, society called upon women of all religious backgrounds to assure that the “moral and cultural values, too often forgotten in the workplace,” were remembered in the home. Children and husbands were expected to “go the way of the women,” in Jewish families, which meant that mothers and wives had considerable influence over their husbands and children. Australian society was more egalitarian than in London, and many women claimed to find fulfillment in doing their own household chores, in order to maintain their lodgings as comfortable and well-managed spaces, rather than delegating this work to servants as was common in England. Many women in both countries aspired to achieve the Victorian-era ethic of ‘cultivated idleness.’ Middle-Eastern Jewish women who were trained as teachers by the Alliance Israelite Universelle in France, were found to be outstanding wives because they were capable of being the “vigilant superintendent” of their homes. They taught their children a range of subjects, and this was praised as making them the “most efficacious and the most persuasive agent of progress among the Jews.” Similarly, in 1864, Baroness de Rothschild was optimistic that “the power of woman upon earth is almost unlimited.” Throughout
history, Jewish women have demonstrated their strong morality and adaptability during troubled financial times in order to safeguard their families.12

Women’s engagement with ‘domestic Judaism’ and the value of piety was promoted by Grace Aguilar’s books, which explained Judaism in a clear manner that most of her younger readers could appreciate. She intentionally avoided “doctrinal points,”13 as she sought to “illustrate the spirit of true piety”14 that bridged Christian and Jewish women who valued their power to influence society and their families through religious observances in the home. Aguilar carefully countered popular notions of Christian superiority, and provided women with strong Jewish female role models from the Old Testament, such as Miriam, Debora and Esther, particularly in her books Jewish Faith and Women of Israel.15 She promoted a feeling of “strength and peace of religion,”16 without attempting to elevate the status of Jews by airing disparaging remarks that discounted or diminished the value of Christianity. Religious adherence in England was linked to gentility and respectability and Christians appreciated that Jews were motivated to provide their children with stable religiously-oriented homes.17 These two religious groups shared a belief that men and women should maintain their separate spheres of influence, though their practice of this was not identical and the underlying differences stemmed from doctrinal differences between the Old Testament and New Testament. It was always evident that Jewish and Christian homes were governed by distinctive religious practices, particularly in relation to food preferences, preparation techniques and their traditions at different holidays.

The image of the ‘Angel in the House’ in England and the ‘Angel in the Bush’ in Australia were less commonly invoked in literature for Jewish audiences possibly because they originated in Christian society. Similar to Protestant and Catholic women, Jewish women were expected to be ‘purifiers of public spaces,’ and they acted as “culture bearers.”18 As Rabbi A. L. Green spoke to his female students in England, he encouraged them to look forward to getting married and running their homes. He defined the “angel of the home” as “an
educated woman." In 1864, Baroness Charles de Rothschild invoked the image of women as "guardian angels" who could intervene with "protecting wings between the numbing coldness, the raging storms," and the "fiercely burning passions of the world" as part of women's "mission." An Australian writer recalled that "Next to women, angels were the most frequent bearers of some of the sublimest and most ideal notions" within the Talmud. When angels appear in Jewish society, they are not always linked to purity and goodness, but can be associated with images of death, such as 'angel-makers' who were murderers of infants, as well as to masculine images and trickster figures that taught difficult lessons. Jewish women were more often encouraged to aspire to be the "priestess of the home," which was regarded as a "perfectly true and eminently beautiful saying" in London. The phrasing carries connotations linked to Celtic Paganism, but was instead a reference to the way women were lifted into the "sublime height of priesthood," because they were given the privilege of lighting the Sabbath candles on Friday nights within the "domestic worship" of the home. In 1892, the London Jewish High School for girls encouraged students to aspire to "become the Priestess in your own home." This was to be accomplished by becoming the "shining lamp" that shed "light over the domestic circle." It was through women's "intelligence," their "purity," and "sincere piety" that women fulfilled their spiritual role in their homes. One Londoner admired another woman who reminded her of a "ray of heavenly delight and enthusiasm" as "she lighted her Sabbath-lamp." In London, Christians who wandered past the "happy little homes" in Jewish neighborhoods around Petticoat-lane on Friday nights were urged to notice that the area was one of "morality and not blasphemy." Sabbath scenes in this working-class neighborhood consisted of children sitting around the tables "singing and chanting" prayers as the family shared their "humble" meals on "milk white table cloths." Ideally, wives and mothers said the prayers over the Sabbath candles and brought warmth, insight and guidance when they led religious rituals with their families.
Once the Sabbath candles were lit at dusk on Friday night, no further work could be performed until dusk on Saturday. Work was defined as lighting the fire, cooking, sewing, milking cows, gardening, writing or engaging in financial transactions. A non-Jewish child aged between ten and twelve was often hired in advance to visit Jewish homes and add coals or wood to the fire so that the house remained warm and light. This arrangement was common and the term ‘Shabbes goy’ was applied to the non-Jewish assistant. Jewish women generally spend Friday afternoon preparing for the Sabbath in order to refrain from working after dusk and the following day.

Widowed women and unmarried women often shared the Sabbaths together and used the time for private reflection. Baroness Charles de Rothschild’s perspective in 1864 was that the day provided her with time to “atone for past errors by vowing to refrain from similar faults in future.” She recounted the popular saying that the Sabbath was a “bridge thrown across life’s troubled waters, over which we may pass to reach the opposite shore.” Sydney’s Botanical Garden was a favorite place to walk with friends and enjoy a picnic along the harbor. Prior to the end of the century, electricity was available and although the use of electrical appliances or lights was prohibited, unless they were left on continually, this did not mean that Jews failed to appreciate this technological advance when they were enjoying their Sabbath. Frances Vogel of London told Mary Vogel of Wellington about how “Last Friday after dinner Fred took us to the gardens,” which “really looked beautiful with the Electric light.” Jewish men in Australia were also known to attend sporting events on Saturday, which demonstrates that the day was not always religiously-oriented, but was also a day of leisure and that abstaining from ‘work’ likely meant the suspension of labor that was considered unpleasant.

Jews were known to eat in moderation at meals. In the letters Sephardic Rabbi Moses Maimonides (1138-1204) sent to his sons, he advised them to lead a healthy life by eating a balanced diet and urged them to avoid unnecessary meals and to eat slowly in order to avoid consumption patterns of those suffering from “bulimia.” In the nineteenth century, Jews continued to observe the connection
between a person's well-being and their diet. Doctors today still share Maimonides recommendations.

In order for meals to be considered kosher, the meat and dairy products had to be kept separate, as did the utensils that were used to prepare these food groups. This kept uncooked meat juices from spreading and limited the possibility of bacterial contamination that caused food poisoning. This was especially important in areas where soap and water were difficult to acquire during the process of food preparation. In 1897, Jewish cooks in Sydney were aware that cow's milk often carried diseases, particularly when the cows were fed an "unhealthy diet." However, they had access to pasteurized condensed milk in tins that made women's work in the kitchen easier given the difficulty and expense involved in having ice delivered in order to store perishable foods. A second aspect of this separation of meat and milk products was that these food groups could not be eaten within a few hours of each other. If a person had consumed dairy products such as cream in their coffee, or butter in a pastry or pie shell, then it was necessary to wait several hours before consuming foods prepared with meat or lard. This was expected to aid digestion and one writer remarked knowingly that "meat prepared with milk and butter is most indigestible." Jewish cooks influenced by Spanish and Italian culinary traditions sometimes relied upon olive oil, which could be served with meat or milk products. Almond milk, a traditional ingredient in the Middle East, was also recommended in place of cow's milk, or even for butter, since it stored well and was compatible with kosher recipes. Arguments over the benefits and drawbacks of substituting margarine in place of butter are evident as early as 1900 among English Jews. These food regulations stood as obstacles for observant Jews who wanted to partake of foods prepared by non-Jewish friends or with reforming Jews who were not maintaining kosher practices.

English Jews ate fish as a mainstay of their diets, and kosher recipes from London focused on Portuguese mackerels, salmon, smelts, haddock, and trout. Fish was prepared stuffed, boiled, fried, devilled, or as part of pies, croquettes, salads, fishballs, omelettes and
Fish was especially popular at holidays, and as a cold dish served on the Sabbath for breakfast and the main meal. It was popular among Jews because it was considered neutral and could be eaten with meat or dairy. In spite of Sydney being situated along the water, a local Jewess reported in 1895 that the fish supply in Sydney was “ridiculously small” and “frightfully expensive!” She remarked that there “must be a great bungling somewhere, for not even the ‘ring’ seems to make money out of the trade.” Even in London, where the city was also situated along a waterway, Jews ate ‘coarse’ fish that was “tabooed by the Christian housewife,” presumably because the price was too high for Jewish women to afford alternatives. Frank Hirsch Loewer, was a German-Jewish migrant working as a fish hawker in Sydney in 1887. He was underemployed, which might indicate that the fish trade was not necessarily lucrative for vendors, even if their products seemed overpriced to customers.

Jewish cooks were distinctive of their Protestant, Catholic neighbors since shellfish could never be served within a kosher meal. Lobsters, crabs, prawns, shrimps, scallops, oysters, clams, mussels, octopi, squids, eels, and sea urchins could not be consumed. The usual reason cited for the prohibition was that the abovementioned shellfish ‘did not have both fins and scales,’ which meant that shark meat and catfish were also prohibited. Shellfish and bottom-feeding fish consumed the “scum of the sea,” and were considered dangerous because they “absorbed poisonous substances” in the water where they lived. These foods could not come in contact with other ingredients or even the dishes used in a kosher kitchen without rendering otherwise kosher foods traif, or unfit for consumption. Shellfish often caused food poisoning, particularly in warm climates where foods spoiled easily because ice was difficult to acquire and was the only way to refrigerate foods. Reform-Jews often abandoned cooking traditions that were Orthodox because they wished to partake of a wider range of foods with protein, and wanted to share meals with non-Jewish friends and work associates who ate shellfish regularly.

In order for meat to be considered kosher the animal had to have been healthy while it was alive. Butchers carefully inspected animals
for signs of cancer, internal pests, or other deformities that might make the meat unsafe to consume. Sheep, oxen and cows were sometimes forbidden, or considered *traif*, meaning non-*kosher*, because of lung diseases, specifically tuberculosis. English-Jews thought the meat from animals infected with this disease could be transmitted to humans.\(^5^9\)

For health-related reasons, certain animals were never considered acceptable to eat. According to one nineteenth-century expert's opinion, which was in keeping with traditional guidelines, this prohibition included mammals or birds that were carnivorous, amphibians and reptiles. Pigs, rabbits and hares contracted parasites or carried *trichinosis*, which were easily transmitted to humans and were prohibited as a food source on the basis that they did not "chew their cud and have split hooves."\(^6^0\) In the early 1870s, Jewish people were proud to learn that modern scientific thinking validated the practices associated with keeping *kosher*. One Australian commented on the Jewish prohibition against pork and felt that "medical research has undoubtedly proved Moses to be right in his selection of meat for food."\(^6^1\)

The story of Rosetta Frankel's fiancé, Sidney Algernon Marks, illustrates the point that Jews who lived in areas without access to *kosher* meat, selected foods that were as close to *kosher* laws as was possible. On Marks' trip in 1890 to Little River, near Geelong Victoria, he shot parrots, rabbits and foxes, animals that were plentiful in the area. The cook for his traveling party made parrot pie for their evening meal.\(^6^2\) Rabbits were not considered *kosher* because of concerns over parasites and foxes were carnivores and also forbidden, which meant that he had transgressed against Jewish law by shooting these animals for sport. However, parrots were permissible since they subsist on vegetation rather than meat. Parrot meat could have been *koshered*, by salting it and rinsing away any blood residue while they were camping. The Cohen family, of Tamworth New South Wales, could not always find *kosher* meat, but the women in the family *koshered* the meat they had and they were known to separate the meat and dairy products at meals.\(^6^3\)
In 1871, Isaac Disraeli retold the parable about a rabbinic debate over the acceptability of eating a peacock in the *Jewish Chronicle*. The story was that a man with a peacock asked his rabbi if Jewish law permitted him to eat the bird. The rabbi said it was not permitted and the man left the peacock with him. The rabbi then deferred to the decisions of his own rabbi who did permit the consumption of peacock meat based on a different reading of the law that he disagreed with, since he had followed the advice of his rabbi, he subsequently ate the peacock.\(^{64}\) This story illustrates that exceptions existed making it so that rabbis could find ways to interpret various legal rulings in ways that were strict or lenient, depending on the needs of the situation. The flexibility of Jewish law was intended to generate justice, but sometimes individuals manipulated the laws in a way that was strict, manipulative, greedy and unjust.

Animals that were permitted to be eaten, had to be slaughtered by a trained Jewish butcher, known as a *shochet*, who used the most humane techniques that caused the least amount of suffering to the animal, and who were trained to detect diseases that might render the meat unsafe for consumption.\(^{65}\) This is similar to the Islamic practice of *halal*. Finding a *sochet* was prioritized higher than finding a rabbi for the congregation, although in practice congregations typically found their rabbi first, and many rabbis were trained as *sochetim*. In 1878, Sydney's *sochet* Lewis Goldring reached retirement age and struggled to meet the demands made on him by the Great Synagogue. They were unable to find a replacement for him locally and were assisted by a relative of the congregation who interviewed candidates for them in Europe. They offered their new butcher an annual salary of £120, which came with the option of earning another fifty pounds as a Hebrew tutor. In 1900, Goldring's successor, Rabbi Philip Philippstein, slaughtered poultry for local families and butcher shops, in addition to “526 bullocks, 5366 sheep, 801 lambs and 450 calves” that year.\(^{66}\) Australian Jews preferred mutton over beef at their meals.

When *kosher* food was unavailable for a short period of time individuals were expected to fast, but it in exceptional circumstances,
such as to avoid starvation, non-kosher food could be consumed. Some Orthodox-Jews refrained from eating meat for humanitarian reasons, a perspective that was shared by many Buddhists and Hindus. Some Australiasian-Jews were vegetarians until a sachet was in the area. Since Jews had a reputation of treating animals humanely, Frances Power Cobbe, a British reformer and close friend of wealthy Jewess Constance de Rothschild, urged German-Jews to abandon vivisection in order to “leave this hateful field of ‘research’ and seek loftier triumphs than those over mangled dogs, cats and monkeys” that were “lying helpless on their vivisecting tables.” Her remarks were opposed by Dr. M. Cohen of Berlin who argued that scientists and doctors would not be able to advance their studies without relying upon vivisection. He exaggerated her point in order to deny her request and suggested that if the premise of her argument was followed then no animals should be slaughtered for food and “all people should become vegetarians.” He then argued that if societies accepted the consumption of meat as food then “it cannot be considered immoral to employ vivisection as a means of saving or alleviating human suffering.” It is unclear if Jews became vegetarians in order to avoid animal suffering, but London’s Jewish women were asked not to purchase hats with osprey feathers because it was promoting extinction of the species. This suggests that they were trying to be socially-responsible consumers and did want animals treated inhumanely. Without access to kosher meat, some Jews risked their health by abstaining from nutritious, but non-kosher food, such as when it was offered to them in hospitals and workhouses. In 1890, the London Hospital had a kosher kitchen, but in other areas where the Jewish population was smaller, patients typically opted to eat fish rather than meat, or became short-term vegetarians.

Christian butchers supplied some kosher meat, and although some Jewish customers were uneasy that Christians might intentionally misrepresent or accidentally sell them meat that was traif, the Jewish Chronicle urged readers to trust that this was an unwarranted fear since most Christian butchers were “conscientious” and honest in
their transactions with Jews.\textsuperscript{74} There were some complaints in 1870 that Jewish sochetim, followed the prescribed method of slaughtering animals humanely, but were not following basic sanitary principles in their shops. Employees and their carts were “dirty and untidy” and even the bills they sent out were unclean, all of which provided evidence that these “evils”\textsuperscript{75} needed to be remedied. Christian butchers who provided kosher meat were clean by comparison.\textsuperscript{76} The example set by individual butcher shops had the potential to be reported to a wider audience through newspaper articles that were distributed to Jewish communities across the British Empire. Today’s kosher butcher shops also struggle with variable sanitary conditions just as they did in the nineteenth-century. Christians purchased kosher meat for their own consumption in 1873 in England, and in 1891 in Melbourne, because of its “sanitary superiority” to the meat provided by other local butchers.\textsuperscript{77}

There were a variety of issues that Jewish communal leaders sought to remedy in Sydney in relation to the consumption of kosher meat. The main issues related to encouraging apathetic consumers to buy kosher meat and to assuring that it was delivered when ordered. In 1871, the York Street Synagogue board of management hired Henry Bell as their sochet, and hoped this would reinvigorate people to resume following Jewish dietary laws. In 1884, the Great Synagogue congregation generally ate meat that was traif.\textsuperscript{78} In 1891, synagogue leaders expressed their concerns about the “quantity of Cancerous and other unsound Cattle,” that had become more common in Sydney.\textsuperscript{79} They were perplexed that families were not purchasing kosher meat, which was inspected by their sochet.\textsuperscript{80} In 1893, the amount of kosher red-meat consumed by Jews in Sydney was small enough to be prepared by a single sochet. The Great Synagogue wanted to hire an assist sochet lighten his work load.\textsuperscript{81} In 1896, Mrs. Buttel of Sydney was a kosher butcher and she reported that there was a growing demand for kosher meat among Jews and Christians, many of whom were aware that scientific and medical researchers agreed that keeping kosher was a healthy lifestyle choice. She felt that the “day is not far distant when everybody” will want to use kosher
meat "for its purity, if for no other reason." Another sign that this aspect of religious tradition had been successfully rekindled among Sydney residents was that the Sydney Kosher Butchery Association formed and had their first shareholder meeting in 1898.

Women who did not eat enough red meat while in their child-bearing years often suffered from anemia, which causes extreme tiredness due to iron deficiencies in the blood. Chicken is nutritious, but is not rich in iron. Mrs. Buttel of Sydney, and other female sochetim, may have become interested in assuring the availability of kosher meat because they understood from their own experiences how important it was for women to have access to red meat after childbirth. Childbirth was a significant rite of passage, and the briss, or ceremony of circumcision for sons, often was a time that led to a reversal of women's usual practice of only consuming kosher meat, as was the case for Rachel Bella Kahn Calof of Devils Lake North Dakota. When the family's ox was slaughtered for the briss and was declared traif by their sochet, she was ordered by him to eat the meat in order to protect her health, presumably to assure that she was strong enough to breast-feed her newborn son. Women who felt anemic after giving birth also had the option of trying 'Pink Pills for Pale People' and other brands of iron supplements that were regularly advertised as miracle cures for anemia.

It is likely that Jewish women relied upon male butchers to slaughter larger cattle, even if they knew how to slaughter chickens. Non-Jewish women had no overt religious taboos that prohibited them from slaughtering chickens, but some rabbis prohibited women from slaughtering them or larger animals on the basis that they were prone to faint at the sight of blood, which was disputed by many rabbis in the nineteenth-century as well as today. Although Mrs. Buttel and other women acted as sochetim, they may not have had the same range of philosophical and technical knowledge in comparison to Jewish men who studied in order to fill this well-paid role. Mr. Buttel was also a sochet and may have trained Mrs. Buttel to be a sochet. The work of the sochet was typically combined with other duties related to the synagogue or ritual life of the congregation, such as the
circumcision of children, teaching religious subjects and Hebrew, or acting as a cantor or reader in the synagogue, as was the case with Rabbi Wolinsky of Sydney's Great Synagogue in 1883. Women could not fill some of these roles and job titles may have lumped extra responsibilities with those of the sochet in order to assure that a man was hired for available jobs. At a large Sydney fund-raising bazaar held in December of 1895, one of the largest and most appreciated stalls was provided by Mrs. David Nathan who spent the day with Mrs. P. C. Mitchell, Miss Holldander, and the wife of Doctor Cohen "ending 'Kosher' fowls (at least, this is how she described them in her characteristic way)." One of their customers admired them as being "charming in cool print dresses and large white aprons." They "drove a brisk trade in the more practical if less artistic exhibitions of the Bazaar." Additional research needs to be conducted in order to better understand women's broader role as sochetim in other regions of the world.

Humans have a long history of creating alliances by sharing meat. In England people of all religious backgrounds went without meat on a regular basis due to the high prices. Poor Jews may have had regular access to kosher butchers but the cost of meat was often beyond their means, whereas in Australia meat was less expensive but there were fewer kosher butchers to prepare it properly. Catholic emigration reformer Caroline Chisholm promoted Australia as a place where working-class people could afford to eat meat three times a day, but this probably did not apply to impoverished Orthodox-Jews who only ate kosher meat. In 1871, Australians looked forward to shipping kosher potted meats "home" to England, in order to benefit the poorest Jews. In 1872, a Melbourne man who traveled on a voyage of 120 days with his wife and five children had been successful at curing and shipping kosher meat on the voyage. When they arrived in London the meat was still "sweet and wholesome" and was "relished" by those who tried it. Meat was also shipped via longer routes such as through the Red Sea. Rabbi M. Rittenberg of England prepared kosher meat and soups that were packed in "tins or air-tight cases," which were made of the "best quality" ingredients. In 1875, the prospect of
portable kosher foods generated excitement over the "great convenience" that tinned meats provided travelers who worked in smaller towns, for "emigrants, tourists and picnic parties." All of these consumers were expected to be able to avoid that "twinge of conscience" that accompanied a taste of non-kosher meats. Once it was possible to ship meats reliably over a long distance, D. Tallerman of London's Australia Meat Agency Company Limited sought approval from London's Beth Din in order to send sochetim to Australia so that they could export inexpensive kosher meats to England. The Chief Rabbi Hermann Adler rejected his proposition because he could not personally oversee the sochetim who were sent to Australia. Tallerman was urged to persist in the matter by a Jewish man who was poor and understood the benefit of making meat available at a more reasonable price. Although the regulations in the Shulhan Aruch did not support the Chief Rabbi's ruling, Tallerman's second request was rejected on the same grounds. This triggered speculation that the Schecita Board, who earned an income from the kosher meat sold in England, realized they would not profit on imported Australian meat. Inexpensive Australian meat would have provided strong competition with the existing income they earned on meats from English butchers. This accusation was denied, and negotiations resumed the following year over the possibility of importing sides of frozen beef from Australia. In 1885, Tallerman was pleased to report that the Chief Rabbi approved of a sochet in Ireland who was exporting affordable kosher meat to England. Australia's distance from England prohibited the trade of kosher meat until shipping methods, such as refrigerated compartments or tins became safer and more affordable.

The number of cookery books that were published by women to promote modern approaches to Jewish cooking was limited. In 1889, May Henry and Edith B. Cohen published Economical Cook: a Modern Jewish Recipe Book for Housekeepers, which was dedicated to the Chief Rabbi's wife, Mrs. Hermann Adler. In 1900, authoress Mrs. Frederick B. Aronson of Sydney regularly published a column under the name of Thalia in the Sydney Mail. One of her larger writing projects resulted in the publication of Twentieth Century Cookery and
Home Decoration. It was similar to Henry and Cohen's book but was intended for an Australian audience. Her unusual and creative recipes spanned a range of foods and included salads that were appropriate for a warm climate, which featured produce that was available in Australian markets. The recipes also included a variety of "dainties," 100 savories, and preserved foods like pickles and jams that could be enjoyed during the winter months when produce was expensive or difficult to acquire. An additional section of the book assisted young women who were learning how to run their households. Her writing was praised for blending artistic sophistication with colonial practicality. 101 If the writing was criticized as somewhat provincial, it was appreciated as being modern. Jewish cooks were accustomed to altering recipes from other religious traditions in order to make them kosher, and they had relatively few cookery books to refer to that were based on kosher British recipes. 102

In 1846, there were complaints that Jewish girls did not spend enough time learning "Culinary science" or the "humble study of household affairs," 103 which was a common issue because families relied often on servants to prepare their meals, especially in London. Middle-class women, irrespective of their faith, were found to be so unskilled in their cooking in the early 1850s that it resulted in social unrest and the disintegration of the family, because men fled from their homes in favor of clubs to avoid the ongoing disappointment at meal times. Even women from the poorest classes, who were most likely to be employed as domestic servants in middle-class households, were known to lack cooking skills. 104 Frances Vogel, a wealthy Jewess living in London's West End worried when guests visited her because she had a "very plain cook." 105 When Jewish girls were given skills to prepare their own meals through books and classes, they were more self-sufficient once they headed their own households, and they were better able to direct non-Jewish servants who were unfamiliar with the art of kosher cooking.

Jewish girls were urged to add cooking, as well as chemistry and science to their schedules. 106 The Society to Promote the Knowledge of Cookery was formed in 1857 to assist poor women to become better
cooks since at that time written manuals were insufficient. In 1882, non-Jewish students in London were also encouraged to learn cooking through classes that were added to their schedules through state-funded grants. Although Jewish children in Sydney and London lacked strong cooking skills, they were often permitted to abstain from cooking classes in public schools if they were not based on kosher principles. The need for classroom instruction on kosher cooking continued, and in 1881, a Jewish observer in Melbourne did not find that household and domestic issues were “innate” to Jewish women and they did not “take to’ the linen-press and the pastry-board as naturally as ducks to water.” In 1888, Rabbi S. Singer was pleased when a cookery class was offered in one of the schools in the East End of London. However, in 1891, London’s younger Jewish women were thought to be less attracted to Judaism because it was “represented to them as an affair of the kitchen, and not of the human character.” In 1895, Jewish girls were taught how to make distinctly English dishes that were also kosher, such as “meat pies, sausage rolls and marmalade pudding.” In spite of the value of food at Jewish gatherings and holidays, a Sydney writer complained in 1898 that although “the majority of Jewish girls” were “amiable, attractive, and educated,” they were also ignorant of how to “cook a potato.” This was quickly refuted by another writer who insisted it was untrue. The suggestion that Jewish girls could not cook potatoes even after classroom education improved was highly insulting since potatoes were a staple in British diets and the Jewish Chronicle’s kosher recipe column included a wide range of potato dishes.

Women bought food for their families, and it was up to them to ensure that their money was spent on safe and nutritious foods. Women were encouraged to promote a pleasant atmosphere at meals in order to generate harmony within their homes. In 1883, British-Jews were encouraged to help the poor to obtain food, as well as teaching them cost effective ways to prepare it that maximized its nutritional value. One helpful tip was that haricot beans were an inexpensive and nutritious substitute for meat, which made them an ideal choice for kosher meals made with dairy products. For working-
class families who were “doomed” to “live on the same monotonous fare” recipe substitutions also added variety to women’s menus.120

The recipes recommended in manuals and newspaper columns were complicated to prepare, and may not reflect the average woman’s dinner menus. Most of the recipes in the *Jewish Chronicle*’s “Kosher Meals for Middle-class Families” column included fish and potatoes as main components of the meal, with beef and chicken appearing regularly as hidden components of vegetable soups.121 Some additional savory kosher dishes listed on menus that today’s cooks might find of interest included a matzo souffle, curried chicken, spaghetti, macaroni aux tomatoes, seakale, roasted duck with applesauce, croquettes of carrots, and kromeskis, or sausage rolls which are still popular in Australia today.122 There were usually two types of sweet dishes on the menu, a fruit dish,123 and a complex dessert at the end of the meal that was often based on cultural traditions linked to a specific city, or that highlighted imported ingredients.124 Anglo-Jewish cooks drew from traditional recipes originating in Britain, France, Germany, Spain, Italy and the Middle East, but most recipes were adapted to culinary traditions from Great Britain. In Sydney, Jewish cooks were urged to expand their diet by trying a recently available Japanese vegetable known as yummayarte, the root of the lily plant. It was cooked similar to “cauliflower, celery, or asparagus,” and reflects influences from the Northern Asian-Pacific region that were relatively absent in the Jewish recipes published in London.125 Although Jewish cuisine today is largely based on Russian and Eastern-European traditions, it appears from the recipes in the *Jewish Chronicle*, that Anglo-Jews hoped to assimilate Eastern-European Jews into British society by teaching them how to prepare meals that were Jewish but British, rather than integrating Russian and Eastern-European dishes into their menus. For example, there were few recipes for borscht, blintzes, piroshky, cabbage-based recipes, kugels, bagels or Russian tea-cookies, which are still considered popular Jewish foods today.

British-Jews applied scientific principles when they wished to improve the health of their families and they shared their knowledge of
herbal remedies as a way of enhancing social relationships, as is traditional in China, Africa, and among Native-American groups. In 1869, girls were urged to extend their knowledge of plants into the realm of “economic botany- the culinary and medicinal uses and properties of the various plants, vegetables and herbs in daily use.”

Women who understood the value of “kitchen medicine” used teas, herbs and even coffee to treat a wide range of ailments and illnesses. Women also shared cure-all remedies that may have had no health benefits at all. Frances Vogel of London wrote to Mary Vogel in New Zealand: “Very many thanks for sending me the Wizard Oil,” but she didn’t indicate if it had worked. The hops in beer have medicinal value when consumed in moderation and in 1884 Frances recommended that her young nephew Frank Vogel might remedy his headaches and stomach trouble, likely due to stress while he was at boarding school, with a “glass of ale with his dinner.” Two years later, Annie Isaac recommended that Mary Vogel might benefit from her headache pills, which she had already taken eighty of and found to be a “great benefit.” She planned to try “something called Cocaine,” which was a “new discovery” that caused numbing and was “only for outward application, to be rubbed on the part where the pain is.” She explained that it was “extracted from the leaves of the coca tree.” Homeopathic chemist James Epps advertised his product ‘cocaine’ that was sold “only in labeled tins,” at the end of a column of kosher Passover recipes. The powder was to be prepared as a tea in order to gain stamina. Although Jewish women avoided the profession of nursing, they appear to have been inclined to resolve health problems with a variety of herbs and dietary measures that are still in use today by doctors and herbalists.

Women also shared their knowledge of how to avoid consuming toxins, such as those found in mushrooms. At the consumer’s own risk, it was recommended that poisonous toadstools could be differentiated from edible varieties by cooking them with a slice of onion. Edible mushrooms turned onions translucent when they were cooked together, whereas the poisonous types supposedly turned the onions black. In the late 1890s, wealthier women in Melbourne and
Sydney purchased bottled water that was processed through “Pasteur’s Germ-proof Filter” in order to avoid contaminating elements in the water. While speaking on the subject of commercial ethics, Rabbi Jacob Landau of Sydney, raised concerns over the issue of food adulteration. Young Jewish women were likely taught by family members that unsafe ingredients could never be considered kosher.

In addition to issues around food safety and cooking styles, women were expected to teach their families proper etiquette. The underlying presumption was that women wanted to eat their meals out of ‘proper’ dishes, such as the popular English-made blue transfer-print Spodeware that families often heirloomed, while sitting at a formal table with a table-cloth, using cutlery that was arranged in a specific way. Jewish women in Baghdad, were more likely to share meals with male family members on Sabbaths and holidays, but the rest of the week they ate separately, which was sometimes perceived as a degrading exclusion. Water often had to be carried long distances, and Sephardi women in the Middle East were criticized for eating straight from the pans used to prepare foods. This minimized the number of dishes that had to be washed and was more sanitary than eating from dishes that had been set aside where they were exposed to flies in the room. Women’s arrangements in the hot climate of Sydney, may have prompted women to abandon some formalities that they were accustomed to in colder climates, even if they remained formal on the Sabbath, at holidays and in the presence of guests. Eating in a less formal space at other times may have provided relief from the heat and for women’s tired feet, even if it wasn’t considered as ‘respectable’ by their peers in London. Since gender segregation at meal times was common in Russia and in other British colonies, it shouldn’t be presumed that all Jewish women in Australia and England adhered to the same standard of etiquette as was aspired to among England’s Protestant and Catholic upper and middle classes.

Fund-raising events that served kosher food were a popular form of entertainment for Jews living in London and Sydney. British women’s fund-raising events that served kosher food were respectable religiously-oriented events. Alcohol was often served and it was not
uncommon for the dancing to continue until well after midnight. Mrs. Schneider provided the kosher catering for the Ladies Aid Society Ball fund-raising event in May of 1898. A month later, she provided the catering for the third annual Sydney Jewish Education Board fund-raising ball which included “all kinds of delicacies, fruits, poultry, and wines, beers and aerated waters.” The newspaper advertisement for this event had enticed potential dancers with advice from two women that the ticket-takers should “wear warm socks and slippers and fortify themselves with a flask of something more comforting than ginger beer,” because it was “very cold in those marble halls at the Paddington Town Hall.” In 1900, Mrs. S. Berkman provided an elegant kosher dinner for nearly three-hundred guests at the third anniversary fund-raising ball for the Baron de Hirsch Memorial Aid Society, which was also held at the Paddington Town Hall. That year, the Jewish Social Club held a fund-raiser at this venue, which attracted about two-hundred-and-fifty people who raised money to pay for a bed in one of the public hospitals. The catering for the event was arranged by the City Catering Company and Mrs. Buttel donated the kosher meat. She and Mr. J. Brigg also donated kosher meat to a social event held in 1900 by the Sydney Help-in-Need Society. Healthy food was an important component of these events and the Orthodoxy practiced by Jews in Sydney and London did not preclude dancing and alcohol consumption, which some conservative Protestants and Catholics did not consider respectable activities.

In the synagogue and at home, holidays were associated with saying prayers and often involved fasting and then feasting. Women usually prepared special food for large holiday gatherings. Abstaining from food was expected to assist people’s spiritual reflections by helping them to appreciate the positive aspects of life, such as that they usually found comfort in their daily meals. In 1864, Baroness Charles de Rothschild wrote of women’s unstructured prayers that “when coming from the depths of the soul,” they were “an inexhaustible source of purification, peace, and solace.” She was critical of the public prayers in the synagogue, which were often referred to as empty “mechanical lip-worship,” and she encouraged...
girls at the Bell Lane School in London to pursue “an intensely thoughtful invocation” instead. Purim, Chanuka, Simcha Torah and Passover were holidays that “were marked out as belonging to children.” Young people were expected to have a purifying influence at holidays because they expected their parents to set a proper example. In 1882, Constance Flowers, formerly de Rothschild, remembered the holidays she spent with her mother Louisa in England. She fasted that year “with dear Motherkins” and later reflected on the value of her company: “With her, sunshine; without her, cold shade... God be praised at having given me such a Mother!” Holidays were occasions that promoted education by parents because children were inclined to ask questions about aspects of Judaism that they did not understand or that needed to be differentiated from Catholic and Protestant traditions, particularly when considering the distinctive preparation and consumption of food.

Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year, usually is observed in late September, when it was cold and cloudy in England, whereas in Australia it was warm and sunny. Women were expected to go to the synagogue on this day to listen to the shofar, or ram’s horn as it was blown. The horn blowing of the Christian New Year in January shared this element in common. This holiday was the first of the ‘High Holidays,’ which concluded with Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement. In 1859, young Annie de Rothschild saw the High Holidays as a time to avoid day-dreaming about “balls and dresses” in order to focus on her prayers. She was understandably annoyed by a visit from a guest named Mr. Helbert, whom she found boring and full of “nonsense.” His presence probably challenged her ability to fully concentration on more spiritual matters. In 1864, Baroness Charles de Rothschild felt that the New Year was a time for turning toward “all that is good and pure.” It was an ideal time to “break old fetters” and a time when “evil connections may be relinquished, dangerous bonds severed, false friends, and wicked associates, and pernicious habits” could be “abandoned.” Not all women felt such a spiritual connection to holidays and for Di Nathan of London, the holidays in
1887 were noticeable because they interfered "so dreadfully" with the time she usually spent writing letters to Mary Vogel in New Zealand. Writing was a prohibited form of 'work' on these holidays. At Yom Kippur people were expected to examine their spiritual status through a process of cross-examination and to make efforts to remedy the wrongs they had committed during the year. The day was viewed by many women, including Baroness Charles de Rothschild, as a "solemn fast" and a "day of humiliation." When Constance de Rothschild was a teenager, she referred to it in her journal as "A terrible evening as always." She reflected back on her lack of "moral courage" and scolded herself in her diary that she should "take care not to flirt." As was customary, she spent the day talking with her family, reading prayers and examining her conduct.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, British-Jews were encouraged to focus on aspects of Christian holidays that they appreciated, and to transfer as many similarities as possible onto the corresponding Jewish holidays. Communal leaders sought to increase the value of Jewish holidays by providing children with memorable experiences that were usually associated with foods, especially ones that were sweet. In 1900, students at the Hebrew and Sabbath schools in Sydney had their second annual Chanuka feast and about 250 children attended an event that was held in the shade at the Queen's Hall during one of Sydney's hotter months in December. The children were given "bags of fruit, cakes and sweets. Besides this, forty gallons of ginger beer were provided for their delectation." The event was historically significant in that Mr. David Nathan provided entertainment with a "large concert phonograph," which he caused to "emit amusing selections." Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau observed that there were few "Chanuka illuminations" in Sydney and noticed that this holiday was not "popular" in the city, which might have been because in Australia it occurred in the summer when the significance of the menorah's warmth and light were less appreciated than if the holiday was observed on a dark rainy night in London. Reformers wanted Jews to re-value the lights of the menorah and to forgo the lights on the Christmas tree. It was suggested that the
Christmas plum pudding, usually a winter favorite in England, could become a part of Chanuka rather than serving it on Christmas. However, this was a heavy dessert that usually contained dried fruits, and in the Australian summer months they had fresh fruits available which were more suited to meals in warm weather. Rather than sending Christmas cards to their non-Jewish friends, Jews were urged that it was more appropriate to send greeting cards that marked the turning of the civil New Year in January. Jews were known to have Christmas trees. Some Jews opted to send cards for Christmas and Chanuka simultaneously. In London, Jews observed Christmas as a secular holiday rather than a religious one, which made this practice less contentious. In 1882, Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau's wife observed that it was a Jewish firm in Sydney, Messrs. Raphael Tuck and Sons, who created some of the most artistic Christmas cards. There was a Jewish lady named Mrs. Tuck who lived in Sydney at this time and she was married to a non-Jewish man. They may have created these cards. While Jews wanted to integrate with non-Jews, they also sought to maintain their own traditions at a time when it was fashionable to observe Christian customs. Some Jewish families feared it would be confusing to children if they sent or received New Year's cards at Rosh Hashanah and then again a few months later in January as was the Christian custom. They reconciled some of the dissonance created by observing dual traditions by arguing that Christmas was a ‘civil holiday’ rather than a religious one even if Protestants and Catholics continued to view Christmas as a religious holiday.

At Passover, which coincided with Lent and Easter, the usual cooking utensils and crockery in Jewish homes had to be kept separate from the every-day set of dishes that came in contact with grain products, also known as chametz, which were prohibited at this holiday. Many women engaged in a spiritual ‘spring cleaning’ ritual prior to this holiday and searched “every nook and corner” of their houses and even pockets in clothing to be sure that everything was clear, and not even a grain of rice or crumb of a biscuit was left in the house. Some women purportedly went so far as to cover the water
faucets with cloth to assure that no contaminants entered the house.\textsuperscript{173} This cleaning custom was reported in 1880 to be most carefully observed by the poorest Jews and is cited as a reason that Jewish people were healthier than others in urban cities, including in the overcrowded neighborhoods of London.\textsuperscript{174} In Australia, this holiday fell not in the springtime, but in the fall, which meant that the 'spring cleaning' aspect of the holiday would have felt out of place to women who grew up in the northern hemisphere. Many Sydney Jews were migrants and it would have been impractical for them to bring or acquire two sets of dishes, one exclusively for Passover and one for every-day use, whereas in London less-expensive dish-sets could be purchased locally or heirloomed to family members. The Jewish Museum of London has a pink and white dish-set that was owned by a Polish family who migrated in 1880. Gold Hebrew lettering was incorporated into the dish's pattern, indicating that they were dishes "for the festival of Passover," assuring that they would not be used at other times of the year.\textsuperscript{175} Rabbi Landau's wife felt that compared with London, Passover in Sydney was not signaled by a flurry of advance preparations to remove 

\textit{chametz} from the house, to clean the kitchens and prepare the Passover crockery and foods.\textsuperscript{176} The Cohen family of Tamworth were known to have a separate set of dishes and silverware for the Passover holiday,\textsuperscript{177} which suggests this tradition was strictly observed some families in Sydney. Ship travel was more economical at the end of the century, which would have lowered the retail price of dishes sold in Sydney. This would have made it more likely that the average family could afford to purchase two sets of dishes, particularly since there were more Jewish merchants in the area as well.

Every aspect of food production and consumption at Passover is carefully considered by Orthodox families in order to observe the holiday in accordance with Jewish law. Sonia Zylberg provides insight into the way feminists have struggled to include themselves into this holiday after the \textit{seder} dinner began, a point when their presence can be easily subsumed by the men leading the prayers. Women today often add an orange to the \textit{seder} plate to acknowledge women and
counterbalance what they see as sexist language in the *Haggadah*, the book used to guide the prayers and explain the meaning of the meal. The orange was not a part of nineteenth-century practices, and the preference for foods filling the symbolic roles may have differed somewhat from what we expect today. In 1855, Lawrence Joseph Spyer of North Sydney’s Elizabeth Street sent a letter to his eldest daughter Sophy, who was about fifteen-years-old. He asked what her impression was of the Passover *seder* she attended at Mr. Walter Joseph’s house. His description of the ceremony suggests that she had never attended a *seder* prior to this year. He explained that all of the foods on the table had a “symbolical meaning” that might “appear at first sight very ridiculous,” however, he encouraged her that “when enquired into” she would find the meaning associated with the food “very significant and for a purpose.” The table is usually set with a plate that contains foods that symbolize Jewish enslavement in Egypt and the exodus of Jews to safety. An egg, called *beizah*, represents grief and is often dipped in salt water to represent tears of affliction. There are bitter herbs, such as horseradish or lettuce leaves known as *maror* that remind everyone of the bitterness of slavery, and a roasted shank bone called *z’roa* represents the sacrificial lamb. *Charoset*, a dish of grated apples mixed with wine, cinnamon and crushed walnuts is included as a reminder of mortar that held bricks together and the forced labor of Jewish workers. *Karpas*, such as parsley, was also dipped into salt water to represent tears. The dinner also includes four cups of wine and a plate of three unleavened flat-bread crackers called *matzos*. The only source of grain permitted within the house would have been the kosher for Passover *matzos*.

Women contributed to the Sydney Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home at Passover by helping to arrange the *seder*, which is usually observed as a smaller gathering in someone’s home. There were typically between ten and fourteen residents living at this nursing home and there were usually more men than women. In the late 1890s, there were three women and eight men. In 1892, there were sixty guests at the *seder*, and the matron Mrs. Goldman was assisted by Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. H. Solomon and her two daughters. In 1894,
the Home had a new matron, Mrs. Isaac Barnett, who was assisted by her husband and another young woman. They served fifty-four guests on the first night when, as was traditional, Rabbi Philip Philippstein led the services. Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis was the traditional leader of the services on the second night, with nearly seventy guests in attendance that year. It is more common to attend seders with non-family members on the second day of Passover, which likely explains the larger number of guests on the second night at the Home.

In 1895, Davis complemented the matron for her successful dinner arrangements, which helped to entice visitors. The services were popular, which was important for elderly residents who might otherwise have spent the holidays feeling isolated. The involvement of young women in the services at the home increased toward the end of the century, which was a reflection of the formation of organizations, such as the Girls’ Guild, that encouraged and facilitated such involvement. Women helped make the seder at the Home a success by donating money, potatoes, poultry, and cases of fruit. In 1894, Mrs. Sarah Asher sold kosher groceries to the community, including foods that were kosher for Passover. She requested the patronage of the Home and they gave her some of their business for the High Holidays, but not for Passover. In 1898, the Home purchased their kosher meat from Mrs. Buttel and the Kosher Butchering Company, who may have been the agreed upon provider of meat when Asher made her offer. At other times of the year women supported retired residents by donating clothing, reading material, medicines, wine, Chanuka candles, and other foods, including kosher meat donated by Mrs. Buttel. Although the Home was composed primarily of male residents, and the seder itself was led by male rabbis, the active involvement of women and girls helped make the Festival of Passover into a well-loved tradition in Sydney.

In 1845, Sydney was one of the largest suppliers of Passover matzos and cakes, with at least two tons being distributed to the neighboring colonies. In New Zealand some men made their own Passover supplies but they also ordered them in advance from Australia. The process of baking matzos was expensive and the
baker for Sydney's Macquarie Street Synagogue needed a loan of one-
hundred pounds in order to stay in business during the time after
Passover when the demand for these crackers was significantly
lower. By 1874, German matzos were made by machine, which
increased production and reduced costs. London's Chief Rabbi
Hermann Adler (1839-1911) did not approve of this innovation in
England, because he observed that it displaced Jewish workers. As a
result, only hand-made matzos were deemed kosher in England, and
other British colonies. In 1874, Mr. Davidson had a profitable
matzo factory in Melbourne that employed twelve people, mostly boys.
Their matzos were described as being "uniform in size, not too
thick," and they weighed "about ten to the pound." For the Passover of
1878, Mrs. R. Abrahams of Castlereagh Street, on behalf of the Sydney
Matzo Board, agreed to make Passover cakes. She was promised that
her services would be advertised, and they provided her with a list of
regulations for the strict manufacture of Passover foods. The location
where the cakes and matzos were to be baked could not to be part of a
living space and no meat could be eaten in the bake-house or its
immediate area, which was to be "kept scrupulously clean." The
water supply had to be pure and from a "tap only used for such
purpose." The grinding-mill had to be cleaned regularly and was only
to be used for preparing Passover flour. The thoumer, who observed
the grinding of the corn and then sealed the bags, was someone who
had to be approved of by the synagogue board. At least three-fifths of
her employees had to be Jewish. Although Abrahams was expected to
pay the wages of the workers, who were specified as men, this may
have meant 'people' in actual practice. Her employees were also
prohibited from working on the Sabbath. Once the matzos were
baked, they had to be stored in a room that was used exclusively for
that purpose and sheets were to be hung around the area to denote its
boundaries. In 1879, Abrahams was asked to prepare the Passover
matzo meal and matzos for Sydney's poorest Jews. In 1891,
London's more Orthodox-Jews preferred to buy their matzos "abroad
because the machinery requires improvement." This suggests that
the Chief Rabbi had given his permission to make them by machinery
in London, but that other regions exported higher quality products that were possibly more affordable by comparison. Joseph Bonn's advertisement in London suggests that matzo bakers competed for their customers. In 1896, the Sydney Matzo Association assured that the Jewish community had an ample supply of matzos at Passover, likely with the assistance of the New South Wales Matzo Company, owned by R. Solomon. This was a significant accomplishment since many potential migrants from England were reluctant to move to Australia until they were certain they could acquire foods that were kosher for Passover.

In 1884, English Christians were “dismayed” to learn that “bread and flour are added” to the list of foods that are prohibited during Passover, and one Jewish person's opinion was that Christians “pity us for the monotonous fare to which they think we must be condemned.” Although there were many “grumblers” at Passover who were not satisfied with the available cuisine, Jewish women were aware of many ways to substitute ingredients so that their usual recipes could be served without a significant change in flavor. In Sydney it was possible to buy a variety of groceries that were kosher for Passover, including Jamaican rum and spices. Londoners had similar options. Almond pudding, cakes made with almond flour, matzo pudding, as well as coconut macaroons were traditional Passover deserts that were rarely served in Christian homes. Another Passover favorite was matzo ball soup, which is a chicken soup that usually has carrots, onions and parsley in it along with dumplings that are made with egg and coarse matzo crumbs. Matzo crumbs were also used for breading fish or chicken. Cream soups and gravy could be thickened with potato or tapioca flour or with the finest crumbs of crushed matzos. Sephardic Jews in London were influenced by Portuguese traditions that permitted the use of rice flour as a thickener, but it was more common to exclude rice from the diet at Passover. Non-Jewish women probably did not cook with matzo meal at any time of the year and would have been unaccustomed to many of the recipes Jewish women thought of as traditional at holiday meals.
Since Anglo-Jews considered beer the “usual beverage” at meals and it was prohibited at Passover due to the barley used in its production, alternative drinks such as sassafras were suggested. This drink usually contained licorice root and aniseed. It was considered “in vogue” by a select few, although most others found it a “fearful concoction.” One writer remarked that although “everyone recommends it as being eminently wholesome, no one thinks of drinking it himself.” Instead, lemonade was recommended as “almost the best thing I know of for thirsty souls.” Londoners probably had access to lemons from Spain, Portugal and Italy at this time of the year and Australians either had access to locally-cultivated lemons or to cordials preserved from the previous season. The Australian wine trade had not been established long enough to export kosher wines to England and this writer pondered if “the Rabbins” had been aware of what Passover wine tasted like in the future, would they “have been so cruel as to insist upon our drinking four cups on the Seder night”? At a Passover seder today there is often a point when individuals place droplets of wine on a plate and name a plague that they would like to see disappear. There were no accounts from Jews in London or Sydney referring to this aspect of the tradition or the plagues they may have named.

On Purim it was customary to visit Jewish friends and give them small gifts, and in the evening there was a festive meal. Money was given to the poor irrespective of their religious beliefs. The Book of Esther, known as the Megilla, was read to the children in the evening. Some Australian Jews had discontinued the custom of making “noises of dislike” upon hearing the name Haman, who had plotted to exterminate Jews, and of applauding Mordechai’s name for asking Esther to go to the King to save Jewish people in the kingdom. Her efforts were successful and Haman was executed before he caused any deaths. Australian children appear to have avoided the Central-European tradition of dressing in costumes and wearing masks as they played pranks in the streets. In Australia in the mid-1890s, Purim usually involved sharing small amounts of ‘Purim money’ with children who were expected to buy “wholesome things.” This ran
contrary to the usual sanction of irreverent behavior on this day. One communal leader indicated that aspect of the holiday was abandoned because “sometimes the fun was altogether too rough.”209 This tradition may have been too closely associated with the Catholic practice of celebrating Carnival, which was popular in Italy and France.210 New traditions developed in Australia and wives of the Sydney Jewish Education Board provided a picnic and sweets for the students.211 In 1896, a Purim picnic was arranged and forty people went to the National Park along with some out of town visitors.212 In 1901, this tradition was solidified and more than two hundred students from the Sydney Hebrew School were treated to a Purim picnic and Mrs. Buttel donated the kosher meat for the occasion.213

In 1883, it was considered exceptional if women took responsibility for the decorations within the Synagogue at Pentecost and the succah at Tabernacles.214 By the mid-1890s, Sydney women assisted with the decorations of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home’s succah. The style of decorations evolved each year. The 1896, succah included umbrellas and Japanese lanterns, “festoons of coloured tissue and crinkled paper,” with “mottoes,” and a number of “incongruous pictures.”215 At least fifteen women made contributions to the structure and the meal that was shared inside after it was built.216 In 1898, Mrs. Isaac Barnett, Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau’s wife, and the Jewish Girls’ Guild decorated the Home’s succah. Their style was considered aesthetically pleasing compared to previous years because they reduced the number of paper ornaments. There were a few well-crafted tissue-paper roses and water lilies that were mixed in with live flowers, including arum lilies. They decorated with fresh fruits, such as loquats, as well as Chinese lanterns and Christmas ornaments, which may have been blown or molded glass in the shape of fruits, which are still a popular ‘Victorian-era’ style of Christmas ornament today.217 In 1899, many of the same women and girls assisted the Home’s new matron, Rosa Hart, with the succah. They refined their style by omitting tissue-paper flowers and substituted natural fruit and flora, such as evergreen sprays with wisteria.218 In 1900, they continued their trend toward a minimalistic design and limited the
decorations to lilies and may blossoms. That year, about 250 children from the Hebrew School and the Montefiore Home visited the succah and were provided with fresh fruit and other sweets. For many years the Girls' Guild also "tastefully" decorated the booth constructed at the Great Synagogue. Families also had their own succot that were visited by their close friends, including Mr. S. Harris from Moore Park, and Mrs. Sonnenfield from Surry Hills. Christmas trees were covered in ornaments, which was part of a wider trend of conspicuous consumption in the Victorian era that was fuelled by technological innovations. This may explain why the early succot were so profuse with decorations while the ones at the end of the century were more minimalistic.

Although men played significant roles at holidays, women's cooking contributions were indispensable components of spiritually-oriented gatherings. Jewish law regulated nearly every aspect of food consumption, particularly at Jewish holidays and the Sabbath. Distinctive characteristics of Jewish dietary traditions included saying certain prayers at meals, abstaining from food on certain holidays, having special recipes or ingredients served on holidays, strict avoidance of unsafe foods, moderate food consumption, maintaining kosher practices by not mixing meat and dairy products at meals, and by slaughtering animals in the most humane way. Communal leaders attempted to bolster girls' knowledge of cooking, as well as 'kitchen medicine,' because they understood that without this knowledge they would not be capable of maintaining kosher homes and might more easily abandon other aspects of Jewish religious traditions, which were known to have health-related benefits. Sophie Spyer, for example, was unfamiliar with the meaning of the foods at Passover, illustrating that this was a legitimate concern. Alterations to Jewish holidays were evident in the use of Christmas ornaments on the succot in Sydney at the Home for Jewish pensioners, and in the use of Christmas cards and trees at Chanuka. The holiday of Purim was also altered to meet the social needs of British Jews.

Reform-Jews wanted to consume a wider range of foods, with less-complicated food preparation practices and wanted to partake of non-
kosher food at social events and in the work-place. Orthodox-Jews in London and Sydney promoted kosher cooking as being modern and aligned with safe food-handling practices and the latest scientific principles. The recipes in the Jewish Chronicle responded to the feedback of Reform Jews by providing cooks with recipes that had simple instructions and were regionally diverse, yet still within the strict guidelines for kosher cuisine. Most alterations to cooking traditions in this time period minimized the obvious differences between Jewish and Christian cooking traditions. Orthodox-Jewish cuisine was maintained by sharing recipes that were popular British among cooks, but substituted fish, beef, lamb or chicken for ingredients such as shrimp or ham. In spite of a large number of Eastern-European migrants living in London in the late-nineteenth century, the influence of their cooking traditions was minimal when compared to the number of recipes from Spain, Portugal, the Middle East and other British colonies, and was distinct from what cooks today think of as ‘Jewish’ recipes. Most accounts of daily life and holiday observances in London and Sydney suggest that Jews were aware of religious restrictions on the foods they ate, but that they were selective, rather than strict, in how they followed religious laws.
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114. From a Correspondent, "Cookery Lesson at the Free School," *Jewish Chronicle*, November 29 1895, 16.
119. **POTATO RECIPES:** Experienced Cook, "Kosher Dinners for Middle-Class Families," *Jewish Chronicle*:
   - **POTATOES AND SPROUTS** December 2 1898,
   - **POTATOES, LEEKS AND TUNEBUTS** December 16 1898,
   - **POTATO RIBBONS** May 5 1899,
   - **BAKED POTATO** June 16 1899,
   - **POTATO SALAD** June 16 1899,
   - **POTATO PUFS** October 27 1899,
   - **NEW POTATOES** May 12 1899,
   - **SAUTE POTATOES** May 12 1899,
   - **SORBO POTATOES** November 10 1899,
   - **BOILED POTATOES** December 8 1899,
   - **POTATO SNOW** February 23 1900,
   - **POTATO CHIPS** May 18 1900,
   - **BROWN POTATOES** February 9 1900,
   - **POTATO SOUP** February 9 1900.
120. Jewess, "Cookery for the Poor," *Jewish Chronicle*, May 18 1883 for quotes, 11;
    Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, "Hebrew Cookery"; Black, "Health and Medical Care of the Jewish Poor," 108.
121. **SOUP RECIPES:** Matzo ball soup "Jewish Cookery," *Jewish Chronicle*,
   - **MATZO BALL SOUP** June 27 1884, 11;
   - Experienced Cook, "Kosher Dinners for Middle-Class Families,”
   - **Jewish Chronicle:**
     - **MARROW BALL SOUP** May 13 1898,
     - **VEAL BONE SOUP WITH SIPPETS**, beef broth with **crotons** June 3 1898,
     - **SPRING SOUP** June 27 1898,
     - **ITALIAN BROTH**, beef or chicken broth with **vegetables** August 12 1898,
     - **NEW CARROT SOUP** August 19 1898,
     - **BEEFROOT SOUP** November 4 1898,
     - **TOMATO SOUP** December 2 1898,
     - **CLEAR MULLIGATAWNY SOUP WITH KLEIS**, an Anglo-Indian recipe with a chicken soup base combined with lentils, vegetables coconut milk, curry, and matzo ball dumplings December 16 1898,
     - **BEEFSTOCK SOUP**, beef soup January 13 1899,
     - **FRIAR'S CHICKEN SOUP**, meat-based soup April 28 1899,
     - **CLEAR SOUP WITH SEMOLINA BALLS**, chicken broth with diced **croquettes** May 5 1899,
     - **BRAZILIAN STEW**, beef or chicken broth with **vegetables** May 5 1899,
     - **BROWN SOURISE SOUP**, a cream based onion soup May 12 1899,
     - **JULIENNE SOUP**, vegetables cut at an angle June 16 1899,
     - **ASPARAGUS SOUP** June 16 1899,
     - **DUCHESS SOUP**, usually a meat broth with added cream, which could never be kosher unless the recipe was modified June 28 1899,
     - **SEMOLINA SOUP** July 7 1899,
     - **CUCUMBER SOUP** September 23 1899,
     - **VEGETABLE MARROW SOUP** September 29 1899,
     - **TONGUE SOUP** October 13 1899,
     - **PAYSANNE SOUP**, thinly sliced vegetables October 27 1899,
1899, **PRINCESS SOUP**, typically a meat broth with added cream. December 8 1899.

**CHESNUT SOUP** February 9, 1900, **POTATO SOUP** February 9, 1900, **RICE SOUP** February 16, 1900, **BATTER SOUP** February 23, 1900, **MOCK TURTLE SOUP**, made with brains and organ meat to simulate turtle meat. March 2, 1900, **CLEAR GRAVY SOUP WITH FRIMSEL**, beef soup with noodles. March 16, 1900, **ARTICHOKE SOUP** March 16, 1900, **CHICKEN SOUP** June 15, 1900, **GREEN PEA SOUP** August 17, 1900.

122. **SAVORY RECIPES:** An Experienced Cook, "Kosher Dinners for Middle-Class Families," Jewish Chronicle: **MACARONI AUX TOMATOES** November 4, 1898, **ROAST DUCK AND APPLESauce** November 4, 1898, **SEAKALE** May 5, 1899, **PIGEON PIE** June 30, 1899, **SALMAGUNDI SALAD** July 7, 1899, **CHEESE STRAWS** July 7, 1899, **GIBLET PIE** October 13, 1899, **BEEF OLIVES** October 27, 1899, **CURRIED CHICKEN** February 1900, **PUREE OF TURNIPS** February 9, 1900, **KROMESKIS** February 16, 1900, **MOIZA SQUFFLE** April 13, 1900, **SPAGHETTI** May 4, 1900, **CROQUETTES OF CARROTS** May 18, 1900, **MUSHROOM PATTIES** June 1, 1900, **VINEGAR TART** August 24, 1900.

123. **FRUIT RECIPES:** Experienced Cook, "Kosher Dinners for Middle-Class Families," Jewish Chronicle: **STEWED CHERRIES** May 27, 1898, **STEWED FIGS** November 4, 1898, **COMPOTE OF CHERRIES** June 16, 1899, **STRAWBERRY CUP** June 28, 1899, **STRAWBERRY FLUFF** July 7, 1899, **STEWED APRICOTS** October 27, 1899, **STEWED QUINCES** November 10, 1899.

124. **SWEET RECIPES:** BUTTER CAKES and COCONUT TARTS "Jewish Cookery," Jewish Chronicle, June 27, 1884, 11; An Experienced Cook, "Kosher Dinners for Middle-Class Families," Jewish Chronicle: **LEMON ICE GLAZE** May 27, 1898, **LEMON SOUFFLE** May 27, 1898, **SAND CAKE** May 27, 1898, **SPONGECake WITH PUMPKIN** (GERMAN) August 12, 1898, **CHERRYCAKE** (VIENNA) August 12, 1898, **ANGEL CAKE** September 9, 1898, **CARAMEL PUDDING** November 4, 1898, **DUTCH FLUMMERY** December 16, 1898, **PINEAPPLE SNOW** May 12, 1899, **WINSTAY PUDDING** May 12, 1899, **ROLLED CHERRY PUDDING** May 12, 1899, **RHUBARB MERINGUE TART** May 12, 1899, **GOOSEBERRY FOOL** June 2, 1899, **LEMON PUDDING** June 16, 1899, **FLUMMERY A LA REINE** June 16, 1899, **GOOSEBERRY TART** June 23, 1899, **STRAWBERRY MERINGUE** June 30, 1899, **CONSERVATIVE PUDDING** July 7, 1899, **OMELETTE AU RHUM** September 15, 1899, **COCONAUT [sic] TART** September 15, 1899, **SPONGE PUDDING** September 23, 1899, **WELSH CUSTARDS** October 13, 1899, **PRESERVED GINGER PUDDING** October 13, 1899, **COCONAUT [sic] CHEESE CAKE** October 27, 1899, **MACAROON TARTLETS** November 10, 1899, **PLUM PUDDING** November 24, 1899, **EGG JELLY** December 8, 1899, **CHOCOLATE ALMONDS** February 9, 1900, **PALMYRA PUDDING** February 9, 1900, **PEAR FLAN** February 16, 1900, **RED CURRANT JELLY**, flavored and sweetened gelatin February 16, 1900, **SWISS TART** February 23, 1900, **COCONAUT PUDDING** March 16, 1900, **AFRICAN PUDDING** March 23, 1900, **ALMOND PUDDING** April 13, 1900, **ROLA PUDDING** April 27, 1900, **ALMOND CHEESE-CAKES**
May 4 1900, **PARISIENNE PUDDING** June 1 1900, **GOOSEBERRY CHARLOTTE** June 15 1900, **FRILLED CHRIMSEL** June 23 1900, **LEMON PUFFS** June 23 1900, **CHERRY PUDDING** June 27 1900, **SUFFOLK PUDDING** August 17 1900, **PINEAPPLE FRITTERS** October 14 1900.
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In this chapter I investigate a variety of subjects related to the education of Jewish girls in London and Sydney in the second half of the nineteenth-century. I argue that even financially impoverished Jewish girls were not excluded from studying mathematics and sciences, but there was a growing concern over the quality of female education in religious subjects, Hebrew and in domestic matters. This contrasted the experiences of Protestant and Catholic girls who were provided with religious training but had lower literacy rates than Jewish girls, suggesting that Christian girls were not provided with encouragement to study secular subjects to the same extent.

Women who understood the *Torah* were perceived to gain some reward from God, but not to the same extent as men. This was because it was believed that women studied to satisfy their desire to learn, whereas men were obligated to study. Jewish society finds greater merit in activities that are performed without a natural inclination. Jewish girls were encouraged to study the *Torah*, but not the *Talmud*. *Torah* study was sometimes discouraged, but it was not forbidden. Texts such as the *Sefer Hasidim* suggested that women should have enough religious education to follow Jewish law, but they were not expected to study the philosophy behind the laws, because it could interfere with their domestic work and child-rearing if they were too focused on religious studies. Women were perceived to gain the greatest merit when they promoted the study of sacred texts by the males in their household. This arrangement was influenced by a belief that females did not need religious study in the same way that males did. Nineteenth-century English and Australian families were familiar with the saying: 'If the woman does not will it, there is no *Torah* study.' Females who studied were protected by the often quoted view that 'Just as it is forbidden to allow that which is prohibited, so, too, is it forbidden to forbid that which is permitted.' The *Talmud* was an expensive set of books that men most likely accessed in synagogue.
libraries. Only the wealthiest women who wanted to read the *Talmud* could have, for example, purchased a set for their male relatives to read, with the expectation that they might also read it with the consent of men in the household, or in men's absence without their knowledge. Women with this level of wealth were also the most likely to be fluent in Hebrew. This situation was considerably different than for Christian and Catholic women who were generally sanctioned to read the *New Testament*, but who were sometimes discouraged from other areas of study.

In the Middle Ages Jewish girls from Sephardic and Ashkenazic families were often provided with a "basic elementary education." The *Schulhan Aruch* advises parents that education is so important for young people that they "should not be disturbed from their studies even for the purpose of building the temple." In London and Sydney, upper-class Jewish families educated their daughters with tutors, governesses and at boarding schools. Middle-class girls typically attended day schools and occasionally met with tutors. The poorest children had opportunities to attend the 'ragged schools,' or free denominational schools. A few Jewish schools were established exclusively for female students. Once discriminatory legislature was repealed in the 1870s, Jewish students, including women, were able to compete for scholarships and earn higher education degrees.

Sephardic scholar Moses Maimonides (1138-1204) promoted the value of female education and saw women as a source of men's 'honour.' He felt it was wrong to deny females access to educational opportunities. In a letter to his sons, he encouraged them to educate their wives, with the added warning not to allow their wives to dominate them. His comment reflected the idea that 'knowledge is power' and suggests that Jewish men and women wanted to form relationships where knowledge and power were exchanged. This contrasts somewhat with nineteenth-century values in English-speaking Protestant countries, which promoted the idea that women who were well-educated or interested in political matters had deviated from their family role and had "unsexed" themselves, which amounted to going against their biological 'nature.' This attitude dissipated
toward the end of the century and in 1879, one English-Jewish woman explained that she thought the appropriate person to decide “what is fit for a woman’s brain” was the “owner of the brain herself.” Her opinion was that the “Freedom of choice, surely, should be irrespective of sex.” Her attitude reflects the changing beliefs about the innate gender roles of men and women, which were adjusted as employment patterns were altered by industrialization and were complicated by colonial expansion into countries where gender norms varied from this model. People began to argue that characteristics that had seemed innate to women, such as cooking and sewing, needed to be taught to girls or else they would not excel at these activities. It became increasingly problematic for men to exclude women from religious study.

Female education within British and Jewish society was expected to be applied most often in the home where females influenced younger children and domestic servants. Periodicals such as the *Imperial Colonist* promoted the idea that ‘colonial motherhood’ should be the mission of educated women. In 1855, middle-class Jewish women from London were accused of being too interested in the “frivolities of life” and communal leaders wanted young women to redirect their attention back to their domestic responsibilities by promoting education that would be valued in the home. Anglo-Jewish authoress Maria Polack argued in her novels that women would be less ‘frivolous’ if they were given the sanction to study religious texts in greater depth. Baroness Charles de Rothschild of London responded to complaints such as this through her classes at the Jews’ Free School in Spitalfields in Bell Lane. She published a book for the girls at the school, which provided them with domestic wisdom and encouraged them to resist the temptations of materialism and to instead favor a life based on piety within the home. Grace Aguilar, an English-Jewess, indicated in the 1840s, an opinion that was still in favor with Sydney suffragist Rose Scott in 1895. Aguilar encouraged parents to provide their children with an education that would develop their intellects and enlighten their hearts and spirits. Jewish men in England and Australia indicated that they wanted their wives to act as
comforters and counselors as well as being a "faithful friend." They were seeking a "partner in life," and a "helpmate." When wives acted like a "plaything," rather than a "supporter," men resented that they had married a "dressed-up doll." In 1873, one Jewish man explained that there was little objection if women wanted to study "conic sections," "differential calculus," "logarithms" or even the "stiffest doctrines of political economy," as long as they remained kind to men and children, and didn't abandon their housekeeping routines. Men wanted women to be "pure toned leaders of society." Men feared that as 'advanced ladies' women were losing their ability to love men and even wanted to "to be feared" by them as rivals instead of being "help-mates." This observer affirmed that other men he knew did not want women to be "ignorant or silly" and found it undesirable to "have for a wife a mere brainless doll." He observed that men did not want a "learned mummy, whose heart has become atrophied in favour of her head," after abandoning the "sweetest characteristics of her womanhood in the classroom." These complaints continued circulating in 1897, when a Jewish man from Sydney explained that he was aware of the "wonderful New Woman," but was wary of the "more doubtful Rebellious Daughters." This was because they invested their time shopping and "gadding about," and were "flippant, loud and too self-confident." Although Polack and de Rothschild argued that women would be less frivolous and materialistic if they studied, these characteristics instead became associated with studious women, and educators were faulted for "packing brains with every crumb of knowledge," which did not leave enough time for "those gentle graces which make a girl so lovable and so popular." While Jewish men in London and Sydney valued women's intellectual goals, they did not want to associate with women who were antagonistic toward them. Men were not ready to take over women's domestic responsibilities so that they could fully engage in the workplace or other public and intellectual activities to the extent that women clearly desired. However, Jewish women rarely made open arguments indicating that they wanted to be freed from their domestic role in the home, and they
also made few complaints about their inability to attain their educational goals. This was likely because Jewish men also experienced *de facto* and legal discrimination as they sought higher education degrees in non-Jewish schools throughout most of the century. However, the absence of written complaints in the newspapers may not accurately reflect the private conversations that occurred between women as they beat the dust out of their rugs or stood in their kitchens preparing dinners for their families.

Missionaries were sometimes called philo-Semites because they proffered “persuasive carrots rather than coercive sticks”\(^{36}\) when they sought Jewish converts. The urgency of opening Free Schools for Jewish students hinged upon the way missionaries were trying to “seduce”\(^{37}\) young girls who were poorly educated in religious matters as they sought to “draw over whole families to their side.”\(^{38}\) It was common that Jewish children attended Christian or Catholic schools that were nearby or were more affordable and prestigious than Jewish schools. Non-Jewish schools sometimes provided Jewish students with food, shelter, clothing or boots, the absence of which could cause health problems and contribute to poor performance at school. Conversionists were not always successful at drawing Jewish students with these enticements since Jewish migrants were known to reject charity from schools even when they were starving.\(^{39}\) Some Jewish parents were motivated to send their children to Christian schools because they felt it would promote greater religious tolerance if Jews and Christians were educated together.\(^{40}\) However, teachers at non-Jewish schools were typically unaware of Jewish religious practices and values, or else openly devalued them, and their routines rewarded students who imbibed Protestant or Catholic doctrines. It was widely understood that parents who sent their children to non-Jewish schools without providing them with a strong Jewish education risked that they would be inculcated with beliefs that contradicted their own. This contributed to inter-generational conflict in Jewish homes.\(^{41}\)

Even in the last decade of the century students at the London University were still disadvantaged by the expectation that they would attend lectures and take exams on Saturdays,\(^{42}\) and Jewish students
were typically unable to reschedule exams on these days. Marie Asher of Brunswick Square was a candidate for a scholarship at the London Academy of Music in the 1870s, but her parents would not permit her to compete in a required event that was held on a Saturday and she lost her ability to receive their scholarship. Miss Emrick, another Jewish student at the academy also had to make a decision between promoting her academic achievement and observing her religion. In the 1870s, England's Elementary Education Act made it so that children were not expected to attend school on days when their parents observed religious holidays. Jewish students were perceived to have a greater inclination toward intermarriage when they attended Christian schools, and some students did eventually convert. As an outcome of the educational offerings at London's St. Thomas Charterhouse School, for example, they boasted that between 1846 and 1851, they increased the number of baptisms from seventy-six to 3,400. It was rare that non-Jewish students attended Jewish schools in London and Sydney and their academic performance was unhindered by their observance of the Christian Sabbath since Jewish schools were required by law to close on Sundays. As Jewish schools gained prominence, were affordable and within close walking distance, Jewish leaders requested that parents resist the temptation to send their children to non-Jewish schools.

As women's increased engagement in the workplace shifted the responsibility for educating children onto the public school system, Grace Aguilar provided support for women to sustain their place as educators in the home by quoting from Jewish sacred literature. She warned men to avoid marrying women with uneducated fathers, because if they died prematurely their wives would have less ability to tutor their children in secular and religious subjects. In a letter to the Sydney Jewish Board of Education, Mrs. R. Lee bluntly refused to "give one penny to any Jewish fund in this city" because she resented their "interference" and wanted her children to know that she was capable of teaching them herself. While some women appreciated that public schools provided them with time when they were not expected to supervise and teach their children, other women
resented that their traditional role as educators was displaced by classroom instruction.

Traditional Jewish attitudes mandated that Jewish males and females should be chaperoned when they studied together, or when mothers communicated with male teachers over school related matters. Gender segregation within educational settings continued to be valued in the last decades of the century in London, when all-girl schools were formed, but it wasn't the norm for most Jewish schools. In 1896, the Jews' Free School in Bell Lane consisted of about 3,500 students and about twenty percent of the students at this coeducational school had English-born parents. The school was founded in 1817 and was so famous, and well-regarded in Europe that recent migrants were known to enroll their children in the school within hours of their arrival in the city. Many of the children spoke no English on their first day of classes and were so poor that they were given free meals and clothing. The female teachers were invested in the success of the school because many of them were former students. Students were devoted to their studies and roughly ninety-five percent of them attended regularly. There were as many as one-hundred teachers at the school and they were almost exclusively Jewish, which provided many women with opportunities to teach girls without compromising their observance of the Sabbath.54

In London, Jewish day schools provided girls with classes in Geology, Biology, Chemistry, Geometry, Arithmetic, Geography, History, Arts, Biblical Studies, Hebrew and European languages. Girls, and some boys, also took classes in Music, Singing, Dancing, Drama and Domestic Arts, such as Cooking and Sewing. In 1871, Sydney's Rabbi Alexander Davis explained that “Hebrews were never opposed to the study of science, nor did they fear to place it side by side with religion” and he drew connections between scientific observations and the maintenance of kosher practices,55 which supported girls’ access to science classes since they were expected to prepare kosher meals. In 1882, it was reported that girls at the Jewish Middle School passed their exams in “geometry and mathematics with good result,”56 and this praise was not
overshadowed by dismissive remarks related to their outstanding sewing or baking skills. The academic success of female students was reported in Jewish newspapers, particularly when they passed examinations at Oxford, Cambridge, Trinity College, the Australian Musical Association and the University of Sydney's College of Music. Although Jewish girls received a secular education that was nearly comparable with Jewish males, it can be argued that boys did not receive the same training as girls since they were less likely to attend classes in Art, Drama, Singing, Cooking and Needlework. The skills taught in these classes were vital for individuals living in rural Australia since they often needed to cook with limited resources, had to repair their gear, and if they could sing or act it enhanced opportunities for socializing. People who lived in isolated areas also valued being able to draw or paint, especially images of Australian plants and wildlife. In 1899, Miss Levy, was sufficiently educated to become the principal of a boarding school in Sydney's neighborhood of Darlinghurst, on Roslyn Street.57 The education provided to girls and university-age women was not significantly unequal or different than for Jewish males who attended similar schools. However, girls received less study in religious subjects and boys were disadvantaged through unequal access to the arts and other domestic skills.

Jewish children in London and Sydney had higher literacy rates than students from numerically-dominant religious groups. Demographer Charles Price's research on Australian census data for students aged five to fifteen indicates that for the years between 1881 and 1901, between seventy-seven to eighty-one percent of Jewish students could read and write in English. For these years, literacy rates for Methodist and Presbyterian students in this age group were estimated to be between sixty-eight and seventy-eight percent. The majority of Australian students were Protestant or Catholic and in these years only sixty-five to seventy-six percent of them were considered literate in English.58 Religious minorities were better able to complete in the job market and their social standing was elevated when they maintained high literacy rates.
Jewish boarding schools provided female students and teachers with learning environments where they were not likely to be stigmatized for their religious beliefs or their gender. As early as 1834, Jewish parents in Sydney, who could afford sixty pounds in annual tuition, could send their children to the De Metz family's boarding school. The benefits of boarding schools were explained by a Jewish mother from London in 1895. She indicated that studying at home provided her two daughters with too many "little distractions." In order to pass rigorous government examinations she believed they were better prepared at a boarding school where they benefitted from the "discipline and hard work of a large school." She disapproved of the way wealthy girls were sent to "foreign" schools, such as those in France, but conceded that a small number of girls who were expected to earn their own living after graduation would benefit from them.

Correspondent K. E. H. indicated that her education at West Brighton College, a Jewish boarding school, constituted the "happiest years of my life," particularly in comparison to the five years she spent at a Protestant day school. Her Jewish school provided nurturing elders and a feeling of 'home' compared with the Protestant school, where the discipline of her female teachers was too severe.

In Sydney, students were often tutored at home by rabbis, including Rabbi Solomon Phillips of the Macquarie Street Synagogue. Rabbi I. Bramson's advertisement in 1898 indicated that he was seeking "pupils" in Sydney and was willing to teach beginners as well as students interested in the most complicated aspects of the Talmud. While his notice was not unusual and his advertisement used gender-neutral language, girls and their parents probably understood that his students were expected to be males since girls would not have been instructed in Talmud, except by a close family member with the knowledge that it was breaking with tradition. Jewish newspapers in Sydney and London were written with a female readership in mind and it can be assumed that a number of girls and women read, and were tempted by, advertisements for private tutors of religious subjects, such as the Talmud, and this may have motivated them to be tutored in Hebrew, or have it taught to their children.
Nineteenth-century women were often disadvantaged in the field of teaching because they struggled to attain the same level of Hebrew fluency as men. Without mastering the Talmud, women could not be considered for the role of rabbi, and they were often excluded from teaching positions that required a knowledge of this text as well as others, including the Mishna, which were typically written in Hebrew. Women needed fluency in Hebrew, the traditional language of prayer within the synagogue, to be perceived as men's equals. In 1819, Floretta Cohen (formerly Keyeser), an upper class woman, was one of the earliest paid tutors of Hebrew in London. Early in the 1840s, many British-Jews, particularly women, struggled to read Hebrew and Yiddish and this contributed to religious apathy because people did not understand the meaning of their prayers. At this time Sephardic Jews were also less-fluent in Spanish, or Portuguese, which was similarly detrimental. Girls were often unable to learn Hebrew due to parental resistance or because Hebrew classes were unavailable at their Christian schools. Feminist theologian Rachel Adler asserts that Hebrew mastery has the power to "mitigate alienation," and when people are fluent enough to understand the nuances of their prayers, it promotes group cohesion and bridges differences in perspective between Orthodox-Jews and followers of the Reform movement. When nineteenth-century females had a strong knowledge of Hebrew, they could potentially become experts in religious law, and in turn could write sermons or prayers that addressed women's distinctive spiritual needs related to pregnancy and childbirth.

Jewish community leaders expected that making English translations of prayer books available, and by teaching Hebrew to students irrespective of gender or their levels of wealth would eventually resolve their concerns about religious apathy within their congregations. In the 1840s and 1850s, Grace Aguilar's writing invigorated Jewish learning and literary culture, firstly through her requests for affordable Jewish translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into English, and secondly, by sanctioning the use of Christian translations until that goal was accomplished. Aguilar was a pioneer because she wrote in English, rather than in Hebrew or...
Yiddish, which widened her audience to Jewish and Christian women who were not fluent in these languages. Her books presented images of Jewish women that were empowered and respectable role models, and she explained Judaism in a moderate way that the average person, regardless of their religious background, could understand and appreciate. Her books were particularly important for mothers and daughters who studied from home. Her book *Sabbath Thoughts* (1853) was the first collection of sermons to be published by a Jewish woman in English, and were intended for use by women and children. She recommended that women should introduce family prayer at a young age to create a firm connection between parents and prayers. She understood that children mimicked adults and believed that if they developed a long-standing habit of taking comfort in prayer, they would be well-prepared to confront the sorrows that life invariably entailed. Similar to non-Jewish women writers, she justified her theological texts, by insisting that “our youth indeed need help and guidance, or they are likely to be lost in the fearful vortex of contending opinions around them.” She justified this by pointing to the strong affinity that existed between Christians and Jews since “Christianity in all, save its actual doctrine of belief, is the offspring of Judaism.” Jews and Christians were increasingly motivated to understand the similarities they shared and her arguments justified cooperative inter-faith socializing, which enhanced women’s educational opportunities since Christian women were often well-versed in the scriptures and were motivated to share their knowledge, sometimes with the expectation that it could promote Jewish women to convert. Aguilar also pointed out the obvious, which was that it was a “mistaken notion to accept any religion without examination.” This was a moderate stance and she warned that too much religious “enthusiasm” could be just as “dangerous” as ignorance.

In 1852, several years after Aguilar’s death, it was more common that prayers pertaining to women were translated into English, such as *Devotions for the Daughters of Israel*. However, in 1885 there were still no affordable Jewish *Bibles* and Protestant translations were preferred because they drew out the “beautiful poetry” in the text,
when compared to Jewish translations that were written in "very bad English." Among Jews who could compare translations, there was a sense that Protestant translations were "extremely partial" and were "often at war with the obvious grammatical sense of the verse and of the context." Another perceived problem was that the Protestant translations were considered "unfair and perverted" due to the "objectionable and totally unwarrantable headings to chapters," which could "perplex readers of tender years, and fill their minds with misgivings and doubts." In 1888, L. Schapp's Revised Bible was affordable and was considered the "least objectionable" of the Christian translations into English. By 1896, Michael Levi Rodkinson's (1845-1904) famous English translation of the Talmud was revitalized by Cincinnati's Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise (1819-1900) of the Hebrew Union College. Many English-Jews were fluent in another European language, such as German or French, and were able to read sacred texts that were translated from Hebrew into that language, or from that language into English. Wealthy families were the most likely to have access to expensive English translations of prayers and sacred literature.

Adults found it difficult to become fluent in Hebrew because it was not spoken in conversation, and some considered it a "dead" language. Hebrew texts were not always written with the vowel points, which was difficult for beginning students who could not easily guess which vowel belonged in the word. Some of the flexibility of Jewish law stems from substitutions of vowels, making study of this language especially complicated. The language is written from right to left, the reverse of English, and a number of the characters are similar in shape to each other, making it difficult for beginning students to distinguish them. European-Jewish women living in England and Australia often learned to speak Yiddish from their parents as children, but not all of them could read texts printed in Yiddish because this language is written in Hebrew script.

Hebrew study for women and girls was more accessible after bilingual prayer books became available. These books had Hebrew or Yiddish on one side of the page and the English translation was either
on the opposite side or just beneath the Hebrew, which provided feedback for a person who was studying one of the two languages. There are several examples of this style of translation that were owned by Jewish women in Australia prior to the turn of the century, including *Interlineary Tephilloth*, which was owned by Jane Hendricks.90 The small lesson booklet used by Deborah Phillips for her Hebrew translation exercises was published in 1885 and was one of several in use in Sydney classrooms.91 Girls had a strong aptitude for learning Hebrew and Rabbi H. Hoelzel was impressed by the female students at the National school in London, but their Hebrew education was considered "satisfactory," rather than outstanding as a result of poor attendance by students, who were probably from the poorest families, as well as because of the short time Hebrew classes had been available.92 In 1869, these difficulties persisted because private lessons were expensive, and competent tutors were difficult to hire.93 By 1880, London's Jewish girls were advancing in their Hebrew study, and occasionally received better marks than the male students because the "patience which is characteristic of girls"94 was "valuable in helping them to master"95 the complications of the language. It was also thought that girls had more time to devote to language study, when compared with older women who were too occupied by domestic responsibilities.96

Louis Pulver, the headmaster of the Sydney Hebrew Certified Denominational School, wanted to improve student's Hebrew literacy, especially by his female students. Prior to his arrival in Sydney in 1885, he taught for six years at the East Melbourne Hebrew School. As was common of male Hebrew school teachers, he was also qualified to perform the duties of the *chazzan* in the synagogue. His father was Rabbi Isaac Pulver and his mother was Rosetta Hadkins. Louis Pulver had not married, but lived with his unmarried sister Miranda. He was among the early and influential Jewish residents in the neighborhood of Waverly at Bondi Junction. He developed kidney disease after riding his imported English Rudge tricycle, on a journey spanning the 430 miles between Sydney and Melbourne. His sister helped to care for him until he died on November 4 1897, at the age of forty-two, not
long after completing his journey. His peers praised the way he carefully studied the "child-nature" of his students, which helped him to earn their "respect" and "affection" as well as their regular attendance and high academic achievement at the school. With a few exceptions, he maintained discipline in the classroom without resorting to the common practice of corporal punishment or even "frowns and harshness." Pulver hand-wrote a booklet titled *Elementary Exercises in Hebrew Grammar for the use in the Hebrew School and for Home Practice*, which outlined the Hebrew alphabet and provided beginners with grammar exercises. The text was written in a clear manner that made the material easy for a beginner to grasp. He also authored *First Bible Stories for Little People*, which was still in publication in the 1930s.

In 1885, A. P. Phillips of Sydney reported that parents were unable to tutor their children in Hebrew because in any congregation there were only a few who were fluent in it. He noticed that the younger generation were interested in learning Hebrew and did not think the language would be entirely lost in the next few generations. This was partly due to the dedication of the teaching staff at the Jewish schools in Sydney. Pulver's dedication to quality teaching prompted him to make numerous complaints in 1887 because the teaching staff at the school could not cope with the number of students they were expected to teach on Sundays. The Crown Street School had sixty-five children who were taught the Hebrew alphabet for roughly two hours per week. Most of the students were so young that they were considered "mere babies." In comparison, the public schools limited their English alphabet-classes to roughly forty students per class and students received up to fifteen hours each week for practice. Since this alphabet was in their native tongue and Hebrew was generally a language his students were unfamiliar with, Pulver stressed the difficulty his teachers faced with such limited time and overcrowded classes. Part of his justification for more teachers and classroom time hinged upon statistics he gathered from other Hebrew schools. Three Jewish schools in Victoria and Adelaide reported that their largest Hebrew class had fifteen students and they generally provided more
than two hours of instruction per week. Ped Pulver's teaching load did not decrease and he reported that there were three teachers for almost four-hundred children. He did not think there was another Jewish school in all of the "British dominions" that was so understaffed. He regularly requested additional teachers and additional funds to cover basic teaching supplies.

The education of girls was often shortened or interrupted as a result of domestic responsibilities and some families did not think educating their daughters was a high priority since they were unlikely to apply what they learned in the workplace. In the 1850s, the Jews' Free School in Bell Lane and the Jews' School in Manchester both urged parents not to keep children away from school because they needed help around the house, such as to care for elderly relatives or because the "wailings of an infant brother or sister must be lulled." In 1876, Kate Emanuel, a widow living in Sydney who was in poor health, kept her daughter Leah out of school because she needed assistance at home. Although girls were usually the ones who remained away from school as care-givers, boys were also kept out of school to earn additional income, particularly in families that subsisted from repetitive tasks performed at home that were paid by the individual piece completed. In 1871, working mothers wanted to form child-care facilities so their eldest daughters did not have to remain at home to care for their younger siblings. Rabbi Ellis Davidson of London raised awareness of the need for additional public schools for middle-class girls, so that they did not have to walk long distances in bad weather, or take the railway as was common for boys, which was also cited as a reason that girls were not sent to school regularly. In 1887, Lewis Lipman of Sydney explained that he discontinued his daughter's education in the Jewish school on the grounds that he did not want them to use the trams every day. Pulver expressed irritation that parents were careless about observing signs of the measles, and outbreaks of other childhood illnesses, such as whooping cough, which contributed to wide-spread absenteeism.

In 1897, Louis Pulver sent a questionnaire to 120 parents about why they no longer sent their children to the Hebrew classes. Forty-
two parents gave no reply and may have moved out of the area, but fifteen families explained that the distance from the school was too great. Six parents kept their children at home for their labor and another five wanted their children to focus on their secular studies. A few parents felt that their children were “too old” to continue their studies, although Pulver indicated that these students were not yet in the advanced classes. Only a few parents complained that they did not place much faith in the staff’s teaching ability, which likely resulted from issues related to overcrowding in the classrooms. Pulver explained to J. Lyons that his two daughters were not able to make progress in their Hebrew studies because they only attended once a week, which he felt was “worse than useless.” He requested that the girls be sent for two additional afternoons by telling their father that in “the case of your own little daughters,” it was evident that “notwithstanding their long period of attendance and good behavior no progress” had been made. He hoped that their attendance at these extra classes would provide them with a “chance of making such progress.” Mr. Rabinowitz was either unrealistic in his belief that his daughters could “learn all they required” from Pulver “in a few lessons,” or perhaps this was a polite way of saying he did not think Hebrew was an appropriate subject for females to study. In contrast, Minnie Kaufman’s parents paid for her to have a private Hebrew tutor. Pulver was disappointed by the apathy of parents who believed the schools provided an adequate level of instruction and did not assist their children by studying with them at home. After receiving feedback from parents, he attempted to increase the amount of time students had for their Hebrew studies during the week.

Absenteeism from Jewish classrooms was typically linked to the inability of parents to pay the tuition costs, rather than that children were rebellious and disinclined to attend, and it is clear that education was valued within families in Sydney. Parents of children who attended these classes were from all social classes, but many parents worked in low-paid occupations and were unable to afford tuition costs. Students were not necessarily turned away when parents could not afford the fees. In spite of that, some parents voluntarily
withdrew their children from school if they needed the money to pay for other necessities.¹²³ For example, it was important for families to pay for life insurance for the male head-of-household since widows had few work skills and found it difficult to acquire legitimate types of employment if their husband died at a young age.¹²⁴ During the Jewish holidays, M. A. Cohen of Sydney reported that parents were inclined to keep their children home for the whole week even if the holiday only accounted for one or two of the days, because they could not spare the cost of the fees for a whole week if they did not receive a full week of lessons.¹²⁵ Louis Pulver thought the cost for multiple children in a family was more economical for parents and influenced them to keep their eldest child out of school until their second child was also attending classes. He was concerned that this reduced the school’s ability to educate children while they were still “very young,” and easily influenced.¹²⁶ In 1890, fifty-three of the 134 students that lived in the areas around Surry Hills or Albion Estate were unable to afford their school fees. Fathers who worked as commercial travelers, clothiers, drapers, or as pawnbrokers regularly paid their children’s school costs, as did more than half of the parents who worked as confectioners, butchers, watchmakers, jewelers, grocers, and importers of boots. It was the tailors, boot and shoe makers, tobacconists, carriage drivers, auctioneers, accountants, general dealers, news agents, commission agents, saddlers and hawkers who had the greatest difficulty paying tuition.¹²¹ The head mistress at Sydney’s Crown Street school promoted student attendance by making her Hebrew classes mandatory, which meant the school was “not in a position to refuse a child” for non-payment of fees.¹²⁸ This reflected the influence of Enlightenment thinking in England and was consistent with the desire to practice egalitarianism in Australia.¹²⁹ The school’s budget was based on the idea that if forty of the sixty pupils paid tuition then the remaining twenty might be funded through subscriptions provided by wealthier members of the community or from fund-raising events.¹³⁰ In Sydney, when tuition fees for Jewish students were overdue, it was their mothers who sent letters of apology. Their stories indicate that the economic
disadvantages they faced related directly to having large families, poor wages, or the absence of a male income earner in the household. Mrs. Ellis had a large family and could not afford the fees. Mrs. Kensell had an absent husband who did not provide her with an income, which meant that she could not spend any money on books for her children. Sarah Myers' husband left her with six children and her income was insufficient to pay for the State School fees as well as the fees for the Jewish school. Mrs. Cassell was grateful for the "kind manner" in which her daughter was treated and wanted her daughter to continue attending classes even if she could not pay the fees. Mrs. Blumenthal could not provide her three daughters with a Hebrew education because the tram fares were too expensive. It was also difficult for the poorest Jewish children to attend free schools when they lacked proper clothing and shoes.

In addition to difficulties linked to having overcrowded classrooms and students who attended irregularly, teachers and students in Sydney's Jewish classrooms had to be flexible and adaptable due to inadequate resources. Teachers struggled to find suitable teaching aids, such as Hebrew alphabet cards and Bibles. In May of 1886, Phoebe Goldsmid reported that she "wasted half of the time" allotted for her class in trying to find a suitable location for it. On various days she was "obliged" to teach students "in an open veranda, lavatory, or other place equally unsuitable." At the end of August, she was cancelling classes because there was no classroom. Pulver supported her by writing several letters so that her class could continue in a suitable location. In February of 1887, they moved the Hebrew classes away from the Fort Street School and William Street School buildings and gave lessons in the Great Synagogue buildings instead. The teachers noticed an immediate improvement in the "quality" of their students' achievement once they were in the new location. Attendance also increased, which meant that they generated more income to purchase the supplies that they lacked. Only a few parents, including Lewis Lipman, objected to having their children attend Hebrew classes away from their usual school. In 1889, teachers had severe problems with "escapes of sewage gas in close
proximity to the school rooms," which necessitated sending children home until half of a pound of chloride of lime remedied the problem.\textsuperscript{140} In 1890, the school building was under construction, and the teachers were again excluded from classrooms, because the area was full of smoke and noise. Pulver reported that the area was too "dangerous" for the children to be around.\textsuperscript{141} As a result of being under-resourced, the Jewish classes in Sydney were in a state of constant disruption, however, student literacy rates were higher than Protestant and Catholic students, who likely had well-resourced and commodious classrooms with fewer students per teacher.

Women who taught at the Hebrew School were professional and successful and they expected to be paid a competitive salary. When they resigned from their positions, they reported that they were moving away from the area, were about to be married, or received a lucrative or prestigious job offer. For example, Zara Baar, was a teacher at the Sydney Jewish Sabbath School in 1879. After she married Frederick B. Aronson, she left the position and later became the author of "Thalia's column" in the \textit{Australasian Hebrew} and was also published in the \textit{Sydney Mail}.\textsuperscript{142} In 1887, Mrs. Phoebe Goldsmid, a Hebrew teacher at the Crown Street School, indicated that her salary was "very inadequate" given the amount of work she provided to the school. She pointed to the improved performance of her students and asked for a raise, but she resigned from the position a few months later in order to become a private teacher where her work-load was less demanding.\textsuperscript{143} Celia Esther Harris was a student of the Jewish school prior to teaching in their classrooms. In 1898, she left the school to work as her brother's bookkeeper at a salary of fifty-two pounds per year.\textsuperscript{144} In 1890, Pulver agreed with other female teachers that his salary needed to be increased in order to keep up with the rising cost of living, which demonstrates that men and women were equally under-compensated for the work they provided.\textsuperscript{145}

Mothers and educators often came into conflict with each other when children were punished for disciplinary problems at school.\textsuperscript{146} In spite of Pulver’s mild nature and benevolent attitude toward children, there was one major complaint by a parent suggesting that
his style of punishment was too severe. In February of 1888, Ben Myers wrote to the school’s board to report that Pulver was “too vindictive,”147 “cruel and arbitrary.”148 This accusation followed an incident where Pulver had flogged and then expelled Myers’ son, who was in the habit of arriving to school without shoes, had poor hygiene and had run away from home. Myers felt that Pulver held a prejudice against poor children and was “pandering to the wealthy”149 children.150 He admitted that his son was “full of life and play,”151 and was no “angel,”152 but did not think his son’s actions warranted the punishment he was given and he withdrew all of his children from the school.153 Pulver had assisted the Myers family by providing them with shoes and assured the board that he acted without “animosity or vindictiveness.”154 Myers’ son often arrived early for school and was kept inside the classroom because he disobeyed Pulver’s authority during the lessons and Pulver thought his “behaviour would have a pernicious influence”155 on the other children playing in the yard. He told the board that he regretted that he had not taken measures earlier. Pulver was supported by Rabbi Wolinski who shared his assessment of the situation.156 In 1900, Daniel Asher’s mother Clara threatened to turn M. A. Cohen in to the Water Police Court if he ever caned her son again. She considered his punishment “inhuman and cowardly.”157 The incident resulted because, like many parents, she had kept Daniel at home for a day. When he returned to class without a note explaining his absence, he explained the circumstances to Cohen, who viewed his answer as a form of insubordination. Clara sent a follow-up note, which was considered “rude,”158 and Daniel was expelled from the school. This prompted additional complaints by her that Cohen’s actions were unduly harsh. It was an accepted practice for children to be punished by having their hands hit with a cane when teachers felt students needed ‘correction’ at non-Jewish schools, including highly esteemed schools such as Sydney Grammar.159 Because Daniel appreciated the classes, Clara attempted to repair the relationship by signing her letter with the phrase, “one of your poor and damaged flock.”160 Cohen had been teaching for fourteen years and defended his practice of slapping children on the hands after
repeatedly admonishing them for poor attendance, indicating that this was not an isolated incident. There were also a few instances when parents agreed with the punishment their children received at school. Barnard Blumenthal's mother wrote a letter of apology after her son misbehaved. After George Gershon Harris was punished for being truant, his foster parents confided that he was a "born thief" and they were "compelled to be done with him" because of his bad behavior. Incidents of conflict between students and teachers generated the most written contact between teachers and parents in Sydney's Jewish classrooms. However, most of the students achieved satisfactory marks on their tests and were praised for their progress, regular attendance and good behavior.

Students who excelled at their studies were rewarded for their attendance and academic success with public recognition in the newspaper, with prizes, and with teaching positions after graduation. In London, the West Metropolitan Jewish School had a unique system of positive reinforcement, whereby students were given colored tickets based on their behavior each day. Red tickets were given for good conduct, blue ones were for students with minor problems, and black tickets were given to individuals who misbehaved. A student that was given a black mark also had their existing good tickets reduced by two. In Sydney, Mrs. Lewis Woolf Levy often provided the funds to pay for the awards given to Sydney's Jewish students. After 1865, the Baroness Lionel de Rothschild of London gave the Sydney Jewish schools five pounds for annual prizes for the one boy and one girl at the school. Mary Bertha Saddling won an annual prize in 1871 and later became a prominent fund-raiser in the Jewish community, after she married Louis R. Wilson, a respectable and wealthy laundry owner. Julia Marks also won an annual prize and remained as a teacher at the school for the eight years following her graduation. The school lamented that only one of their male students who won their prize subsequently became a teacher at the school. In London, Claude Montefiore (1858-1938), an active supporter of the Reform movement, memorialized his deceased wife Therese Schorstein (1864-1889) with a prize at Cambridge's Girton College where she had
graduated with distinctions in the area of moral science.\textsuperscript{169} Financial incentives for young students were often provided by older women who had been successful in school, or by their widowers.

Louis Pulver carefully recorded the attendance rates of boys and girls at the Sydney Certified Denominational Schools. The gender ratios at the Crown Street School,\textsuperscript{170} William Street School\textsuperscript{171} and Waverly School\textsuperscript{172} averaged to be about equal. At the Darlinghurst Street School ratios were also about equal, until 1899 when the attendance of girls waned noticably.\textsuperscript{173} In 1896, attendance rates for the Castlereagh and Crown Street Schools were combined and the average attendance for boys and girls was equal with 114 boys and 115 girls.\textsuperscript{174} The Castlereagh Street School,\textsuperscript{175} the “Sunday School” classes\textsuperscript{176} and the “Hebrew School” classes\textsuperscript{177} often consisted of fifteen to twenty more boys than girls, although the ratio was occasionally more equal. Pulver also recorded attendance data for children attending schools in areas where there were fewer Jewish families. These schools included the Cleveland Street School,\textsuperscript{178} Surrey Hills South School,\textsuperscript{179} Fort Street School,\textsuperscript{180} Paddington Public School,\textsuperscript{181} Newton North School,\textsuperscript{182} Macquarie Street School,\textsuperscript{183} Woolahra School,\textsuperscript{184} Plunkett Street School,\textsuperscript{185} Korgarah School,\textsuperscript{186} Waterloo School\textsuperscript{187} and Ultimo School.\textsuperscript{188} The uneven gender ratios at these schools likely reflects that within the few Jewish families living near the school, the gender ratio was uneven, such as a family with two daughters and four sons that all attended the school regularly, rather than reflecting that the attendance of daughters was discouraged.

The Sydney Jewish Sabbath School was formed initially for girls and their longer period of attendance meant that they made greater improvement in their classes than the boys in 1864.\textsuperscript{189} The school began with six female and five male teachers.\textsuperscript{190} Mrs. Benjamin Francis served as a lady director at the school between 1865 and 1875.\textsuperscript{191} Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis’ wife, Blanche Annie Harris (d. 1892), was a Hebrew School officer for those years.\textsuperscript{192} Female attendance declined along with the number of female teachers later in the century, but extant historical records do not indicate why this was the case. There were no suggestions in the board’s correspondence
that women’s role within their classrooms was unwelcome or unappreciated. Boys were introduced into the classes and the educational focus may have shifted toward preparing them for their Bar Mitzvah, and since girls did not require similar preparation they may have attended less frequently. In 1893, Davis, Pulver and Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau, formed a religious class on Sunday for the children of the Sydney Great Synagogue congregation. In 1895 and 1896, they were pleased to report that these afternoon Sabbath classes had as many as 130 children in attendance. They initiated these classes in order to increase the religious “obligations” of “both sexes” since they were concerned that religious apathy was too prevalent. Male Jewish communal leaders continued to value the presence of girls in their classes, in spite of a decline in their attendance in some classrooms.

Doris (Dora) Janetta Barnett, was a successful Jewish student in Sydney, who had a strong religious education and was well-integrated into non-Jewish society. She was born in Sydney in 1884 and was the only daughter of Connie and Leopold Barnett. They lived on Macleay Street and later on Darlinghurst Road, areas where many of their neighbors were Jewish. They attended the Great Synagogue when Doris was growing up. Dora and Connie had worked together within at least one Jewish fund-raising group by selling hand-made goods for the benefit of a children’s hospital in Glebe and an Infants’ Home in Ashfield. Connie died in 1897, when Dora was thirteen. The following year Dora passed the Junior Public Examinations at Sydney University, receiving a B and four C’s. After matriculating the next year, she transferred to the Church of England Girls’ Grammar School, where she was awarded the honorary status of dux of school. Although she was exposed to new religious influences, she continued to attend and win prizes at the Great Synagogue’s Sabbath School. In 1898, she and Violet Alexander presented Rabbi Landau with a token of gratitude on behalf of their class. When she was sixteen, Rabbi Landau read her essay titled Sanitary and Dietary Laws of Judaism, to their class. She continued to work toward philanthropic causes within Jewish groups and she played two piano solos at a fund-raising
event for the Prince Alfred Hospital's Amusement Association. As a student of Sydney Moss, the choir-master of the Great Synagogue, she performed at a recital held at the Young Men's Christian Association Hall. Her performance included classical piano selections by Romantic composers, including Schumann's *Forest Scenes*, a piece by Charles Camille Saint-Saens, and Jewish composer Mendelssohn's *Variations Serienses*. Her performance was described by the *Jewish Herald* as "uniformly excellent, being marked as much by refinement of style as brilliancy of execution." Barnett had a strong Jewish education and her attendance at a Christian school did not diminish her attachment to Judaism or to Jewish society, just as Grace Aguilar predicted would be the case if Jewish girls were provided with a religious education.

Young women and adults who were past school age often continued their secular and religious education by reading newspapers and books from the library. The Jewish community's elders in Sydney observed that, "Not even the Sabbath" was "powerful enough to arrest" students' "insatiable desire for sensational novels." The Jewish Library of Sydney began in 1846, and was modeled after London's Sussex Hall and the Jews' General Literary Institution. The *Jewish Chronicle* in London and the *Sydney Herald* advertised it, which helped to generate £250 of funding. Their published catalog contained over six-hundred titles, many of which related to influential Jewish and British topics or authors, including four titles by Grace Aguilar, six by her American publisher Isaac Leeser (1806-1868), as well as Charlotte Montefiore's *Cheap Jewish Library*. Readers were also provided with access to Jewish newspapers published in England and America. In 1872, not long after the first Australian-Jewish newspaper the *Australian Israelite* was founded, the library may not have been as central to the community or as well-funded as in prior years, but it still had 437 books in the collection. In 1889, the Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society and the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home held collections of Jewish books that were made available to residents after Mrs. Moritz Baar's father died. Toward the end of the century
people reported an observable increase in interest in novels and History books rather than books on religious topics.\textsuperscript{201} Jewish women were criticized for their love of reading novels, but they carefully analyzed what they read and recommended their favorites to their friends and family. Jewess Annie Isaac of London complained to Mary Vogel of New Zealand that the “light works are either tame and insipid or so naughty that one may be corrupted by their perusal.”\textsuperscript{202} *Silence of Dean Maitland*, was mentioned to Vogel along with the warning that it was “not fit for young people” because the idea of a clergyman impregnating a young unmarried woman and then murdering her father and blaming another man for it was, and still is, considered highly scandalous.\textsuperscript{203} The works of famous authors such as Grace Aguilar, George Eliot, Sir Walter Scott, Israel Zangwill, William Thackeray, and Charles Dickens, were recommended as quality reading by Jewish women. Isaac recommended *A Little Dutch Maiden* and *In the Name of the Tzar* to Mary and indicated that Aguilar’s *Vale of Cedars* was “too advanced for Phoebe just yet, but she is so precocious, she will soon be up to it.” Phoebe was just learning to read at that point.\textsuperscript{204} In 1896, Sydney’s Jewish columnist ‘Judith’ seemed unaware of the library and felt the absence of one reflected badly on the community. She suggested one should be made available for Jewish people in order to “set the example to our race throughout the world.”\textsuperscript{205} She thought Australian readers benefited by living in a “young country”\textsuperscript{206} since life was “not bound by hereditary custom” making it so that settlers had greater opportunities to advance themselves than in England.\textsuperscript{207} Louis Pulver hoped that when his students read Jewish literature it would inspire a “love of their race.”\textsuperscript{208} In the early 1890s, there was a Free Library specifically for Russian-Jews in London, which encouraged them to visit by providing hot tea and sugar, “as it is generally known that Russians are particularly fond of this beverage.”\textsuperscript{209} Specialist libraries provided Jews with the novels they enjoyed reading, often in languages other than English, some of which filled a side function of educating people about Judaism and Jewish life as well as providing entertainment and
a social space that affirmed rather than undermined Jewish women's distinctive religious culture and traditions.

When Jews maintained positive relations with Christians it was a vital step in gaining recognition for the scholastic achievement of Jewish students, particularly at the university level. Discrimination experienced by Jewish people was initially challenged on a religious and racial basis and then on the basis of gender. The University Test Act discriminated against Jews, Protestant Dissenting groups, Catholics and Hindus by preventing them from obtaining higher education degrees. Women did not experience equality in the area of higher education until this Act was repealed. In 1852, Louis Kyezor of London conveyed his frustration over the inequality Jews experienced in London's Jewish Chronicle and wrote: "I, as a free-born Englishman, shall strain every nerve, to the last day of my existence," to help establish a Jewish College. Others shared his determination and the Jews' Free College opened three years later and provided men with greater equality in the period prior to the repeal of the Test Act. After 1853, the University of London was one of the first places Jewish men and women could graduate with a higher-education degree. Other significant advances in the higher education of Jewish men prior to the repeal of the Test Act included that mathematician Arthur Cohen, the nephew of Baron de Rothschild, and a "gentleman who denies the Lord Jesus Christ," was permitted to graduate from Cambridge on July 5, 1857. Oxford served the scholastic needs of Protestant men since the end of the twelfth century and Cambridge had opened in 1209. In 1858, two Jewish men were awarded scholarships for the first time at Cambridge and Oxford. In 1890, both universities agreed not to schedule examinations on Saturdays, so that Jewish students were not penalized for observing the Sabbath. After the Test Act was overturned in 1871, universities in England and Australia were no longer considered "appendages of the dominant ecclesiastical body," and professors were no longer restricted from teaching material that was contrary to the Holy Scriptures. Jewish students were then permitted to reschedule exams that fell on Jewish holidays. However, it was not
until 1878 that it was more common for universities to consult with the Chief Rabbi Dr. Nathan Marcus Adler (1839-1911), so that they could schedule their exams on days that did not fall on Jewish religious holidays. The Test Act was overturned because it was no longer considered compatible with the "enlightened spirit of the age."

Regardless of their religious background, Australian and English women were not eligible to earn university diplomas until the 1870s. In the 1880s, "girls" were permitted to compete with "men" for Hebrew scholarships at the University College in London. Without scholarships most Jewish women could not afford the tuition for the full duration of a university degree, which made this a vital step that promoted greater equality for women. Women who graduated with degrees in the nineteenth century generally did not apply their skills in the workplace, although some women who graduated became professors. Women who studied to become professionals tended to be unmarried and childless, which carried a stigma in Jewish society. This was the reverse situation faced by men as they advanced their careers, since professors and rabbis were expected to be married, and their family was considered an asset rather than a liability. This amounted to a double standard since women with families were expected to remain in charge of domestic matters in addition to their professional responsibilities, but men were relieved of their domestic obligations when they were employed outside the home. It wasn't until 1900, that the first Jewish woman, Dora Yates, received her Master's degree in England. She was a student at Manchester's Victoria University. Jewish women in England appear to have had fewer opportunities to successfully complete degrees at higher education institutions when compared with women in other countries. For example, Matilda Cohen was the first Jewish person to receive a Master of Arts degree from India's Calcutta University, in 1897. Phoebe Landau, the wife of a prominent Sydney rabbi, reported that in Australia women who wanted to further their educations were "in all respects on an absolute footing of equality with
the men" in the area\textsuperscript{230} and she felt the extension of the "intellectual franchise has worked exceedingly well."\textsuperscript{231}

A popular nineteenth-century saying was that the "girl who wins fame at college marries and cannot be traced."\textsuperscript{232} Alice Joseph earned a Bachelor of Science degree at England's Bedford College and subsequently taught Mathematics and Zoology. She died a few years after graduation and was recalled as a "popular" woman who had "extraordinary intellectual attainments," who was "utterly at home in the mystic realm of the Higher Mathematic."\textsuperscript{233} Unlike other women of her status, she did not conform to the stereotype of a 'blue stocking.'\textsuperscript{234} A Jewish woman from Sydney explained that it was somewhat insulting to be called a 'Girton girl' or 'blue stocking' because this was a way of saying a woman was unattractive but well-educated.\textsuperscript{235}

Ethel Nadia Bensusan (formerly de Lissa) was one of the first Jewish students at the University of Sydney's women's college and was awarded a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1897. She was the eldest daughter of Julia Joseph and Montague de Lissa, who was an established member of Sydney's Great Synagogue. Ethel de Lissa won silver medals in French and Geography and took classes in History, English, German, Arithmetic, Botany, Logic, and Mental Philosophy. She was twenty-one when she married Arthur John Bensusan, a thirty-year-old mining engineer, and at least two hundred guests witnessed their vows before the "happy pair started on their honeymoon amid a shower of confetti and rose leaves."\textsuperscript{236} They had four children and she supported her husband's career as they lived overseas. She was still alive in 1970 and although she had a personal history of being a brave trend-setter, when asked, she reported that she disliked the then-popular fad of the mini-skirt. Although she placed the needs of her husband and children above whatever desires she had to pursue a career, she reflected upon her life and the advances made by second-wave feminists and seemed satisfied with her life.\textsuperscript{237}

In 1892, Hortense Henrietta Montefiore, the daughter of Esther Hannah Barrow and Elizar Levi Montefiore, was privately tutored by
Miss Gilders of Elizabeth Bay in order to pass the exams at the University of Sydney. The following year she enrolled formally in the university’s women’s college and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1896. While enrolled she passed classes in French and Geology and worked as an honorary librarian on campus. After graduating, she became an assistant teacher at the Brisbane Girls’ Grammar School in Queensland. In 1897, she studied in Germany at Marburg, and in 1899 was the Modern Language teacher at Kings High School in Warwick England. She completed further studies in Germany and graduated with distinction in 1901. Solomon Marks, a Sydney jeweler, had three children who earned university diplomas. Two of them were his daughters Leah and Florence. The latter daughter was a devoted student who won the attendance prize from the Sydney Certified Denominational School, prior to teaching at the Sabbath School. In 1885, they owed her six months of her salary and she sent them a notice that she would not continue teaching unless they paid her. She left that position when she received a scholarship from the Hurlstone Government Teachers’ Training College in Sydney’s suburb of Ashfield. She also studied perspective drawing at the Sydney Technical College and took classes in Latin and French at the University of Sydney, where she was awarded a Bachelor’s Degree. Her sister Leah also attended the University of Sydney. Although many women got married after their degrees were completed, some continued to teach in non-Jewish settings.

Jewish women had a difficult time competing with Jewish men when they taught religious subjects due to their differing level of religious education, which did not include study of the Talmud, the Mishna or Kabbalah, but their opportunities to teach young Jewish children was relatively equal. In 1810, one account, perhaps an exaggerated one, suggested that there was “not a single female teacher in the whole of the British kingdom.” However, by 1891 there were 144,000 women teaching in England, compared with 50,000 men. Christian and Catholic women experienced some disadvantaging in the area of teaching, particularly of religious subjects, but not to the same extent as Jewish women.
After the mid-century, there was less rhetoric about Jewish women acting as religious or secular educators of children in the home because public institutions met the needs of most Jewish students. As Grace Aguilar hoped, Jewish students like Doris Barnett, who had a strong knowledge of Judaism were able to integrate into Christian society without diminishing their engagement with Jewish society. Female Jewish students were expected to study a full range of subjects and were not discouraged from learning sciences and mathematics as is common today. Jewish women's knowledge of domestic matters had waned and their knowledge of cooking and other domestic related matters had to be cultivated within the classroom. A preference for sex-segregated classrooms meant that there was a greater demand for female teachers in public Jewish schools. When women taught in public institutions they had less control over the teaching environment and had to develop different strategies for coping with overcrowded classrooms, a wider range of student discipline issues, and a lack of teaching aids. They had to strengthen their knowledge of a range of subjects in comparison to women who earned their income as tutors or governesses in private settings where they could focus on teaching specialized subjects, such as Hebrew, French, Botany or Geometry. Although it wasn't until the 1870s that women from any religious background were awarded scholarships and higher education degrees in England and Australia, most Jewish men were also prevented from earning diplomas, and even in the late 1870s were sometimes unable to attend exams and classes that were regularly scheduled on Saturdays and Jewish Holidays. This meant that the educational attainment of Jewish men and women in the 1870s was relatively equal, particularly when compared with Protestant men who were not legally excluded from obtaining higher education degrees since just prior to the start of the thirteenth century. Although Jewish women represented only about a quarter of one percent of the population in Sydney, several of them were among the earliest university graduates, which is consistent with the high literacy rates among Australian-Jews. As Jewish women excelled at their studies at the university level, it increased their ability to study
Jewish sacred texts to the same extent as men. This was a vital step towards women's equality and their ordination as rabbis.
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British women were more likely to have control over their destinies than women in generations prior.\(^1\) However, at the end of the century most women continued to refrain from paid employment and instead assisted their families through self-provisioning and the care of children and extended family members within the home. Women's employment in the nineteenth century was typically underreported in the census,\(^2\) making it an important subject for historians to consider. Australia's colonial governments wanted to increase their populations, which meant that women's role as mothers was valued more than their contributions in the work place. Most women in English-speaking countries did not have the economic ability or the social support that was needed to become financially independent of the men in their lives until the twentieth century. In contrast, British men's gender identities in the nineteenth century were based on their ability to provide physical protection and financial stability for their families.\(^3\) Men were expected to exert self-discipline and to postpone their marriages until they could adequately provide for their wives and children.\(^4\) When Jewish men were able to find employment in a wider range of occupations that were well-paid, their wives were able to remain in the home caring for their children. This was viewed by their peer-group as a signal of success. Marriage records for London's Bevis Marks Synagogue reveal that after 1837 women rarely reported that they worked in occupations outside the home, and men's work was limited to a narrow range of mostly non-professional occupations.\(^5\) This trend was representative of Anglo-Jews in Australasia and to many Jewish migrants living in the American Far West and New Zealand in the nineteenth-century.\(^6\) Jewish women entered a variety of professions not long after Jewish men widened their employment prospects in the 1870s. The footnotes in this chapter provide the names of Jewish men and women in Sydney who were known to engage in occupations that are discussed within the chapter. This occupational data was gathered systematically,
however, it consists primarily of individuals who were in Sydney when they gave or received charity, registered the birth of a child, got married, died, or paid fees for children in the Jewish Board of Education schools. In this chapter, a variety of previously overlooked primary sources were reviewed in order to establish the professions that were most common for Jewish women in London and Sydney, which will provide a basis for future investigations into the distinctive occupational trends of British Jewry.

Women's inability to find husbands while living in Australia was detrimental to their ability to survive. In 1879, one Jewish woman in London claimed that if she “had half a dozen daughters” she would prefer to “train them all- to be married, believing so that I was giving them not only the ‘higher’ but the highest” form of education. 7 Israel Zangwill (1864-1926), disagreed with this perspective and felt that in the future women would be expected to work and society would benefit from this because once women were financially self-sufficient, they would marry for love, “instead of selling themselves for a home.”8 Since not all men and women supported the idea of women working as paid employees, social and financial constraints pushed the poorest women to accept ill-advised marriages rather than remaining single with the expectation of being self-supporting. Nineteenth-century colonial emigration societies focused on assisting women as they were seeking employment, and were often accused of being ‘matrimonial societies’ because they were “among the most active promoters of marriage.”9 Single female migrants who did not expect to marry were more successful if they remained in Britain and found a low paying job than if they relocated to Australia.10 Women who were realistic about their work prospects upon arrival in Sydney remained in the city and were reluctant to go into rural areas.11 As was discussed in chapter four, single Jewish men tended to live in small country towns and they often married women from Sydney. After the wedding, couples usually relocated to the husband's rural residence. Women also met their husbands while they were working and if it was financially possible wives quit their jobs after the wedding, which was
the case with the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home’s Matron, when she remarried.\textsuperscript{12}

Women’s wages were rarely equal when they performed the same work as men because their income was expected to be supplementary rather than providing options to become independent of their fathers or husbands.\textsuperscript{13} As a result, they had to work longer hours in order to survive and often had to care for their children and households in the absence of domestic servants. Women in Sydney sometimes lowered their social standing by working long hours in low-paid jobs in order to increase their household income. Mrs. S. Alexander, for example, was a Jewish widow who migrated to Sydney after living in New Zealand. She asked for assistance to return to San Francisco where she has lived before, because she had to work from nine in the morning until nine at night to support herself and her four-year-old daughter.\textsuperscript{14} In spite of rhetoric in the Victorian era that placed mothers on a pedestal, widowed women often lost custody of their children because of financial constraints related to women’s struggle to earn a head-of-household wage and also care for their children. This is a situation that many divorced women can relate to today. Dora Montefiore, who had one Jewish grandparent, was told that her children might have been sent to live with others as orphans if her husband had not written in his will that she was to retain custody of them. It was this realization that activated her interest in women’s rights.\textsuperscript{15} When women, often widows or women whose husbands had deserted them, acted as the head-of-household it justified women’s right to work and earn equal wages.\textsuperscript{16}

In the last third of the nineteenth century, it was not uncommon that all but one of the daughters in a working-class family were employed outside of the home. With the exception of the wealthier migrants, most families needed additional income to compensate for expenses related to relocating to Australia, such as the loss of household goods. Eastern-European Jewish migrants who were not native-speakers of English found it particularly difficult to earn enough money to sustain their families, which resulted in women’s role in the workplace becoming desirable, or at least acceptable, in
order for the family to survive. At the end of the century, daughters began to keep the income they earned rather than sharing it all with the family as had been expected in the past. Amelia Moss of Sydney provides an example of a young woman who was expected to share her income. In 1861, she was considered an orphan, although her mother was still living. The Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society found an apprenticeship for her. She began working with a salary of three shillings, and was expected to eventually pay her own bills, and pool her income with her younger brothers Phillip and Montague. In 1884, Frances Vogel of London explained to Mary Vogel in New Zealand that their acquaintance Lewis Levy was having financial difficulties because of health problems. He had to sell the family home, but the brighter side of the story was that his two “clever and excellent daughters” were not only financially independent of their parents, they also provided some monetary assistance to them in their time of need. The income generated by female workers within middle-class families challenged the centrality of men’s financial contributions and made the role of head-of-household more “arbitrary.” Working-class families found that there were more benefits than drawbacks to having a wife or daughters who worked outside the home.

Australian migrants were expected to engage in more arduous physical work than was typical in London, and the Religious Tract Society of Great Britain promoted the view that “hard, rough work is not destructive of happiness,” and that migrants would reap social and financial benefits in proportion to the efforts they expended. It was the “rough and homely” workers who were well-paid and in demand compared with those who had skills that were “refined and delicate.” Women did not “abandon familiar notions of women’s place” in society when they migrated to Sydney and one writer remarked that “women’s work’ is women’s work all the world over,” and that there was “as little variety in female employment in Australia as at home.” Women have a long history of contributing to the household through self-provisioning that required both delicate and rough work, such as milking cows, tending the garden, caring for
livestock, making candles, soaps, preserves, weaving, sewing clothing and butchering meat. Women with these skills, such as house maids, laundresses, kitchen workers, milking-maids and child-care providers were the most likely to find employment in Australia. Migrants reported a feeling of accomplishment once they successfully completed difficult tasks related to settling into their new routines in Australia. Women within the household needed to cooperate regardless of their class-standing and women who opposed this arrangement were the least likely to migrate. Colonists relayed many complaints about female migrants who arrived and were unprepared for the physical nature of the work that was expected of them. Anglo-Jewish men also avoided employment that required greater physical labor or left workers with dirty hands. Only a few Jewish men worked as laborers or in outdoor occupations in Sydney. Five Jewish men worked as cabinet makers and one was a stick maker. Two men were window glaziers, and one was a brick layer. Only one Jewish man was known to work in each of the following occupations: as a soap maker, a bootblack, a polisher, a saddler, and an oil-skin maker. One Jewish man worked as a mechanic, and one was an electrical engineer. Two Jewish men worked as painters, but it wasn’t clear if they were artists or working in construction. Even though Sydney’s waterways were close to the central business district where most Jews lived, there were only three Jewish men who were known to be sailors and one man was a marine dealer. In 1895, Gustave Max Meyer, formerly of Germany, was working at the Port of Melbourne, but had “run away owing to the bad treatment he received” while he was there. Only one man listed his career as a mining engineer in spite of the draw the gold rush provided to the area. Five Jewish men worked as metal craftsman. Jews in England and Australia found hard physical labor “unbecoming,” which likely explains why so few Jewish men and women in Sydney were employed as farmers, sheep shearsers, cattle drovers. European Jews were economically stressed as a result of rapid changes linked to industrialization, and many of them shifted to working in factories that were built on land that was formerly utilized for agriculture. Jewish traders and artisans also found their
skills were less in demand in the latter half of the century as manufacturing jobs increased, and many Jewish people migrated to other countries to better their prospects.40

Jewish men and women in Sydney were more likely to work in cleaner indoor environments as service providers that did not require extensive physical labor. Two Jewish men worked as hotel keepers,41 and four men worked as carriage drivers or owners in Sydney.42 Albert Aaron Brodizak worked as an inventor in 1899,43 and Gorden James Hull was a safe expert.44 Seven Jewish men worked as hairdressers.45 Mrs. Carlotta Minnie Loewenthal was a manicurist.46 Mrs. Sarah Goldman and Mrs. Albert A. Goldsmid worked as labor agents.47 Within types of employment that were relatively sedentary, there is evidence of gender segregation in the occupations of Jewish men and women in Sydney.

Religiously-observant Jews who followed the laws of *Yichud* would not have wanted their daughters to work without an older female chaperone. Jewish girls in nineteenth-century Jerusalem struggled to work or become educated because they were expected to remain secluded within the home where they would not be looked upon or talked to by men they didn’t know. One Jewish observer there reflected that for women the “publicity of being a book-keeper or saleswoman would bring her crushing and overwhelming disgrace,” and for this reason he felt business owners would not “introduce so startling an innovation as that of employing a woman in his store or office.”48 In the American Far West, Jewish women were often employed by close friends and family members in shops or department stores that were not gender segregated, but that were nevertheless considered safe and respectable workplaces for women.49 While British-Jews might have rejected women’s seclusion in the home, they reported struggling with this issue of gender segregation for different reasons. They found that when Jewish men and women were in close association at work they became competitors, and this eroded the romantic “thoughts and imaginings”50 of male suitors who became disinterested because of the “fatal fact”51 that women had “made themselves too much like men to be regarded as objects of desire and
devotion. However, by the end of the nineteenth century, Anglo-Jewish women's intelligence was more optimistically likened to a fruit that had "ripened" and her role in society was thought to be "practically without limitations." If Jewish men in Sydney and London demanded that girls and women should be secluded in the home, it was not talked of openly, nor was this custom sanctioned in English-speaking countries.

Men's wariness of the changes to women's status was evident in comments that women had "invaded" nearly all of the professions that were previously reserved for them, and that women had succeeded by waging a "fierce battle of existence shoulder to shoulder" with their male co-workers. In 1896, women workers had displaced men in some occupations. For example, women became the dominant group employed as telephone operators in Melbourne. A writer named Outis wrote in the Daily Telegraph that the "telephone girl has arrived and the telephone man has to move on." While women's accomplishments in the workplace were generally admired and appreciated, one Jewish man confessed that in his "heart" he really wanted to find a "quiet, old-fashioned, pious mother of former years." He felt that even if a woman was "less brilliant and intellectual" when compared to "her modern sister," it would not matter because she was "much more soothing, lovable and comforting." As a result she would be valued by men who knew her. Jewish men's comments often mixed condescension, humor and pride in response to women's skill and determination to be equals in the workforce. As discussed in the previous chapter, women's educational goals were simultaneously supported and limited by men's arguments that they wanted wives who were intelligent, domestically-oriented, and not antagonistic to the men around them.

At the turn of the century some estimates suggest that one out of three young women aged between fifteen and twenty were employed as domestic servants in England. In 1884, domestic service jobs in England were among the few occupations open to women that did not have a high surplus of workers. Those who promoted Jewish women's advancement into domestic occupations through special
training schools believed the wages were good and that the treatment girls received was fair and the work took place in a wholesome environment. When Mr. Charles Schmith presented his paper *Jews and their Callings* to the Sydney Literary and Debating Society he raised some of the problems that arose when British-Jewish girls avoided domestic service and instead worked in factories under “injurious sanitary and moral conditions.” He felt factory work caused them to miss opportunities to learn domestic skills that could help them become good wives. He “regretted that Jewish girls should think it derogatory to become nurses, cooks or housemaids in Jewish families.”61 In London, Constance de Rothschild’s perspective, as a wealthy woman who employed servants and probably had little experience cooking and cleaning, was that domestic service was a respectable and “enviable calling.”62 Amelia Danzic, a widower with a three-year-old daughter, was rare in her request to be placed as a domestic servant in a Jewish household. As a single parent she preferred to work within the home and wanted her daughter to grow up “with a knowledge of Judaism.”63 In order to make domestic service work more appealing to single women, reformers quoted the maxim that “he who gets a servant gets a master.”64 In spite of that, Jewish women reportedly did not wish to “drudge all their lives for a moderate salary”65 and complained that the work was “degrading”66 and “undignified.”67 In 1879, Jewish authoress Amy Levy, published *Miss Meredith*, a book about a British governess, which depicted the profession as “notoriously ill-paid drudgery, for which only peculiar minds are really fitted.”68 Jewish girls were not only disinterested in domestic service, they were also thought to be relatively incompetent at it, which was cited as a reason they changed employers frequently and found little personal satisfaction from their work. Young Jewish females were also hindered from this occupation because mothers and daughters were unwilling to live apart until the daughter was married. This may explain why the five Jewish women in Sydney who were known to work as housekeepers were married women. They were already living away from their mothers, had acquired some domestic skills, and were working to earn a second income.69
Jewish women were reluctant to accept employment in non-Jewish households where they might be pressured to convert, to eat non-kosher food or to work on the Jewish Sabbath. Upper-class Jews living in London and Sydney often had paid cooks and housekeepers, and showed a preference for Christian servants who could light the fires and work on the Jewish Holidays and Sabbaths. It appears to be rare that Jews in London or Sydney employed Jewish servants, and Protestant and Catholic families also tended to employ non-Jews as their domestic workers. Tensions often developed between Jewish families and their non-Jewish servants, and Sydney's Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis was accused of sexual misconduct by his non-Jewish maid Miss Cockburn. The charges against him were dropped by the Water Police Court. Gwendoline Marks, a Jewish woman from Sydney retained the services of Catholic woman as her household assistant for twenty-five years. Migration historian David Fitzpatrick finds that Irish and Jewish females preferred different types of work and that Irish women were "over-represented" in domestic service until the turn of the century. Domestic service was a less common occupation for Jewish females in England and Australia due to cultural preferences and religious considerations.

Jewish women were most likely to work within the home as foster parents of Jewish children or in families with Jewish boarders. The Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home cared for elderly residents and the matron was female. When Jewish women in London advertised their services as governesses, they were often seeking a home in the country where they were expected to perform additional duties that might otherwise have been delegated out to domestic servants. Mrs. A. Solomon, Mrs. Annie Brodziak and Samuel Barnett kept Jewish boarding houses in the 1870s. Although there were possibly others who were undocumented, Eve Boulton was the only woman who listed her occupation as a governess in Sydney's communal records, and this was at the end of the century in 1899, which supports Fitzpatrick's observation above that Jewish women were not well-represented in domestic service until after the turn of the century. At least seven Jewish women worked as housekeepers, but it isn't known
if they were employed by Jewish or Christian households. Only Jewish men reported earning their living as cooks or waiters in restaurants in Sydney. There were no Jewish women who reported earning an income by washing other people’s laundry. When Jewish females worked as governesses, cooks, housekeepers or did other people’s laundry, it was generally linked to running boarding-houses, taking in lodgers, caring for foster children, or as the matron of the nursing home for Jewish residents, where domestic work was a component of their normal work day.

It was rare that British-Jewish men and women worked as health care professionals. In Sydney there were four men trained Jewish dentists, one Jewish man was a podiatrist, one was a barber and at least three were trained to circumcise male infants. Two Jewish men worked as pharmacists. Jewish women “held aloof” from the medical profession and were “such a rarity as to be scarcely known.” The occupational trend in Sydney contrasted with Berlin, where there were at least 526 Jewish doctors in 1896 and it was one of the most common professions listed for Jewish men. Doctors in England did not change out of their blood-stained coats in the 1870s, and they were known to prescribe medications indiscriminately. Given Judaism’s strict observance of cleanliness in the kitchen, women were probably not impressed by unsanitary conditions in hospitals, which was a complaint aired in 1901 after members of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home visited the Miller Point Hospital, which they found “disgusting.” There was a Danish-Jewish doctor practicing medicine in Tamworth New South Wales who was known to be an alcoholic, which is another indication that doctors were not necessarily model citizens. Just as domestic service work was unappealing to Jewish women, the field of nursing was also considered “degrading” work, although those who were practicing it defended their occupation as a “labour of love.” In 1890, Rabbi Adler of London organized a fund to provide holidays for Jewish nurses so that they could maintain their health by having sufficient rest periods, but there were still relatively few Jewish nurses even at the end of the century. One of the difficulties in retaining Jewish nurses was that
they tended to quit working not long after becoming qualified, in order to get married and have children. Jewish communal leaders hoped that nursing would become more respectable and more Jewish women would seek training. After the Crimean war, nurse Florence Nightingale was a role model that women could emulate, and the field of nursing in England and Australia was predominantly Catholic in the nineteenth-century. This was probably another underlying reason Jewish women avoided the nursing profession. Rose Shappere, of Ballarat Victoria and New Zealand, graduated from Prince Alfred Hospital in Melbourne's suburb of Prahran, and is thought to be the first Jewish nurse in Australia. She served in this capacity in South Africa during the Boer War. However, two Jewish women worked as nurses in Sydney possibly prior to when Shappere completed her training. Both women listed that they did nursing work when they got married at the Great Synagogue: Rosalie Strolitz in 1897 and Leah Solomons in 1899. Their educational training may have been minimal in comparison to Shappere.

Women who were interested in the medical profession found it difficult to pursue even though it required minimal training. The small number of medically trained Jews in Sydney should not be viewed solely as an outcome of religious discrimination within educational settings, since there were only a few trained female medical practitioners from other religious backgrounds in Australia. In 1876, women's entrance into the medical profession in England lagged behind European countries and America, where women were already practicing obstetrics. Elizabeth Blackwell was qualified to be a medical doctor in 1849 and by the end of 1895 there were at least four thousand female doctors in America. English-Jewish women were encouraged to enter this profession, which was promoted as being more desirable than the "drudgery of governesses in private families." In 1879, English authoress Amy Levy described the medical profession as one that women were "barred and blocked" from entering "by about every means which the ingenuity of man could devise." Male doctors were encouraged to be more gentle and considerate in matters of female health, which legitimized their
suitability as caregivers to female patients. The Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society board made an indelicate comment in relation to Mrs. Goldstein's diagnosis of cancer, indicating that she might have to have one of her breasts "cut off" in order to recover.97 Several non-Jewish doctors at the Royal College of Surgeons in England were so hostile to women that they resigned rather than accepting women into their classroom examinations. However, Jewish men supported women's entry into this profession and argued that the "exclusive privilege of the male sex is no longer tenable."98 Jewish women who wanted to become health care professionals were discouraged by the cost of tuition, by religious discrimination, gender discrimination, and to perceptions that the work they would perform was degrading. Jewish women were well-versed in 'kitchen medicine,' chemistry, sanitation methods and were accustomed to caring for sick children and family members. Their expert skills as seamstresses also provided them with preliminary training that was valuable to the medical professionals, such as midwives, surgeons, nurses and chemists.

Women's community-groups assisted others financially, but also included visiting and caring for individuals who were sick and dying, such as through the Chevra Kadisha. In 1877, there were complaints by older women in London that the younger women in the Jewish Ladies' Benevolent Society were not assisting them. It was suggested that younger women spent too much time "lounging on soft ottomans," or "lolling about in elegant carriages," and criticized them for flaunting the "newest Parisian fashion."99 Partly as a result of their apathy, some members of the Jewish community considered combining the role of the watcher, which they felt was intrusive, with the duties of nurses in 1899. They expected this would be less disruptive to patients and thought nurses would find their role more valuable because it was infused with religious meaning.100 American-Jewish women in Cincinnati had to be "compelled" by male leaders to take their role in assisting the sick and dying and to make the shrouds for those who had died. The tone of American men's language was one of dominance,101 which is not evident in Sydney's communal records. In
Sydney, women took their role in the Chevra Kadisha voluntarily, seemingly without any pressure from male leaders, even if they avoided the occupation of nursing. By 1898 in Sydney, and 1900 in London, the activities of the Chevra Kadisha were promoted in Jewish newspapers that published their reports. This information likely inspired women to support the community and provide social support to families dealing with the loss of family members. Women whose children were adults or who were childless had the most leisure time to offer to the community.

In 1895, Mrs. Isaac Barnett complained that her first year as the matron of the Sydney Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home had passed without acknowledgment from their board of management. After being notified that they were pleased with the performance of her duties with the elderly residents, she requested a raise in her salary, which they were not able to offer her due to funding limitations. Her husband died unexpectedly a few months later. At her next annual review period, she requested a pay increase, but before the matter was resolved she resigned her position and remarried, which was a common choice made by female workers. The value of having steady, competent and humane staff at the Jewish nursing home was evident in the story of the final days of a resident named Joseph Henry. The board reported that he died peacefully. He was ninety-three years old and although he was oblivious to the visits of local clergymen in the days prior to his death, he continued to be alert to the presence of Mrs. Barnett, who he referred to as a "second mother." Barnett was honored for her services and her hospitality to the residents of the Montefiore Home in an Australasian Hebrew article during her first year of employment. They had a difficult time replacing her, which further substantiates the complaints made in England and Australia that there were few Jewish women interested in the field of domestic service or nursing.

After receiving the resignation of Mrs. Barnett, Rose Hart was offered a monthly salary of fifty-two pounds. She was instructed to wear a uniform while on duty, which signaled that she was considered a professional. The board agreed that either party could end their
contract by giving the other party one month of notice. Hart came into conflict with one of the male residents almost immediately, and the man who complained indicated that he wanted to live elsewhere. He was told that if he left the Home he would not be allowed to return. A year later he was still living there and the disagreements between the two had not dissipated and he was asked to move out. At that time the board indicated that they were pleased with her services because she had assisted them in reducing the costs of running the Home. However, in December of 1900, the Home's Ladies committee reported that they were unsatisfied with Hart's work and found it difficult to communicate with her. The expenses of the home were carefully averaged so that they were aware of the daily cost for each resident. On one occasion they asked Hart to explain why the sugar and potato costs had increased. She replied unapologetically that the money and food "was used." Although she was kind to the residents, they were unimpressed with her reply and observed that she did not scrub the floors vigorously, was not tactful and did not follow their directions. After deciding that they "could get no satisfaction from her" they asked her to respond to their complaints in writing. They were not placated by her answers and asked for her resignation, which she quickly provided.

Three married women and three single women applied for Hart's position. Mrs. E. Lowenthal accepted the starting salary of fifty-two pounds, but she resigned after four months. The ladies' committee complained that she quarreled with one of the residents, had left the Home while the residents were watching a performance, and "was in the habit of entertaining Christian gentleman at the Home." Since only a few months had passed since other candidates had been interviewed, they asked Mrs. J. Blitz to try the position for a fortnight, at a salary of one pound per week. They then offered her the position for a three month trial period. Even though there were certainly Jewish women seeking employment in Jewish settings within a home-like atmosphere, it was difficult to find competent staff for the Home.

Jewish workers and apprentices were socially and economically disadvantaged if they followed Jewish religious law in addition to local
laws in London and Sydney. English occupational restrictions persisted even after discriminatory laws were repealed in the 1830s. In 1850, one writer complained in the *Jewish Chronicle* that "Jewish clerks" or "porters, door-keepers, lodge-keepers and messengers are quite rarities." He asked: "why should that be?" It was observed at this time that educated men were still working as peddlers out of "compulsion," because they could not find employment in occupations that suited their training and religious values. The Factory Act of England was updated nine times between 1802 and the end of the century. It was coupled with the Factory Acts' Extension Act. The result of this legislation was that Jews were restricted from working on Sunday because it was the Christian Sabbath. They were intended to improve children's scholastic performance by restricting children under the age of eight from working. Some evening work and overtime was prohibited, and there were requirements to improve sanitation, ventilation and overcrowding within workplaces. Women and young people under the age of eighteen were limited from working more than twelve hours in a day. Children were not allowed to work more than six-and-a-half hours a day and were required to spend a minimum of ten hours in school each week. The outcome was that religiously observant Jews were prohibited from working 117 days of the year, while Christians only lost fifty-four days, because they were not prohibited from working on the Jewish Sabbath. There were regular complaints that Jewish employers were unsupportive of the need for Jewish workers to have extra time off to observe Sabbaths and Jewish religious holidays, particularly in comparison to the tolerance they experienced when they worked for Christian employers. Although large and successful Jewish stores such as the Myers and Company department store in Australia closed on the Christian and Jewish Sabbaths and reported that it was not a hardship for them, most Jewish employers and workers found it difficult to subsist upon four or four-and-a-half days of income in a society that was based on a six-day work week. This was also the case in America in the 1870s.
It was well-known that Jewish workers and employers avoided being detected as they worked on Sundays in home-workshops, on ships or in "secluded offices." The police did not enforce employment-related legislature in some areas of London. Critics of laws that limited work on the Sabbaths observed that businesses in poor areas, such as tobacconists, were "boldly open" on Sundays. Bakeries were typically closed, making it so that "the possibility of respectably and decently sustaining one's impaired vital energies by a cup of coffee or a biscuit" were nearly "out of the question." Yet, the "means of getting comfortably drunk" were "at the disposal of the humblest inhabitant of the metropolis" for at least a few hours in the day. The 1867 Acts made an exception in order to permit Jewish workshop-owners to employ workers on Saturday from sunset until nine in the evening, since this was after the Jewish Sabbath had ended, whereas non-Jewish businesses had to remain closed after two in the afternoon. The group most affected by the Factory Act and Extension Act were the nearly four-thousand poorly-paid Jewish tailors and tobacco workers in London. Young Jewish girls living in London's East End were often employed to roll cigars and cigarettes. Their schedules were irregular and their pay was low. This occupation was easily disrupted by changes in the duty costs associated with tobacco products as well as to legislation related to the employment of women and children on the Sabbaths. One employer complained callously that if his youngest workers were allowed to "play" from Friday afternoon until Monday morning their hands "would be so stiff and clumsy" that their work would be "of a very inferior quality." In 1869, a cigar manufacturer in Whitechapel, Mr. Witmond, was caught breaking the Factory Act when Jane Nathill, a fourteen year old Jewish girl, was at work at a prohibited time. It was around the High Holidays, which meant that she and other Jewish workers lost eight consecutive work days in addition to the Jewish Sabbaths over a period of just a few weeks. This posed a severe financial hardship, particularly for this group of impoverished workers. Children who dropped out of school to earn their living in the tobacco industry who did not acquire additional trade-skills later
in life were severely disadvantaged as adults since they were displaced by younger workers who accepted the lowest wages and most irregular schedules. Although some Jews were defiant and did not comply with civil laws in order to work longer hours at times that suited them, and were known to evade detection of inspectors and police, Jews who abided by religious and civil laws were highly disadvantaged by employment legislation that favored the needs of Christian workers. Neither situation promoted the well-being of the Jewish community, since workers were either criminalized or penalized.

Writing was prohibited under Jewish religious law and this inhibited Orthodox Jews from legal careers. Sydney's laws were more tolerant of religious minorities than in England, and in 1868 Jews involved in legal proceedings, including barristers, could postpone signing their names on Saturday. Only a few Jews in Sydney found employment within the legal system, in positions as judges, police officers, barristers, jailors, clerks, language interpreters, and public servants, such as Leopold Yates of Sydney, who was a stipendary magistrate. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, it was difficult for Jews to obtain the necessary qualifications and overcome de facto discrimination, partly because of barriers in higher education prior to the 1870s. In 1896, New Zealand's women won the right to become professional barristers but the Female Law Practitioners Bill had only passed by a narrow margin. Men in New Zealand still described women's successful entrance into legal careers in antagonistic terms. Ethel Rebecca Benjamin (1875-1943), a Jewish barrister for the Supreme Court in New Zealand, was the first women lawyer in the country. She encouraged women that if they were "determined to succeed; if they are diligent and pushing" and if they made the "most of every opportunity that presents itself, sooner or later success will crown their efforts." She also warned that women who succeeded were "regarded with jealous, distrustful eyes." Women were often excluded from becoming religious and civil lawmakers, and as a result it was difficult for them to protect themselves from de jure and de facto gender discrimination. When compared to Britain and the Australian colonies, Jews living in Russia and
continental Europe were more likely to become barristers. In 1890, there were at least 240 Russian-Jewish attorneys, but after this year legal restrictions barred Jewish men from following this career.\textsuperscript{137} In 1896, the city of Berlin had 315 Jewish attorneys.\textsuperscript{138} As Jewish men and women were awarded higher education degrees in England and Australia in the 1870s, more of them found alternatives to working in low-paid retail jobs by becoming professionals, but there continued to be few Jews who were trained for the legal profession at the end of the century.

Jewish workers made significant contributions to Australian society in their role as merchants, particularly in rural areas. A number of types of commercial trading provided Jewish men and women with varying levels of income. As circumstances improved or declined, workers often shifted between these categories: hawkers who called out what they were selling on the street,\textsuperscript{139} traveling peddlers known then as commercial travelers,\textsuperscript{140} shop keepers, merchants and dealers\textsuperscript{141} pawnbrokers who sold second hand goods and loaned money as goods were held for a contracted period of time,\textsuperscript{142} importers,\textsuperscript{143} property agents,\textsuperscript{144} auctioneers,\textsuperscript{145} and commercial agents.\textsuperscript{146} People often starting as hawkers and progressed to be merchants with greater control over their work environment and the ability to set their own priorities and honor their cultural traditions, such as eating kosher meals at breaks and taking time off at the Jewish holidays and the Sabbath. By 1850, Sydney had grown large enough to support specialty retailers, such as furniture shops or silk mercers.\textsuperscript{147} Although there were few paid cooks that were Jewish, there were a number of Jewish men and women who owned or operated food processing and manufacturing establishments, with specialty shops selling fish, kosher meat,\textsuperscript{148} baked goods and matzos,\textsuperscript{150} green groceries,\textsuperscript{151} confections,\textsuperscript{152} tobacco products,\textsuperscript{153} as well as producing and selling alcoholic drinks and cordials.\textsuperscript{154} Many of the men and women in these specialized trades were European, rather than British migrants.\textsuperscript{155} In the second half of the nineteenth century Jewish shops existed in most towns in rural New South Wales, which provided them with some influence in local affairs.\textsuperscript{156}
Women often had more autonomy when they were married to merchants, and a few were known to work in the store, later taking over the business when male relatives had health problems, died or were out of the area. Merchants created social networks that generally promoted chain migration and civic order in the areas where they settled, which was valued by their non-Jewish neighbors.\(^{157}\)

An English-born Jewish writer living in Australia reflected on the economic advances Jews had made in 1872 and recalled that “troops of Jewish boys who, a quarter of a century ago, infested the public thoroughfares" working as “vendors of fruit and nicnacs," aside “men who assailed the ear with the incessant cry of 'old clothes,'” had progressed and “taken to more legitimate pursuits, either at home or in the colonies.”\(^{158}\) Although permits were required in London and Sydney prior to hawking wares in the street, this type of work was still considered “unsavory”\(^{159}\) and individuals who worked as sales-people were also “unjustly stigmatized.”\(^{160}\) A number of Sydney’s tailors earned their living as hawkers, but their decision-making was usually linked to health considerations, rather than a preference for that type of work.\(^{161}\) These two occupations were linked because of the used clothing market. Hawkers and ‘old-clothes men’ verbally called out as they announced their wares to prospective customers.

Anglo-Jewish women were depicted as hawkers in drawings and ceramic statues in the eighteenth century wearing brightly-colored printed-fabrics as they sold their wares.\(^{162}\) Women and girls in London and Sydney continued to work as hawkers in the nineteenth century. In April of 1873, Leah Emanuel was assisted to find alternatives to hawking by the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society after she was placed into the custody of Mrs. Selig after her father died. Her mother Kate’s health was precarious, and she was a source of so much disruption over this custody arrangement that Mrs. Selig was compelled to make a formal complaint against her. Kate eventually took custody of her daughter and later that year, the board was distressed because Leah was hawking in the streets. Kate was asked to prevent Leah from earning money this way, but the situation continued. Kate often kept Leah
out of school because she needed assistance at home, and may have been reliant upon the income Leah earned in order to pay for basic necessities. In 1881, the board intervened and found a job for Leah at the American Novelty Company, where she was given a small salary and was allowed to observe the Jewish Sabbath and holidays. However, after about a month, Mr. Little said "he had an excellent opinion of her business capacity but did not want her any longer in his employ."\textsuperscript{163} He gave her a good letter of reference. At that time, Kate admitted that she was not able to control Leah, which suggests that her daughter might have been a difficult employee. Although it may have been more common for Jewish women to be employed in retail jobs, it was not until after the turn of the century that women were hired to work in non-Jewish owned department stores in Australasia. Leah was again placed in foster care, this time with Mrs. Fernandez, who promised to "treat her like her own daughter" and she taught Leah about hotel-keeping. Not long after these domestic and employment adjustments were made, Leah was observed working behind the bar at the hotel, which the charity board objected to because it was considered a "dangerous calling for girls."\textsuperscript{164} They tried to help her move to Grafton New South Wales, in order to work at Hunter's Boot Palace. Instead, she secured a job that paid ten shillings a week in Sydney, which meant that she was able to remain near her mother. For a short while she earned ten shillings a week in a refreshment room on Elizabeth Street, probably not far from the Great Synagogue. Leah then moved to a more "respectable" shop on nearby George Street where she earned one pound per week, and this enabled her to save some money. In 1883, Kate's residence was sold, likely the house where they lived at thirty-three Dowling Street in Paddington, and she moved into the Gladesville Hospital for eight months before she passed away. Leah moved into shared accommodation and she was unemployed for the five weeks prior to her mother's death. She requested assistance to begin her own business, but the board made alternate arrangements for her to work at Mr. Castner's hotel next to the train station in Yass New South Wales. When women owned their own businesses in the nineteenth
century, it was generally because they had inherited them from their husband or father. As a poor orphan, Leah’s request for assistance to begin her own business was unlikely to be supported, but it was evidence of her strong desire to be an independent and self-supporting woman. Although her potential as a business-woman is palpable, her circumstances were financially unfavorable and the charity board consistently directed her away from the type of work she was seeking. This meant that she also lacked the social resources she needed in order to reach her full potential.

British-Jews were commonly employed as tailors, shoe and boot makers and worked in factories, workshops and in their homes under conditions that would be considered ‘sweat work.’ The term ‘sweating’ or ‘sweat work’ had many definitions but usually referred to low-paid work that required long hours at tasks that were considered unpleasant and were often performed in locations that exposed workers to outdoor extremes, to poorly ventilated workshops, or that were located in cramped conditions, such as within people’s homes, which was also referred to as ‘out-work.’ Women who worked in factories spent long amounts of time away from the home and their children, which is why unmarried women were more inclined to take these jobs. Tailors were accustomed to working thirteen-hour days, although this was often followed by long rest-periods between orders. Rose Cohen’s *Out of the Shadow*, describes the harsh conditions sweat workers experienced even when they were still very young. Her complaints were similar to those of seamstresses in London who felt that garment industry workers were treated like “machines.” In London, the common types of sewing work for Jewesses included making umbrellas and preparing button-holes on garments.

Although there were reports that Jewish women tailors demanded higher wages than women from other religious groups, even those who received better pay found this type of work to be “at all times precarious.” In London, female garment workers often found their jobs posted on neighborhood billboards, rather than in newspapers, which how governesses and tutors found employment. Reports about the availability of sewing work in Sydney and London indicate that it
“very rare,” for people to find jobs. Jewish tailors in England in the 1880s were economically distressed and were twice as likely to need financial assistance compared to boot and shoe workers.

Aside from commercial traders, tailoring and dressmaking were among the most common types of employment for Jewish workers in Sydney, and there were at least thirty-nine men and nineteen women in this occupation, not including specialized workers, such as Mrs. Silberman who was a trained machinist. In spite of low wages paid to London’s female machinists, they were known to “dress fearfully excessive” and arrived at “work dressed in silks, crinolined to the greatest extent, and full of trinkets.” Garment industry workers had some freedom to arrange their own schedules, could observe Jewish holidays and the Sabbath, and some worked from home rather than in factories. In the early 1870s in Sydney, two women requested assistance from the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society to purchase sewing machines so they could become self-supporting, presumably while working from home. Julia Isaacs and Amelia Levy were milliners, or hatmakers and probably had more artistic freedom than other garment sewers. Russian and Eastern-European Jews were the predominant group who worked as furriers in London, and only one Jewish worker in Sydney had these skills, likely because of the low demand for it in Sydney’s comparatively warm climate. In 1885, Jewish women were chided for their desire to promote fashionable styles, rather than falling into this line of work because they lacked other options. One writer described that they “devote themselves to tailoring as if upon them devolved the duty of protecting the whole of humanity from the inclemency of weather,” and in line with this view, they “dress feathers as if all their fellow beings required personal adornment of this kind.”

In 1884, Frances Vogel had admired Mrs. Harris’ dress at Emily Nathan’s Synagogue wedding and later asked her dressmaker, Ms. Jones of Mornington House on Hampstead Road, to create several dresses to be sent to her sister-in-law Mary Vogel in New Zealand. In 1886, Mrs. Jones had to hire an attorney because Vogel had not paid her bill, which amounted to 169 pounds after the interest was added.
Letters from Frances included apologies to Mary over her dissatisfaction with the fabrics and the style of the dresses when she received them, as she considered them beneath her social status. Frances replied that it was "vexing to go to the expense of having them sent all that distance and then be unable to wear them." Frances was in an awkward position and defended her actions by writing to Mary about the "tenor" of her letter. She wrote that it was obvious to her that Mary thought she was "to blame" and that she had not given the "proper order." She wrote: "I beg to say I took the greatest trouble about these dresses." She vividly recalled telling Mrs. Jones to avoid the use of "common style or material." She concluded her comments by writing that Mrs. Jones was a "real nuisance" for not completing the order as requested or in time for Frances to view it prior to shipping it out.184 Jewish women often worked in jobs that were found undesirable by Irish-Catholic women, and to some extent dressmaking was an example of this.185 Nineteenth-century dressmakers in Australian cities may not have had skills that were competitive or stylish enough for upper-class women, particularly those who were homesick and dissatisfied with "colonial life."186 Although sewing work was the one of the primary occupations open to Jewish women in British colonies, Vogel opted to have her dresses sent from London. Melbourne and Sydney had not yet solidified their reputation as leaders in the fashion industry as is now the case. Dressmakers were often expected to pay for raw materials out of their own budget prior to being paid by their clients, which was detrimental for Mrs. Jones, and to poorer women working in this profession.

Jewish workers in Sydney also worked sewing boots and shoes, or by sewing fabrics that were not part of the clothing industry. Louis R. Wilson, one of Sydney's most prominent Jews, was exceptional in that he was the owner of an industrial-sized laundry.187 Chinese families were living in the area and men regularly performed this type of labor for low wages. It should not be presumed that Wilson hired Jewish or female workers. Four Jewish men listed their occupation as factory workers, but it isn't clear what sort of work they performed. Twelve men were skilled at making boots or shoes.188 Mrs. Rebecca Myers
worked as an artificial flower-maker, which likely meant she worked with silks.\textsuperscript{189} Two Jewish men worked as textile or as thread dyers,\textsuperscript{190} and five men worked as drapers or upholsterers.\textsuperscript{191} Jewish men also filled jobs as manufacturers,\textsuperscript{192} warehousemen,\textsuperscript{193} foremen, or as business and factory managers.\textsuperscript{194} May Abraham, a Jewish woman, was the first factory inspector in London.\textsuperscript{195} Wealthier Jews opened businesses as clothiers rather than sewing the clothing themselves.\textsuperscript{196} A number of men worked as accountants or book keepers for merchants and manufacturing businesses. Celia Harris of Sydney was hired to work as her brother's bookkeeper for fifty-two pounds a year.\textsuperscript{197} In Sydney Jewish women were rarely hired as factory workers, which contrasted with experiences of Jewish women in England and America.

Jewish women tended to work in environments where they were able to "maintain familial social control,"\textsuperscript{198} such as in shops that were attached to their living space. This was also the case among Jewish women in London's East End, where Jewish living spaces often doubled as at-home factory workshops. Women regularly worked between twelve and fifteen hour days, aside their husbands, children and other extended family members when they earned their incomes through 'piece-work' or 'out-work' at home. This work was paid based on the number of items completed rather than an hourly wage. Children contributed to their family income by running errands, doing chores, caring for siblings, doing piece-work and freeing their parent's time so they could work. Jewish men and women were known to collude against work-inspectors to avoid being caught as they broke laws governing work within the home, typically by giving excuses that workers found on the property were visitors.\textsuperscript{199} Inspectors observed that houses in many Jewish neighborhoods were untidy, showing no effort to treat the home as a purified space that functioned as a refuge from the public, as was idealized by Victorian society. Working-class and poor Jewish mothers did not necessarily align themselves with the 'angel of the house' ideology that is presumed to be typical of white-skinned Protestant women's attitudes in England, Australia, New Zealand and America. In spite of the disorder of some Jewish
women's homes, Jewish women who earned money as out-workers may have had more control over household budgets than women in upper and middle-class families where husbands maintained control over the couple's finances and women had little to do except care for the house and children.

Jewish men and women in Sydney occasionally found full-time employment in the arts as printers and compositors, book finishers, photographers, painters and other visual artists. At least fourteen Jewish jewelers and watchmakers lived in Sydney, likely attracted by gold and gems found in the region, and with the exception of pawnshops and craftsmen, Jews were not openly engaged in the diamond trade as was common in other regions. British-Jews were appreciative of the arts and often spent part of the Sabbath enjoying London's art galleries and museums. British-Jewish women and girls created artwork that was shown in informal community art shows and local galleries and presented their work to friends and family. They were often recognized in the newspapers, through their associations with organizations such as the London's Society of Lady Artists. Rebecca Solomon, a Jewish painter in London, was recognized for her talent of creating images that seemed to be "living and breathing reproductions" of the people who sat for her portraits. Mrs. David Nathan was an oil-painter who exhibited three paintings at the Art Society of New South Wales' thirteenth annual spring exhibition. She was one of only a few Jewish people to be elected to be a member of their society. Similar to other female artists at this time, she preferred to paint images from nature, such as sunflowers and cassandra flowers. One of her paintings sold for five guineas, which was the cost of three months of training as a nurse at a lying-in-hospital. At least a few talented artists could have sold their work to pay for training in other occupations. Amelia Cohen, who was born in Sydney and resided at Potts Point, was another acclaimed Jewish artist who specialized in painting on china. Her work was highly regarded and was compared with those of skilled European artists. One of her paintings depicted a distressed ship and another was of a girl looking out a window. Early in 1901, Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis of
Sydney received a letter from Phineas B. Selig on behalf of his young daughter Mina (b. 1886), who had used pastels to create a life-size version of Davis’ image, and another one of Louis Pulver, the former headmaster at the Hebrew school who had passed away a few years earlier. He planned to have the images framed by his niece Miss Blumenthal, whose business address was in Sydney’s Queen Victoria Markets. One of these portraits was expected to be displayed at the Young People’s Industrial Exhibition along with several other paintings she created in water-colors and oils. He requested that the rabbi consent to the images being displayed at the Hebrew school following the exhibition.209 In 1896, the city of Berlin reported that there were twelve Jewish painters and seven sculptors living in the city, which is relatively similar to the number of well-paid artists in Sydney.210 Although most women did not receive monetary compensation for their artistic talents, their creativity was well-appreciated.

There were relatively few Jewish people working in the theatrical profession in Berlin in 1896, with as few as three theatre directors and eight actors listing this as their usual profession.211 When Jewish women worked as professional singers, musicians, dancers and actors they were usually unpaid, but were appreciated by the Anglo-Jewish community, partly because of the honorable role of Jewish women in the Old Testament who were praised for their ability to sing and dance.212 In the 1850s, theatres were also known to “teem with depravity and licentiousness.”213 The theatre required actors and actresses to perform on the Sabbath, and attendance at the theatre was considered a ‘desecration’ of it by those who were strictly observant in their religious practices. This negative image was offset by many amateur performances associated with performances by religious groups, fund-raising groups and schools that provided wholesome entertainment. Colonial theatre was not only entertaining, it helped reroute people’s thoughts so they were less “brooding over unpleasant reflections.”214 Public lectures were popular on Friday nights at venues such as London’s Sussex Hall.215 For most Anglo-Jews, attending a stage performance was an ideal way to spend the
Sabbath and socialized with friends and family, and for a select few it was also a paid career. Acting careers provided a few young Jewish women with travel opportunities. In 1894, Inez Isabel Bensusan (b. 1871) was a young actress from Sydney who moved to Paris to advance her professional career. A year after her arrival there she moved to London and was offered work in a well-respected company owned by Mr. and Mrs. Kendall. Bensusan toured the English countryside with them prior to performing on stage. When she returned to Sydney, she was a successful member of the University Dramatic Society. Similarly, Minna Phillips was a Sydney-born stage performer moved to Brisbane when she was seventeen in order to perform as a concert singer. Like many young singers and actresses, she sang for free at fund-raising events until she was offered payment for her services. Her initial debut came when she was performing a minor role in a “comedy-farce-operetta” at the Theatre Royal called *Pat, or the Belle of Rathbeal*. At the end of the first night, they were unsatisfied with the leading lady, and as the under-study she was asked to perform the role the following evening. Her performance under short notice was admired and she was given the lead role. She studied with Mr. Ringholder and Miss Wangenheim, as well as being a singer at the Great Synagogue in Sydney. Her talent continued to be recognized and she went on tour in New Zealand. Her most famous role was in a play called *Work and Wages*. At age twenty-three, she was single and lived with her parents as she focused on her acting career. She likely needed financial support of her family in order to survive. Esther Kahn, whose life is featured in a film, *Esther Kahn* (2000), composed two musicals that were performed in Sydney in 1894 and she was trained as an actress in London. In the nineteenth-century, actresses were often expected to have musical talent and the most successful women traveled away from their homes as they trained and performed on stage.

Providing musical entertainment was a socially accepted activity for Anglo-Jewish females. There were at least twenty-five Jewish
musicians and composers in Berlin in 1896, but in Sydney and London it appears to be rare that this was a full-time occupation. Ruby Sophia Rich was probably the most famous and well-respected female Jewish musician born in Sydney in the nineteenth-century. She was the daughter of Ada Bebarfeld of Devonshire England and Louis Rich, who had migrated to from Germany in the 1840s. They attended the Great Synagogue when they lived in Sydney, residing most of the time in the prestigious areas of Elizabeth Bay and Darling Point. Ruby was one of six children, and was born in Walgett New South Wales in 1888. In 1900, at the age of eleven, she was referred to affectionately as a "little mite" who confidently performed Chopin's Concerto from memory in front of a large audience. Parents in Sydney often sent their children to Europe to receive competent musical training, but Ruby was instructed by Josef Kretchmann, a famous master pianist. Her younger brother was tutored by a Norwegian master, Mr. Greig. In addition to her musical studies, she was provided with private lessons in French, German, History and Literature. Illana Lutman finds that Ruby's twentieth-century feminist activism was inspired by her strict father and "in a perverse way her upbringing gave her a strong and forceful personality." After providing Ruby with superior musical training that likely could have made her financially independent of her father, he instead expected her to set her career aside to find a husband, learn to "cook and run a house" Carrie Emanuel, was a successful opera singer in 1873, and Beryl Yates and Miss M. L. Chapman composed waltzes in the mid-1890s. Although many Jewish women and girls performed on stage as actors and musicians, only a few were paid regularly to perform in public, and their pay was rarely sufficient to provide financial autonomy or free women from the expectation that they should become home-makers.

Men often became aware that they wanted to become rabbis at the point when they were studying sacred texts in preparation for their Bar Mitzvah prior to the age of thirteen. Since very few Jewish girls went through the ceremony of Confirmation in Australia and England,
it is not surprising that few of them questioned their exclusion from becoming religious leaders. Rabbis in Australia were usually recruited from overseas, and there were no local seminaries that an aspiring Jewish man or woman could imagine themselves attending in Sydney. Women in these cities do not appear to have sought access to the rabbinical education that some American-Jewish women wanted to acquire. American-Jewish women reported that they had not thought to question or challenge this barrier until they saw another woman demanding equal access. Women did not make steady progress toward being ordained as rabbis until there were several local women working together to achieve that same goal.\textsuperscript{226} Although it was extremely rare, several women delivered sermons in the synagogue in England and America in the nineteenth century. At Temple Emanu-El, in San Francisco, Rachel (Ray) Frank, the daughter of Polish migrants, was the first woman to act as rabbi by preaching a sermon and reading the Scriptural passage. The audience was double that of the usual attendance and one observer described how “her words were dropping like sparks into the souls of an aroused people before her.” As she concluded the “there was a little hum of approval and satisfaction.”\textsuperscript{227} She also held services in Vancouver British Columbia at the High Holidays.\textsuperscript{228} A few Jewish women from Chicago, including at the Jewish Women’s Congress of Religions in the mid-1890s, preached and were also well-known.\textsuperscript{229} In 1981, nearly a century after Reform congregations in England and America permitted women to preach in the synagogue, Karen Soria, was ordained as the first Australian woman rabbi.\textsuperscript{230} For women to preach sermons in the synagogue the issue of men’s centrality on the main floor of the building had to be altered so that women were integrated into that space. Women in non-Jewish congregations were also discouraged from preaching, but it was more common that they were given the opportunities to influence the morality of their congregations in alternate settings.

Only a few individuals were paid on a full-time basis by the synagogues. Across Australia, the Jewish community in any location was relatively small, and the advertisements for teachers required that
successful applicants perform two or more roles, and in nearly every case, this meant that women were excluded from applying. The requisite skills needed to be a successful rabbi were not outside of women's regular sphere of activity. However, women lacked the specialized education that was required of this role. Rabbis were generally able to teach 'foreign' Kabbalah but women were excluded from studying this component of the sacred literature, which until recently, was not written for a lay audience. Even though some women could sing well and read Hebrew, they could not fill the role as the first, second or third Torah reader, or as the chazzan, because it was considered immodest and it broke the rules of the synagogue's gender segregation. Women were accustomed to organizing the labor and necessary resources for successful fund-raising events and were expected to promote morality and justice, but they were not permitted to apply their skills to fill the role as parnas, the president of the congregation. Women were no less inclined than a male rabbi to care about religious rituals related to marriages, births and deaths, and they regularly cared for the sick, treated wounds, and performed the last rites when needed, but they could not fill these roles in the same capacity as a paid rabbi. Women were not permitted to perform circumcision and become mohels, even though it was common that men filling this role in Australia were self-taught, and in Medieval Europe women had filled this role. Women inherently understood issues related to menstruation, and could become 'mikvah ladies,' but they could not alter or make official judgments about the family purity laws that governed their sexual relations, or visits to the mikvah, which were inextricably linked to women's menstrual cycles. Instead, they were encouraged to take their questions to male rabbis and allow individuals who had never menstruated to make definitive decisions about this highly personal aspect of women's lives. Women were capable of humanely butchering livestock, but were not versed in the deeper philosophy linked to this and could not become lawmakers and advisors in matters related to the shechita board that oversaw the sochetim in the area. Similarly, men maintained control over defining the proper methods of maintaining kosher kitchens, even when they
did not do the cooking in the household. Women could write calligraphy, but could not prepare the *Sepher Torah*, or scrolls of religious law even when they were fluent in Hebrew. The Jewish Literary and Debating Society and other similar groups provided women with opportunities to write papers on controversial subjects and religious matters and present their views for public debate, yet women were rarely, if ever, accepted as preachers and sermon writers. Although Jewish men and women shared a relatively equal status in a number of professions and trades, women were clearly disadvantaged in their ability to acquire the skills necessary to assist or lead the congregation in religious matters, except as teachers in classes for young children or older girls.

English and Australian husbands were not always able to support wives or start families, due to the difficulty of finding work in times of high unemployment or because they were newly arrived migrants in Sydney, a city that had limited opportunities for factory work. Female workers were rarely paid a breadwinner-wage even when they were the sole-income-earner in the family. Jewish women's work patterns differed from Protestant and Catholic women in London and Sydney and were also distinctive of Jewish occupational trends in continental Europe, notably in Berlin. Anglo-Jewish women were most likely to be employed in fairly sedentary jobs that were associated with selling products or that required high levels of dexterity, such as rolling tobacco and dressmaking. Anglo-Jewish women were disinclined toward jobs that were related to work in unclean environments or that required hard physical labor, such as domestic service and farming. Although there were many talented women who were artists, actresses and musicians, their performances were generally considered a leisure activity rather than a full-time job. The types of employment that Jewish women had the most difficulty acquiring were related to teaching religious subjects to older children in public settings. Women often needed to earn the primary income for their household as a result of being unable to find a marriage partner, or because of a husband who was absent or financially irresponsible. Jewish women
benefitted most when they moved from London to Sydney in order for the husband in the family to become a merchant, particularly in smaller towns and suburbs outside of Sydney, where the rent on buildings was less expensive and there was little competition from other merchants, making their services to the community highly valued.
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174. JEWISH MALES WHO WERE TAILORS IN SYDNEY: SOLOMON FRIEDMAN/FREIDMAN/FREIDMAN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 19, 1869; Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135: JACOB TYFELD March 25 1878, M. LEVY August 26 1878, LEWIS BURSCH, formerly of Melbourne, February 10 1879, September 26 1881, December 15 1881, MR. NOVISKY, formerly of Poland and London January 7 1885, H. EISENBERG June 30 1887, July 25 1887, WILLIAM POOLE, formerly of Melbourne March 24 1850; SAMUEL SCHWARTZBERG Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 259, 1880; MR. NOVISKY, formerly of Poland and England Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, January 7 1885; L. GREENBERG, formerly of Egypt Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, September 20 1886; Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886: HYMAN COHEN, NATHAN GOLDSTEIN, DAVID GOODMAN, MORRIS KENSALL, HARRIS LAZARUS, LEWIS LOVISKE, ISAAC ROSEN Feld, AARON JOSEPH SELIG, MORRIS SOLOMON, SIMON SOLOMON: Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135: SON OF JOSEPH MARTIN March 1 1888, MAURICE FREDMAN January 15 1889, SOLOMON HYAM, formerly of Warsaw and Melbourne April 29 1889; Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 16, 1890: JOSEPH BEAR, LEWIS COHEN, ABRAHAM KURTS; GEORGE COHEN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 826, 1893; Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home (Sydney): LEVY BERKOVITZ claimed to be a tailor in 1892 in Sydney and was sent to Melbourne, he later returned to Sydney and claimed it was his first visit and that he was a hawker not a tailor. They claimed to have “proved” his statements were incorrect April 2 1894, MR. BLOOM Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, May 20
1895; EDWARD COHEN March 18 1895, SOLOMON SKROVINSKY, formerly of Poland and New Zealand April 20 1896, ABRAHAM COOK, formerly of England October 25 1897; MARKS COHEN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 552, 1897; LAZARUS SHERMAN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 543, 1897; MORIS ISAAC PETEROSKE Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 544, 1897; AARON MARKS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 1023, 1898; ABRAHAM LEWIS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 1063, 1898; SAMUEL YOUNG Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 592, 1899; JACOB LEWIS Jewish Herald, February 3 1899, 61; MANASSEH ARTHUR LASKER Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 603, 1900; HARRIS LEVY Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 606, 1900.

175. JEWISH FEMALES WHO WERE TAILORS OR QUILTERS IN SYDNEY: MISS ESTHER ISRAEL "Jewish Emigration Society," Jewish Chronicle, May 22 1868; Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135: MISS ROGERS, formerly of England March 4 1869, MRS. MORRIS COHEN April 18 1871, REBECCA BASOB, formerly of Fiji February 25 1873; ELIZABETH WOOLFSON/WOLFSOHN, FORMERLY ISAACS AND WIFE OF HARRIS SAMUEL WOOLFSON/WOLFSOHN New South Wales Marriage Register 1222, 1877; Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135: MIRIAM BARNETT, FORMERLY PHILLIPS AND WIFE OF JOSHUA BARNETT, formerly of London December 15 1879, FANNY SILKMAN November 26 1880, MRS. GERSTMAN, formerly of Melbourne February 18 1878; MRS. HENRY PLUM Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, March 13 1888, April 12 1888; ETSY MORRIS, FORMERLY SIMMONDS AND WIFE OF HENRY MORRIS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 470 (1894); ROSE BARNETT, FORMERLY LEVY AND WIFE OF SAMUEL BARNETT Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 554 (1898); ETTIE BERNHARDT, FORMERLY NOVISKI AND WIFE OF ELIAS MOSES BERNHARDT Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 558 (1898); EMILY ABRAHAMS, FORMERLY FRANKS AND WIFE OF DAVID ABRAHAMS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 562 (1898); RACHEL GOLDBERG, FORMERLY LEVY AND WIFE OF LEWIS GOLDBERG Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 580 (1899); ESTHER BARNETT, FORMERLY HART AND WIFE OF MARK BARNETT Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 589 (1899); SARAH BEAR, FORMERLY HYAMS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 592 (1899); DEBORAH HYMAN, FORMERLY CANTOR, WIFE OF LEWIS HYMAN IN 1899 AND OF CHARLES BEAR Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 594 (1899); KATE LEVY, FORMERLY BEAR AND WIFE OF HARRIS LEVY Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 606 (1900).

176. JEWISH MACHINISTS IN SYDNEY: MRS. SILBERMAN Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home (Sydney), Box 103, March 23 1896.


180. JEWISH MILLINERS/HAT MAKERS IN SYDNEY: JULIA ISAACS, FORMERLY MENDOZA AND WIFE OF SOLOMON ISAACS Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, December 12 1882; AMELIA LEVY, FORMERLY SOLOMON AND WIFE OF SOLOMON LEVY Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886.

181. JEWISH FURRIER IN SYDNEY: JOSEPH ABRAHAMS, formerly of Russia and Hong Kong Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, December 23 1876.


184. Vogel, [Frances Vogel] MS 0178-036, October 23 1884 for quotes; Vogel, [Frances Vogel] MS 0178-034, June 26 1884; Solicitors Young, Jackson and Beard, MS 0178-023, March 10 1886.

185. Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, November 26 1880; Fitzpatrick, Oceans of Consolation, 17.

186. Vogel, [Frances Vogel] MS 0178-036, October 23 1884

188. JEWISH FACTORY WORKERS IN SYDNEY: HENRY MICHAELS, formerly of Melbourne, worked in a bedding factory Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, July 29 1884; JACOB COHEN, formerly of New Zealand, Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home (Sydney), Box 103, February 19 1894; LEWIS SOLOMON/S Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 553, 1897; MARKS GOLOMB/E Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 565, 1898; JEWISH BOOT, SHOE AND SLIPPER MAKERS IN SYDNEY: Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135: MR. ROGERS, (age 16) formerly of England March 4 1869, JOSEPH JACOBS, formerly of England February 18 1878, March 11 1878, HERMAN/HYMAN WOOLF, formerly of Dunedin New Zealand December 9 1878, December 16 1878, October 19 1887, December 11 1888, January 15 1889, SOLOMON GREEN July 19 1880, MR. SHEMSKI, formerly of Poland and Manchester England January 7 1885; Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886: DAVID CASSEL, formerly of Melbourne, S. LEVY, HENRY SOLOMON; JACOB HAYMAN, formerly of London Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, June 30 1887, July 25 1887; Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 16, 1890: SAMUEL GOLDMAN, MYER ROTHBAUM, HENRY GOLDMAN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 619, 1900.

189. JEWISH ARTIFICIAL-FLOWER MAKER IN SYDNEY: MRS. REBECCA MYERS Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886.
190. **JEWISH DYERS AND WOOL SORTER IN SYDNEY:** MICHAEL JOSEPH ISAACS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 10, 1868; SIGMUND GOLDSTEIN, formerly of Hamburg, Germany, was a WOOL SORTER Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, April 3 1879.

191. **JEWISH DRAPERS AND UPHOLSTERERS IN SYDNEY:** EMANUEL TUCKER Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, November 25 1885; ABRAHAM MAGNUS Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886; JUDAH ASSURI Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 16, 1890; BENJAMIN DE GROEN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 569 (1898); JOSEPH HENRY SALMON Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 622 (1900).

192. **JEWISH MANUFACTURERS IN SYDNEY:** DAVID LEVY Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 846, 1894; SYDNEY MOSS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 601, 1900.

193. **JEWISH WAREHOUSE WORKERS IN SYDNEY:** ISAAC MARKS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 218 (1878); JACOB HAYMAN, formerly of London, Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, June 30 1887, July 25 1887; ABRAHAM BENJAMIN PYKE Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 583 (1899); MOSS MAURICE FRIEDMAN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 618 (1900).

194. **JEWISH MANAGERS OR FOREMEN IN SYDNEY:** ELIZER LEVI MONTEFIORE, formerly of the West Indies and England, Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Registers 106 and 113, 1873; HENRY MYERS Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886; MORRIS MENSER Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 16, 1890; GUSTAVE MAX MEYER, formerly of Germany, Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home (Sydney), Box 103, October 28 1895.


196. **JEWISH CLOTHIERS IN SYDNEY:** ABRAHAM COHEN, formerly of Melbourne, Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, May 3 1883; Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886; ABRAHAM GOLDBERG, ABRAHAM RODGERS/ROGERS, SARAH DE GROEN, WIFE OF SAMPSON/SIMPSON DE GROEN; SAMUEL SCHWARTZBERG Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 841 (1894); SOLOMON LOUIS GOLDFIELD Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 557 (1898); MYER MITCHELL Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 559 (1898); LIONEL LEVY Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 610 (1900).

197. **JEWISH ACCOUNTANTS AND BOOKKEEPERS IN SYDNEY:** JOHN NATHAN ISAACS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 13, 1868; Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886; LEWIS LEVY, SIMEON FRANKEL, LOUIS PHILLIPS; CHARLES A. REUBEN Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 16, 1890; LEOPOLD ALFRED WILLIAM MOSS Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963,
Register 551, 1897; Celia E. Harris was employed by her brother Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 18, to Rabbi Alexander Barnard Davis January 4 1898; Leon Levine Victorsen Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 611, 1900.

200. "Notes of the Week," Jewish Chronicle, March 9 1888, 5; Benjamin, "Eliezer Montefiore," 311-340; Burke, Australian Women Artists; Cherry, Beyond the Frame; Cherry, Painting Women; Gaze, Mihajlovic and Shrimpton, Dictionary of Women Artists; Germaine, Dictionary of Women Artists in Australia; Schwarz, Jewish Artists of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.


200. Jewish Printers and Compositors in Sydney: Amelia Harris was a Compositor Jewish Museum of Australia, From Where We Have Come; Mr. H. Fisheelson, formerly of Jerusalem, was a printer Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, July 12 1881.

201. Jewish Book Finisher in Sydney: Joseph Lipschiz, formerly of Melbourne Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135, August 30 1881.

202. Jewish Photographers in Sydney: George Baron Goomdan, an English Jew, was one of the earliest Photographers in Sydney in 1843 Allision, "Photo May Be Our Earliest," Sydney Morning Herald, June 22 1891; Joseph Flohm Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886.

Jewish Female Artists in Sydney: Miss Amelia Cohen's paintings were in a show. "Notes and News," Jewish Herald, March 1880; Mrs. David Nathan "Sydney," Jewish Herald, September 21 1892.

203. Jewish Artists Who Sold Their Art in Public in Sydney: Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society, Box 135: Joseph Cohen was a Scene Painter December 4 1876, Louis Petrovitz January 27 1880, Samuel Taylor, formerly of England, was a Printer and Glazer April 21 1884; Lee Lampie, formerly of Queensland, was a Glass Stainer and Maker of Plaster of Paris Figures July and August 1887; Mrs. Sierlah Nathan, Formerly Cohen and Wife of David Nathan Jewish Herald, September 21 1892; Paintings by Female Artists Were Shown at the Royal Academy in Sydney in 1896, and the Following Women Who Contributed Their Art Are Thought to Be Jewish: Australasian Hebrew, June 19 1896; Miss Edith Jacobs, Miss Annette Elias, Miss Edith Lazarus, Miss Mabel Levy, Mrs. Cohen, Mary F. Raphael; From England:
“Society of Lady Artists,” Jewish Chronicle, February 7 1896, 18; **BERT A. LEVY** Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 941, 1896; **MISS MINNA SELIG** Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 18, 1900, April 29 1901; **JOE WOLINSKI** sold a PAINTING to the Sydney Art Gallery for £200, however it cost him £180 to create “Successful Jewish Artist,” Hebrew Standard of Australasia, August 24 1900; **ALSO SEE** FAMOUS MELBOURNE ARTISTS PHILLIP E. ZOX AND ELIZER LEVI MONTEFIORE: Zubans, E. Phillip Fox; Fox, E. Phillips Fox and His Family; E. Phillips Fox, Folder 346; Benjamin, “Eliezer Montefiore”; Faebter, “Eliezer Levi Montefiore.”

204. **JEWISH JEWELERS IN SYDNEY:** SIMON SOLOMON Sand’s directory (1875, 1876); SAMUEL KASKER Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7967, Register 378, 455, 1885; Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Folder 40, 1886: HERMAN BLACKSTONE, WILLIAM BRASCH, BENJAMIN BRAUN, ABRAHAM COHEN, JOSEPH LEVY, MEYER MANDEL, SOLOMON MARKS, PHILIP MITCHELL; SARAH ISRAEL, FORMERLY COLLINS AND WIFE OF ISAAC ISRAEL Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 16, 1890; SOLomon COHEN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 548, 1897; SAMUEL JOEL BORNSTEIN/BRONSTEIN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 575, 1898; BERNARD DE GROEN Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 566, 1898.


206. “Pictures by Miss Rebecca Solomon,” Jewish Chronicle, August 20 1875, 334.


209. Jewish Board of Education (Sydney), Box 18, April 29 1901.


363
216. **PROFESSIONAL JEWISH FEMALE ACTRESSES IN SYDNEY:** MISS INEZ BENSUSAN, DAUGHTER OF SAMUEL LEVY BENSUSAN, was an actress in Sydney in 1894 and in London in 1895. Jewish Herald, January 26 1894; Jewish Herald, September 6 1895; Hebrew Standard of Australasia, December 6 1895; Australasian Hebrew, December 6 1895; MISS MINNA PHILLIPS, was an actress in Sydney in 1896 and had acted in shows in New Zealand prior to this year. Australasian Hebrew, January 10 1896; JACOB AND SYRA FRIEDMAN, FORMERLY BLOUSTEIN, Great Synagogue (Sydney), MS 7963, Register 539, 1897.


219. MISS ESTHER KAHN, DAUGHTER OF BERHNARDT KAHN, her musical compositions were ‘Souvenir de Sydney’ and ‘Reverie.’ Jewish Herald, May 4 1894; Jewish Herald, June 29 1894; “New South Wales,” Jewish Chronicle, July 6 1894; Jewish Herald, November 13 1896; Jewish Herald, October 26 1900.


224. **JEWISH FEMALES WHO WERE PROFESSIONAL MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS IN SYDNEY:** CARRIE EMANUEL, performed ‘Rose of Castile,’ which had received favorable reviews. She also played Amina in ‘La Sonnambula’ “Successful Debutante,” Australian Israelite, August 22 1873; MISS BERYL YATES composed a waltz “Shantilla,” Hebrew Standard of Australasia, December 6 1895; MISS M. L. CHAPMAN composed a waltz ‘We Two,’ which was dedicated to the Viscount and Viscountess of Haneden and was played at the Sydney Botanical Gardens in 1896. Australasian Hebrew, June 5 1896.


230. Soria, Folder 1152.


232. Ben-Amos and Mintz, In Praise of the Baal Shem Tov; Besserman, New Kabbalah for Women; Bonder, Kabbalah of Envy; Bonder, Kabbalah of Money; Cooper, God is a Verb; Heckler, Mystical Bodies, Mystical Meals; Samuel, Kabbala Handbook.

233. Baumgarten, Mothers and Children, 67; Grossman, Pious and Rebellious, 190; Goldman, Beyond the Synagogue Gallery, 71, relates to American context but applies to Australia and England.
Chapter 9: Community Work by Anglo-Jewish Women and Girls: 'Amazon's Service.'

The communal work and fund-raising activities of nineteenth-century British and Australian-Jewish women have not been fully recognized by scholars, partly because their activism tended to be unhinged to feminist activities. Peter Gordon and David Dougan's *Dictionary of Women's Organizations 1825-1860*, and Frank Prochaska's *Women and Philanthropy in Nineteenth-century England*, included a few references to Jewish charities, but the broad scope of these books meant that these entries represented brief starting points for later scholars. English-speaking women in the nineteenth-century were expected to express their 'passion' through their role as mothers to society. Women promoted morality and acted as role-models when they worked toward charitable causes. In the 1850s, prominent Catholic reformer Caroline Chisholm recognized that women who advanced the needs of poor people ultimately discover that "they must occupy themselves with the political arrangements which tend to make or mar the happiness" of millions. Jewish-feminist scholars Hava Tirosh-Rothschild and Susan Starr Sered, among others, have requested that future studies of Jewish women should place attention on women's empowerment as well as their lack of participation within public settings. The second half of the century is a fruitful period to examine since women's role in public affairs was increasingly active and political across most religious groups in English-speaking countries.

The popular belief is that nineteenth-century Australian and British-Jewish women spent most of their time in charitable activities 'knitting booties' for men's fundraising efforts. Suzanne Rutland's research on Australian-Jewish women, affirms that women's participation in charitable groups was substantial. However, she finds that from the initial phases of Jewish settlement until the 1920s, their involvement in public affairs was not "prominent," and that they were
modest and assisted in female-oriented philanthropic activities where they remained "subordinate to male efforts." She indicates this was due to "strong male opposition to any possible interference by women in the running of the community." Hilary Rubinstein's perspective is that Jewish communal involvement was "blunted" in Australia in the 1860s by apathy, fear of anti-Semitism, and the death of the oldest members of the community, but much of her research was focused on Melbourne rather than Sydney. Karla Goldman contributes to the discussion of community groups through her research on Cincinnati in the 1850s, where she finds that Jewish women's activities in Benevolent Associations were curbed as they were able to participate more fully within the synagogue. I find that Australian and English Jewish women increased their involvement in the synagogue throughout the second half of the nineteenth-century, similar to American women. However, in the American Far West, where Jewish life was more similar to communities in Australian cities, William Toll finds that Jewish wives from Eastern-European families were rarely expected to exercise independent judgment until they migrated to America, because women needed to assist each other when their husbands traveled regularly for commercial reasons. In the absence of long-established Jewish charities, women began assisting men by accepting "major communal responsibility," which had previously been reserved for men.10 In this chapter I evaluate some of the public roles held by women that were unpaid and that were attainable irrespective of women's educational achievements, in order to recognize the tangible benefits that women provided to the Jewish communities of London and Sydney, particularly through their fund-raising efforts that were sustained not only by their persistence and ingenuity, but also by their hand-made sewn goods, such as 'hand-knit booties.' Through an investigation of previously underutilized primary source material, I build upon the research findings of Rutland, Rubinstein, Toll and Goldman and observe the distinctiveness of Jewish women in relation to Jewish men and Catholic and Protestant women.

Jewish women differed in their charity work from Christian and Catholic women who were interested in "saving souls" through
Nineteenth-century Jews occasionally referred to ‘sins’ but they carefully avoided the subject of ‘heaven’ and ‘hell,’ which meant that women were not engaged in a battle to prevent anyone from ‘going to hell,’ or encouraging them to aspire to ‘go to heaven’ after they died. Jewish women were less likely to quote scriptural passages to justify their efforts to modify male behavior because they were not as well-educated in Jewish sacred texts, such as the Talmud, the Mishna, and even the Old Testament or Torah, in comparison to men, and they often lacked knowledge of the New Testament as well. Jewish women’s Visiting Societies were focused on influencing women to be more observant on the Sabbath each Saturday. The Ladies’ Sanitary Association in London was devoted to helping poor people understand Jewish sanitary laws, such as maintaining kosher kitchens and following the laws of Niddah. In 1896, Rabbi Jacob Henry Landau’s wife Phoebe explained in her column under the pen-name Miriam that “intelligent minds” could not overlook the “problem of the poor.” She saw that single women, particularly those who did not have to contribute an income to their households, were in a unique position to benefit from their work in charitable causes because their talents were not left “dormant.”

Jewish women agreed with Protestant and Catholic women that poor people improved themselves after being assisted into better social conditions, and this served as proof that the poverty caused by anti-Semitism was not a sign of moral inferiority. English and Australian Jews did not necessarily support the Protestant values that kept the British Poor Law in place. Non-Jews in the colonies also criticized this law because they believed it created a “class of dependent poor stuck in a poverty trap” and failed to reduce poverty levels. In 1859, a sympathetic Jewish correspondent named ‘H’ promoted the belief that poor people did not “require money alone,” but needed “encouragement to strive for a livelihood.” In 1862, another Jewish Londoner observed that a “true and cheering word” could be more beneficial to a “wretched mother” than a “donation of money or clothes, needful in their place.” In 1888, as more migrants from Eastern-Europe arrived in London, a Jewish writer expressed the opinion that in the absence of
financial stability, "in ninety-nine cases of a hundred, spiritual well-being cannot be preserved." When reformers shifted the blame for social problems away from the character-traits of individuals and onto social and environmental causes, it promoted democratic values and helped reduce the impact of anti-Semitism, racism and classism.

Many cities across the world established a Jewish Benevolent Society by the late 1850s, even in areas with small Jewish populations that could not afford to hire a rabbi. Women typically visited poor people in their homes and assisted them with food, coals, firewood, money and blankets. They often crossed boundaries of religion to include non-Jews in their fund-raising balls that served as a vital form of entertainment in small towns. Although Jews arrived in Sydney in 1788, it wasn't until 1833 that the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic Society was formed. In 1844, the Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Institution for the Relief of Distressed Married Females of the Jewish Faith During their Confinement was founded in Sydney with a committee, officers, and president who were all women. The only man in the organization was the doctor. Women were also the primary subscribers and donors of material goods for this charity.

In 1842, London had roughly thirty Jewish charities, and by 1872 there were nearly a hundred organizations devoted to supporting Jewish life in the city. It is estimated that at mid-century more than half of the Jewish population were from the working-class or were "poor." In 1849, London's Jewish Ladies' Loan and Visiting Society assisted 334 clients with loans. In spite of the number of organizations devoted to assist the poor, it difficult to distinguish between the Jewish working and middle classes since many people had "attained an unprecedented degree of prosperity."

Women who contributed financially to the welfare of charities run by men may not have had the power to regulate the distribution of their donations, but they had a great deal of autonomy in how they approached their fund-raising efforts within male-governed charities and organizations. Jewish men requested assistance from women on
regular basis and saw women’s participation as being integral to the success of Jewish communal affairs. In 1871, there was speculation that the successful management of the Jewish Emigration Society in London resulted from the efficiency of the ladies who were believed to be better managers than men. In 1872, in relation to women’s management of the Jewish Ladies’ Benevolent Loan and Visiting Society in London, it was observed that men were not always as exacting in the way they conducted “public business” in comparison to how they ran their “own private affairs.” One writer appreciated women’s managerial skills of “organization, economy and judgment,” which they could “import into public matters,” since these were the talents they relied upon to “render the homes of their husbands and children happy and well-ordered.” In 1879, another writer explained that it was a “popular delusion” to believe that women were more easily influenced than men by “sentimental considerations” as they managed charity funds, which suggests that women were still struggling for full recognition of their abilities. This writer recommended women as managers who were less-inclined to “be gushing and to yield readily to a piteous, but ill founded, appeal.” Women were also considered ideal administrators because they had more time available to investigate matters carefully and were willing to discuss issues in greater depth as they assessed a situation. Women’s fresh ideas provided an alternative to the “machine-like system” that was set up by men. Women’s battle for social changes was perceived to be rooted in education and was ‘bloodless,’ which supported the maxim that the “tongue and pen are far better than the sword.” A Jewish Londoner supported women’s contributions and authority within communal affairs by affirming that the “separation of the sexes in synagogue need not be carried out in communal matters,” and felt that it would only benefit society if men and women worked “harmoniously together in the sacred cause of charity.”

Historian Gerda Lerner finds that women have a long history of sacrificing their social and familial ties in order to engage in public activities, such as becoming social reformers. Prior to 1900, the Jewish community in Sydney was small, which meant that when
women and girls were active in Jewish communal organizations it was possible to publish their names along with the accomplishments of their organization in the newspaper. I found that women were most often working aside extended family members. This meant that Jewish mothers in Sydney were nearly immune from criticisms that they had abandoned their familial responsibilities in order to move into the public sphere to promote the welfare of others. In Sydney, girls as young as eight years old joined a variety of short-term groups to support fund-raising bazaars, sewing bees as well as to permanent groups such as the Jewish Girls' Guild and the Band of Young Workers. Fund-raising became an arena where mothers taught their daughters about the value of social networking, economics, accounting, merchandising, hand-craft skills, as well as lessons about social propriety and the consequences of living in poverty. Women's administration of charity events was generally reported to be efficient, and the donated money usually went straight to the intended source rather than to paying salaries of charity workers. These practical lessons by mothers were accomplished largely by working in small groups composed exclusively of Jewish females, but often toward larger social events or sales where their efforts interfaced with Jewish men and with non-Jews who showed their support by becoming consumers or attendees of the events.

Jewish men viewed women's charity events as a component of their social lives, as well as being among the strongest financial contributors to their causes. Their appreciation of the assistance women and girls offered was meaningful, primarily because for many years they handled all of the arrangements for fund-raising events, including decorating the halls before fancy-balls, without the assistance of women. In 1895, Milly Goldberg of London felt certain that Jewish men would assist local women who wanted to form a club similar to the Beth Hamedrash by providing them with books printed in English. Another example of men's cooperation with women's goals was that Mr. Louis R. Wilson, the owners of Wilson's Steam Laundry in Sydney's Surry Hills, was one of the most active Jewish
philanthropists in the city. He and other men were pleased to accept the invitations by the women who were organizing the Jewish Board of Education's fund-raising ball in June of 1897. Another example is that the men on the board of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home assisted the Sydney Jewish Young Girls' Guild by allowing them to use their board room for their sewing classes and they were permitted to leave their sewing machines there between lessons. In 1899, the Home's board of management decided that the women should have the "full power to arrange matters in all minor cases" and they changed by-law number one so that their committee consisted of four men and three women, with four members needed to form a quorum. Within the first few months the committee observed significant improvements in the way the Home was organized, supplied and cleaned, and their expenses were lower, which prompted them to unanimously pass a vote of thanks for the changes made by the women in their group. When men were asked to participate in women's fund-raising events they responded favorably and there were few instances of tension between men and women in Sydney in relation to the management of charity matters and fund-raising efforts.

Jewish women were valued for their nurturance, as well as for their monetary contributions, their arrangements for fund-raising events and their managerial skills. In London, wealthy women provided substantial leadership as well, including women from the de Rothschild and Montefiore families, along with published authors including Anna Maria Goldsmid (1805-1889). In 1845, Lady Rolle and Lady Montefiore of London held positions of authority as the vice-patronesses to the Jews' Orphan Asylum in Goodman's Fields, which was established in 1831. In Sydney, there were several communal organizations that were managed entirely or partially by women. The most active groups included the Sydney Jewish Aid Society, the Hebrew Ladies' Dorcas Society, the Jewish Girls' Guild, and the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home. The Home was maintained by a matron or a 'lady superintendent.' Julia Solomon (1826-1914) was known as 'the Grand Old Lady of Sydney Jewry' because of her contributions to the community. Her husband Lewis Wolfe Levy (1815-1885), was
president of the Macquarie Street congregation. They both migrated to Australia prior to marrying in 1845, and lived in New South Wales in Maitland, Tamworth and in Potts Point in Sydney. They had fifteen children, thirteen of whom survived. After her husband died, Mrs. Lewis W. Levy, as she was usually known, donated £1300 to three educational and health-care facilities that assisted Jewish residents. At that time she gave another £2500 to fourteen non-Jewish hospitals and schools. Her assistance was not limited to these donations. She was actively involved with the local Hebrew School and was a financial supporter, an honorary treasurer and life-time Vice President for the Sydney Jewish Aid Society. Women such as Mrs. A. Hoffnung also were highly valued for their “incessant and unostentatious efforts on behalf of the poor” and she was considered one of the “warmest friends” of the Sydney Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home. The National Council for Women formed in New South Wales in 1896 and was modeled after the National Council for Jewish Women of America, which was formed eight years earlier. The International Council of Jewish Women was formed in 1899, demonstrating that women’s ability to financially sustain organizations and influence society was part of a global trend that was concurrent and compatible with the goals of non-Jewish women in English-speaking countries, who were also working to benefit society. Jewish men offered little overt resistance to women’s efforts prior to 1900 in Sydney and evidence suggests that this was also the case in London.

In the 1880s, close to a decade prior to the economic depression that affected all religious groups in the 1890s, Jewish migrants fled anti-Semitic conditions in Europe and economically, it caused a “period of extraordinary distress” in London and Sydney. Jewish migrants who arrived in London were often poor, unskilled, non-English-speaking and had chronic health conditions. By 1884, it was estimated that roughly a quarter of English-Jews received charity. Due to England’s close proximity to Europe, wealthier Jews in London felt that the economic drain on their communal resources from incoming migrants was greater than that faced by New York’s Jewish charities.
The London Jewish Board of Guardians was one nearly a hundred organizations that assisted poor Jews, and in 1889, they assisted at least 3,391 cases. Many migrants were provided with return passages to their native countries, or were sent overseas, primarily to Australia, New Zealand and America.

Many of the Jews who were sent to Sydney by London's Jewish Board of Guardians had not been well-integrated into British society prior to their arrival. There were complaints by the Sydney Hebrew Philanthropic and Orphan Society that European-Jews were arriving "without means of obtaining even a loaf for their families," which led to them being stigmatized as the "foreign poor." As early as 1879, the Sydney board had already requested that the London Board of Guardians limit the number of "practically penniless" families that were sent to Australia since they did not have the resources to sustain pensioners who were not fit to work after they arrived. The poorest migrants were 'pauperized' when they were unable to find work and were reliant upon charity. Among the migrants requesting assistance in Sydney, only a few arrived by way of government assisted passages. Most of them had paid for the fare themselves or were assisted by friends, family or a Jewish charity from another city. Of the Jewish migrants that arrived in Sydney after living in England between 1866 and 1900, there were at least nineteen family groups, twelve single men, and two women who were the head of their household. Seven husbands and one wife also arrived from England without their spouses. They requested assistance after they arrived and often needed assistance over a longer period of time, which suggests that some migrants remained economically disadvantaged many years after their arrival in Australia.

The statements made by Jewish charity recipients to the Sydney Philanthropic and Orphan Society and the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish home reveal that only a few of them had received assistance from non-Jewish charities in Sydney or while they were in England or other cities. Jewish women avoided joining Protestant charity groups for the same reason they did not wish to be recipients of their charity; they
wanted to avoid being proselytized or subjected to anti-Semitic remarks. When Jews and Christians contributed financially and socially to each other’s charity and fund-raising events, it was a crucial advance for Jews since it alleviated a sense of shame, which was perceived by some English-Jews to be more detrimental than legal disabilities. In 1890, Rabbi Albert Lowy’s sermon at London’s Berkeley Street Synagogue encouraged Jews to assist the poor without regard to the religion of the recipient. Hannah de Rothschild, widow of Nathan Mayer de Rothschild, was not uncommon in that she subscribed to a wide range of Jewish and Christian charities and it was observed that “She loved them all.” As the Jewish middle-class slowly expanded, they were able to purchase the markers of social status and make donations to charities that visibly demonstrated that wealth and respectability were not reserved primarily for upper-class white Christians.

When women and girls could not afford to donate large sums of money, they combined their own money along with donations they solicited from wealthier individuals, which meant that even poor women could raise substantial funds for charity. Sydney’s Great Synagogue is the largest synagogue in the southern hemisphere and women provided a large portion of the donations that paid the £30,000 bill for the cost of the building. Forty-three married women and twenty-eight unmarried women and girls made donations to the building fund, and several exceptional donations were made by Mrs. Maurice Alexander who donated £125, and Mrs. S. Harris who provided one-hundred pounds. Several married women also bequeathed money to the building fund, including Mrs. David Barnett and Mrs. H. Elias who each willed fifty pounds, and Mrs. Agnes Simmons who willed one-hundred pounds. In 1875, Sydney’s Jewish women held a fund-raising bazzar to help pay for the building and their advertising reflected men’s approval of their efforts: “All people who go to fancy fairs, and that means all men who love young ladies,” which was defined to mean “all men worth knowing,” would be “relieved by the very sensible announcement made by the Hebrew
ladies' about the upcoming event. Embroidered fabric bookmarks were created to commemorate the sale. They sold products at or below retail cost and the event was held in December to attract Christmas shoppers. Seven women had stalls at the bazaar, and roughly a quarter of their total earnings were from the stall of Mrs. Sigmond Hoffnung, formerly known as Elizabeth Marks. After many months of planning, women raised £4227 to help pay the building costs in just a few days.

In spite of the substantial contributions women made to assist Sydney's Great Synagogue financially, the congregation's bank account was overdrawn the year after the building was completed. In 1891, their board of management reported a rise in expenses and suggested that their financial situation came about because the congregation was not contributing sufficiently to the "voluntary offerings," and those who made offerings during their "semi-annual appeals" in the past had ceased to do so, which was attributed to the economic depression. They estimated an annual loss of £500 and the board wanted to avoid reverting to what they described as an "old and objectionable system of making offerings at the reading of the Torah." They warned that such a system might be "forced on the congregation" unless donations increased. Women were not called to the Torah and would not have participated directly under this system except when making donations through male relatives. The board hoped to uphold the new arrangement they made in 1890 whereby "seat holders and visitors" were given the option of pledging offerings on Sabbaths and holidays. Women may have felt more encouragement to donate under their existing scheme even though they were less likely than men to have finances to donate. The congregation's leaders appealed to people's sense of honor and admonished them for their "reprehensible disregard" of their debts and reminded that these were not only legal obligations but also sacred ones. In 1894, they reduced expenses and collected past debts in order to "mitigate" the economic slump. They continued pleading for the congregation to pay for their seats and encouraged visitors to rent the "large number
of vacant sittings." In 1897, women joined men in their effort to reduce their bank overdraft of three-hundred pounds. In conjunction with the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, the board noted that the "ladies of our congregation have kindly undertaken the management" of the Self-Denial Fund. Women's "zealous efforts" raised £682 during the "Ten Penitential Days." The Chief Rabbi reduced his salary and the congregation paid for the overdraft amount and preserved women's ability to contribute to the congregation under their existing system. They were able to afford maintenance costs related to their sanitary arrangements, which in 1889 had curtailed student's ability to attend the Jewish Board of Education classes that were held at the synagogue. In 1900, the congregation was clear of debts. That year they reported renting nineteen new seats, showing that the community was still growing, even though many long-standing Jewish residents in the city were passing away due to old age. The congregation's financial difficulties were overcome only after men and women worked together toward that mutual goal. Women's financial offerings were highly valued by the men in the congregation and women's efforts were lateral with men's rather than being dictated to women.

Christian women in Australia, England, America and Germany often sought to control men's sexuality, as well as their drinking habits, through their public activism in social groups and philanthropic causes. Reformers argued that because women were potential mothers they needed to protect the 'home' by keeping the community safe and free from vice and crime. Reducing prostitution by curbing male sexuality in Jewish society was expected to be accomplished through the intervention of other men, such as rabbis, rather than by mothers and wives, which made Jewish women less inclined to join groups based on the goal of controlling men's activities. Jewish women reformers helped women avoid becoming prostitutes, and to a lesser extent aided unwed mothers and women with sexually transmitted diseases. Jewish women who were prostitutes in London were written about in relatively neutral terms.
when compared with the scathing critiques of Jewish men who were working in the narrow range of occupations that were permitted to them after living under discriminatory governments. These occupations included working as, money-lenders, and corrupt financiers were referred to as being part of the "gutter brigade" and they were likened to a "malignant canker." The reluctance of Jewish men and women to dividing themselves from each other over this issue is also evident in an observation that the average Jewish woman would "consider it a violation of chastity, propriety, and duty, to desert her household duties," or "neglect her family," in order to attend public demonstrations such as Temperance meetings. Unlike Protestant and Catholic women, there were few complaints on the part of British and Australian-Jewish women that their husbands beat them after drinking excessively. Polish and Russian Jewish men were also known for their sobriety. Historian Jeanne Abrams finds that Jewish women in the American West hoped to curb prostitution and were engaged in the Temperance movement, but that this was "rarely the central focus of their social welfare work." Domestic abuse often escalates in response to poverty and this may explain why Jewish women focused on the economic well-being of women and families rather than on Temperance work.

Jews and Catholics drink alcohol in moderation as part of their religious rituals as well as at meals and they generally opposed Temperance campaigns by Protestants who advocated teetotalism. Temperance was not popular among Jews who believed people are more attracted to what is forbidden and that "young people who drink a glass of wine or beer at their parents' table," will not become "drunkards" or "temperance fanatics." Among residents in Sydney, it was most common that alcohol was mentioned in relation to wholesome events, such as kosher fund-raising dinners, fancy-dress balls and weddings. In 1900, Mrs. Abraham Sonnenfeld donated the kosher wine for the Kiddush prayers said at weddings held at Sydney's Great Synagogue. Although Jewish society was often based on the separation of men and women, it was more common that they
consumed alcohol together, which was nearly the reverse situation for Catholic and Protestant women whose husbands left the house and socialized in public spaces among other men as they drank. One observer explained that when a Jewish man drank or played cards, “his wife and children are not excluded from the same pleasure.”

There were Jewish men and women in Sydney who had social problems because they drank alcohol abusively. Mrs. Harris, a pensioner at the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, was reported several times for having a drinking problem. Joseph Abrahams reported her to the board of management and she was also observed being drunk on two Sabbaths in October of 1868. She denied the charges and was given a good testimonial by someone who knew her landlady. However, two years later, she was again accused of “continually getting drunk” and “even selling her food to obtain drink.” In many societies women who drank alcohol in the nineteenth-century were stigmatized and assumed to be sexually promiscuous. Other male pensioners at the Home were also reported to the board of management for their drinking habits. The board encouraged the sobriety of all residents and attempted to punish them by withholding their pensions, but women’s drunkenness was not treated differently or as more of a scandal than when men were reported. In 1899, Protestant reformers in New South Wales were so convinced that alcohol was the cause of social problems that they outlawed the sale of alcohol to Aboriginal-Australians, whereas Jewish women reformers might instead have sought to remedy problems by instituting fair wages and educational programs in order to curb the poverty that led to domestic abuse and alcoholism.

Charlotte de Rothschild, was one of the founding members of London’s Jewish Ladies’ Benevolent Loan and Visiting Society in 1854. She provided the inspiration for Constance Flower, formerly de Rothschild, in her work of improving the circumstances of Jewish females in London. She also worked the Association for the Protection of Girls and Women and highlighted the need to protect migrant women as they arrived in London from Continental Europe. In Flower’s
role as honorary secretary of the Society for Preventative and Rescue Work in London, she helped establish a home for girls in 1883. Most of those who were assisted had been victimized as recent migrants and found themselves “entrapped and ruined by miscreants” seeking “easy prey.”97 The society had a worker who went to the shipping docks to assist Jewish women in the area who did not speak English. They helped prosecute and convict two men who robbed a Jewish woman. They speculated that she had not been met by anyone when she arrived in London. They also encouraged rabbis in other countries to prevent young women from relocating to London without resources.98

Gender-segregated clubs that were based on religious values provided Jewish women with a space where they could socialize in an environment that wasn’t hostile to their distinctive religious and cultural traditions. There were numerous clubs in London and Sydney that were similar to the Catholic Young Men’s Guild and the Young Men’s Christian Association, in that they provided a basis for individuals of a religious group to socialize and relieve those in need of assistance. Although the latter clubs excluded Jews from membership, one observer noted that “no Jew has ever attempted by any means to consider their establishment as a menace to him, or object when he finds that he is excluded from participation in their benefits by its religious principle.”99 Although English-speaking Jews were excluded from many social clubs that were based on Catholicism and Protestantism, they often expressed discomfort at the prospect of socializing with non-Jews because they felt it would lead to intermarriage and weaken their already small population.100

Reformers hoped that their ‘preventative’ work would reduce the need for ‘rescue work.’ The practice of having upper-class women create deliberate friendships with poor women in order to influence them positively was considered a failure by those who felt that real friendships had to develop spontaneously.101 It was hoped that if these visits seemed artificial at first, over time they would become a “means of bridging over the chasm created by difference of station,”102 which was what made them so valuable.103 The Jewish Ladies’ West-end
Charity hoped to "make the rich personally acquainted with the poor," which suggests that wealthy women were expected to broaden their views as they learned more about the experiences of poor women. Reformers believed that girls who participated in clubs were less desirous of the "idle companionship of lads," which could have reduced premarital pregnancy rates. In 1884, Constance Flower was determined to devote more time to having personal contact with Jewish women living in the West End. The following year, she was working with "tremendous ardour," and felt satisfied that "something bona fide" was progressing. With financial assistance provided by the Jewish community, she and her sister Annie Yorke (both formerly de Rothschild) provided a "refuge" for economically disadvantaged women by providing them with a space to socialize with upper-class women. They were active supporters of the Club for Jewish Girls in 1884, and the Girls' West Central Friday Night Club in 1888. The latter club provided girls with a place to gather for the Sabbath without the "temptations of the cheap music halls and tawdry entertainments." They also worked with the West Central Jewish Girls' Club, which was organized by Jewish reformer Emily Marion Harris (d 1900). This club provided working-class girls with food, such as strawberries and cream, in a rented hall where they could socialize during the week. In 1888, the Jewish Ladies' Association had assisted forty-five women, seventeen of whom had became domestic servants. Three women were able to marry, another three migrated, but a few relapsed "into their former mode of life." The majority of them were young enough to return to their parents homes. Flower hosted some of their meetings at her residence, and made arrangements for the furnishings in the Home. She hired the superintendent and was responsible for the Matron of the home and ultimately for the conduct of the girls who lived there. Although she found the magnitude of the work overwhelming at times, she also observed that she was less consumed by the frivolity of high society, preferring to spend her time on "works which show some result." When she took a holiday by the sea, she reflected upon her goals and was satisfied with her "full life." In spite of the "high pressure,"
she hoped to write another book, and wanted to maintain personal contact with the women and girls she associated with in various charitable organizations. In 1890, Flower and Harris worked on behalf of the Society for Befriending Young Girls. Their aim was to “succor, to lift up those ashamed and shameful sisters who would otherwise continue a course of degradation.” One of their benefit concerts was attended by Princess Louise (1848-1939), who was provided with classical music selections, including some that were distinctly Jewish, such as Byron’s Hebrew melodies by Henschel. The event also included recitations and some comedy. A decade later, Flower eulogized Harris upon her death, as did Rabbi Morris Joseph of the Berkeley Street Synagogue. He hailed her as “one of the best types of the English Jewess” because of her work with poor people.

In 1899, Harris’ efforts were linked to the expansion of the West Central Girls’ Club in order to provide classes in hand-crafts, language study, singing, cooking, laundering, and gymnastics. Harris’ contact with young women was reported to be successful because it was genuine and free of condescension. Although the abuse of vulnerable women and girls was considered the “dark side of Jewish life,” women involved in ‘rescue work’ felt that “Only mischief can result from covering up a wound in the body-politic” and it is evident that wealthy women found intrinsic rewards in their contact with lessfortunate women. Visiting clubs benefitted young women who were seeking social contacts that might lead to placement in jobs or to suitable marriage partners, as well as providing them with time to converse on intellectual subjects.

In Australia, girls’ clubs and visiting societies were modeled after the ones founded in London. In 1890, Maud Stanley’s Clubs for Working Girls was written for a wide female readership in order to expose the conditions of working-class girls who came home to rooms that were over-crowded with family members, as was shown in the film Esther Kahn. Overcrowding was thought to be detrimental to the well-being of modest young women. In 1896, Flora Rosenhain, of Melbourne’s suburb of Richmond, described one of their social clubs
and suggested that women in Sydney would benefit from a similar establishment. In her neighborhood, hundreds of girls spent the larger part of their day at "some monotonous uninteresting task, often amidst noisy machinery, in hot impure air," and in the evenings they avoided returning to their crowded lodgings by walking on the main streets where they might "pick up chance companions" and be enticed into "visiting hotels, music halls, dancing saloons, and even worse resorts." It was hoped that these same girls would prefer to be in the company of "other girls, playing, singing, dancing, or having games under the leadership of a member of the committee." For a small fee, the club provided them with a small drawing-room that was "all their own," and for an additional fee also gave them the option of taking classes in "cooking, mending, hygiene and gymnastics." They also provided some free social events, a visiting society for members who suffering from illnesses, a library and for the afternoon workbreak, girls could enjoy light refreshments at wholesale prices. Two years after Rosenhain's recommendation, the Sydney Jewish Social Club formed and provided similar activities. The club was expected to be a home-like atmosphere where young Jewish people could meet "without their elders having cause to fear" that they might meet "undesirable associates." Clubs provided an alternative to the "at home" visits "when the juniors have not the chance of enjoying themselves after their own fashion," out of "deference" to their "seniors who do not care about dancing." In 1900, the club functioned as more than a space for Jewish people to socialize. They sold 250 tickets to a fund-raising ball to pay for a bed in a local hospital with the support of Rabbis Alexander Barnard Davis, Jacob Henry Landau and Philip Philippstein. Mrs. Buttel provided kosher meat for the event. Visiting clubs bolstered Jewish women's educations, their ability to socialize with other Jewish women, and provided them with opportunities to raise funds so that they could contribute to the welfare of the wider community in a setting that was accepting of kosher cooking and other Jewish religious observances.
In the period between the 1840s and 1900, historical sources from London and Sydney reflect that the Jewish communities had numerous social and charitable organizations that included women as prominent members. In 1895, Jewish women in Sydney had already given the community fifty-years of "yeoman's service,"¹³⁷ which one writer suggested could more accurately be referred to as "amazon's service."¹³⁸ These groups were active after the 1860s, which challenges the idea that communal life in Sydney was "blunted"¹³⁹ as Rubinstein indicates. Women included their children and husbands in communal work, which meant that they were engaged in public activities without infringing upon the time they spent with their family members. Men's attitude toward women's public activism and fund-raising in Sydney was positive and there is little evidence to suggest that women were irritated with their status or that men were actively suppressing women's activities, as was more common in the twentieth century due to changes in migration by cultural groups that were more patriarchal.

It would have been difficult for men to raise the funds for the Great Synagogue and maintain it thereafter without women's assistance. Although women were excluded from some positions of power within public organizations and the synagogue, this chapter demonstrates that women were permitted a greater degree of social and financial influence than was previously recognized. For most of the second half of the nineteenth century, when Jewish women were involved in fund-raising events and charity work, their role was lateral to and integrated with Jewish men rather than subordinate to them. Goldman finds that Jewish women diminished their role in communal groups as they became more prominent within the synagogue services. I find that Jewish women in London and Sydney increased their involvement in communal groups as they became more integrated into the life of congregations. Women formed their own organizations, which men supported, in order to resolve issues that were specific to women and girls within the wider Jewish community.
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Conclusion:

Jews continue to be almost undetectable in most regional studies, even when the subject of study relates to religious groups in Australia, and when Jews are mentioned they are rarely female. An interdisciplinary approach was essential to the process of making Jewish women visible in the historical landscape of the nineteenth-century British world. Jewish women's history is better supported by literature on women in religious groups that are not based on New Testament values and this literature is currently overlooked by most Judaic studies scholars. Research related to lesbians and to non-Christian women living in areas that had been former British colonies in America, British Colombia in Canada, Egypt, South Africa, Hong Kong, and India often had greater relevance to the themes that were significant in the lives of Jewish women when compared to the exhaustive literature that currently exists in relation to Protestants or Catholics women in the United Kingdom or Australia. Research on women in minority religious groups tends to focus on women's cultural, racial and religious distinctiveness, and the difficulties that arise from being assimilated rather than integrated into the majority group, as well as tensions related to gender that are more pronounced or that manifest differently than is the case between Protestant and Catholics.

The overarching themes in the chapters of this dissertation relate to racial relations, family dynamics, class-standing, sexuality, civil rights struggles, and the complex fusion of ethnic and religious traditions within the British cities of London and Sydney. Jewish women's complex cultural traditions were primarily influenced by their ethnic origins, their place of birth and their level of Orthodoxy. Their life-ways often stood in contrast with those of Christian and Catholic women in London and Sydney, even as Jewish traditions became increasingly Anglicized, or indistinguishable from individuals who were part of the
religious majority. For example, Jewish women were less inclined to participate in the feminist movement in Sydney and London because they were still focused on gaining equal rights for Jews regardless of their gender. Transnational and interdisciplinary scholars find that the study of marginal and less-famous people often results in re-evaluations of the majority group. Similarly, female-centered research related to nineteenth-century Jews challenges existing beliefs that Jewish women were oppressed by Jewish men. This research also challenged ongoing misperceptions that Anglo-Jewish women experienced no anti-Semitism, even if sexism and anti-Semitism did not often manifest in outright violence. This dissertation reassesses the practice of categorizing Jews with Protestants and Catholics simply because they were English-speaking and shared some common British cultural-traits. Similarly, I find that British-Jews were distinctive of European, Russian and American-Jews.

Jews were confronted with stereotypes and anti-Semitism, such as being blamed for the crimes committed around their neighborhoods, and they suffered discrimination from legislation that prevented them from working more than four-and-a-half days per week even though Christians were accustomed to working a six-day week. These attitudes and conditions were detrimental to Jewish individuals and the wider community and contradicted the widely-valued image of the ‘free-born Englishman.’ English and Australian Jews felt that they were living in a ‘tolerant’ society because they compared their own experiences with more violent experiences that confronted European-Jews, rather than that there was a complete lack of anti-Semitism in British society, as is often suggested. As Jews in Australia gained fuller legal and social equality, there was an increase in favorable depictions of them within literature and the theatre in London, even if negative imagery persisted in both countries. Racism, ethnocentrism and classism increased in response to European-born and Russian-Jewish refugees, who were stigmatized as ‘foreigners’ by Jews and Christians, which created multiple layers of discrimination that hindered many migrants from receiving fair recognition for their talents and from earning fair wages.
Arguments over the issue of Jewish political Emancipation prepared women for their own campaign toward enfranchisement and more equal access to employment and education. Women in Australia gained the right to vote and sit in Parliament in 1902, significantly earlier than these rights were granted in England. Most women did not expect to live independently of men, but at the end of the nineteenth-century, they reported that having a bicycle afforded them with a new type of freedom to move between places, which broadened their ability to socialize, recreate and to accomplish their daily tasks. Women’s clothing styles changed as a result of bicycle riding and it became more acceptable for women to wear pants and loose-fitting clothing that facilitated a wider range of physical movements than had been accepted when upper-class women were expected to remaining idle within the homes. The acceptance of female bicycle-riders corresponded with the image of the ‘New Woman’ and the ‘Advanced Lady.’ The primary objection men had to women adopting these models of femininity hinged upon men’s desire to be loved by their wives, sisters and mothers, rather than that they had objections to women’s education, employment or use of bicycles. Jewish women viewed these models as being compatible with Jewish feminine ideals, rather than perceiving of them as a radical shift where women gained new rights, as may have been the case for Protestant and Catholic women.

Research has been carried out on the radical activities of Jews in London, such as their support for Socialism and Communism. I found that these women were rarely mentioned in Jewish newspapers and appear to have little influence or relevance within the lives of religious Jews. In Sydney, there were few indications that Jewish women were interested in radicalism. There were no sustained efforts to encourage or restrict Jews from involving themselves in Communist or Socialist activities within newspaper articles. British Jews were focused instead on their loyalty to the Queen and their desire to participate in the existing government framework.¹

As a result of new opportunities in Australia, and persecution in Europe, nineteenth-century Jews moved frequently between countries,
colonies and even within neighborhoods. This may have generated feelings of exile, but it also meant that Jews had a wide range of cultural influences and they adapted rapidly to new circumstances. Jews were attracted to life in Sydney because they expected that it was a location where they could improve their quality of life by becoming wealthy, improving their health, enjoying a more pleasant climate, reuniting with friends and family who were already settled in the area or because they were aware that Australian-Jews experienced lower levels of anti-Semitism. The presence of poor refugee migrants in London and Sydney in the last third of the century promoted greater involvement of women in communal matters because the number of migrants in need of assistance expanded rapidly. Men needed women's assistance to cope with the demands made by refugees as Jews from all areas of the world and collectively fought against the anti-Semitism that displaced European migrants. This struggle over Jewish civil rights exposed women to a variety of political conditions in other areas of the world. Some women responded by provided assistance primarily to migrants who were female in order to promote their adjustment into British society. Emily Marion Harris, Annie Yorke, Constance Flower, and their older female relatives in the de Rothschild and Montefiore families wanted to prevent migrant women from becoming prostitutes when they arrived in London without funds, family ties or the English-language skills needed to quickly find respectable types of employment, which preserved their ability to marry men who were considerate and financially stable.

The phases of female Jewish migration from London to Australia differed slightly from Jewish men and from Protestant and Catholic women. Single female Jewish migrants were less likely to go to Australia after 1857 due to a variety of circumstances related to their personal safety as well as concerns over their ability to maintain their usual religious traditions and moral codes. The experience of Jewish passengers varied from Catholics and Protestants for a variety of reasons. Religious Jews did not want to eat non-*kosher* food, they observed the Sabbath on Saturday, men did not approve of shaving their beards at the crossing of the line, it was difficult to bring *kosher*
food, and their ideas about gender segregation were more carefully regulated than was usually the case for non-Jews, particularly in relation to women's menstruation. Jews also resented the conversion efforts of missionaries who were en route to the southern hemisphere. Toward the end of the century ship travel was less tainted by fears of immorality and it became a more acceptable as a mode of travel for upper-class passengers. The sailing route between Sydney and London took less time and was less hazardous due to technological advances. The availability of kosher tinned meats made the voyage acceptable to communal leaders after the 1870s, especially for migrants who had been unwilling to become vegetarians for the duration during the voyage in earlier decades. Single Jewish women did not migrate in significant numbers at any time in the century, because there were too few financially-stable men looking for wives. Jewish women arrived aside their husbands and other single men, and over time, their presence in the colonies promoted chain migration. Sydney's synagogues were well-established and there were more opportunities for Jews to network with others who shared their religious values immediately upon their arrival. Because factory work was not widely available in Sydney, many Jews saw America, New York City specifically, as the destination that was most likely to provide them with economic and social stability. After migrants were in Sydney, if they went to America, they usually went to San Francisco. Australia's reputation as a penal colony inhibited upper-class couples from migrating to Sydney, however these families had the least incentive to migrate since they were already financially stable and socially well-established in London. This was evident in the decision-making of Constance and Cyril Flower, an intermarried couple, as he considered accepting the offer to become the Governor of New South Wales.

Although the age of eighteen was the idealized age for Jewish men to marry, in Britain and the colonies, men often postponed marriage until they were in their mid-thirties. Nineteenth-century Jewish women were blamed for a perceived decline of the Jewish family because men feared they could not satisfy wives with such extravagant tastes. Brides were often significantly younger than grooms, which
increased men's authority. It was rare that Jewish women were more than three years older than their husbands. Anglo-Jews felt that arranged marriages had some social and financial benefits, but they were not as common as they were in Europe, which provides another strand of evidence for the distinctiveness of the cultural practices of Jews living in Britain and Antipodean colonies. Jewish law provided married women with a ketubah that safeguarded their personal rights and assured them that they had the possibility of receiving a divorce decree known as a get if their husbands were considered sane and abused them. These protections were not always available to Catholic and Protestant women due to high legal costs. Jewish women were disadvantaged by husbands who deserted them, because they were not permitted to remarry without a formal divorce from a Jewish Beth Din, and sometimes they needed another divorce through a civil court. Although spouse-abuse occurred, communal leaders generally opposed women's mistreatment and provided them with some financial support when they were in need of food, clothing, employment, shelter and educational opportunities for their children. Community leaders were less supportive of women who wanted to live apart from abusive husbands. Conversion to Judaism was not sanctioned among British and Australian Jews until the 1870s, which contributed to high rates of intermarriage, since rabbis discouraged potential spouses from converting in order to marry Jewish partners. Staying single was discouraged in Jewish society and although intermarriage placed a couple on the margins of Jewish society, it helped men start families at times when it might not have been possible to find a Jewish wife.

In the nineteenth century, women had greater control over their family size and the spacing between pregnancies. Some forms of birth control were sanctioned for women, but barrier methods used by men continued to be prohibited, making abstinence one of the most important family-planning methods available to Jewish couples. Although many Jewish women in Sydney had children at eighteen-month intervals and registered as many as eighteen children with their synagogue, it was more common that women registered births that were spaced farther apart or with women reporting six children or less.
This was the case among women whose childbearing histories were fully-documented in their death records, as well as for women who regularly registered their births in Sydney, and appears to be the case among women with childbearing histories that seemed somewhat incomplete. At present, it is not possible to substantiate the number of births and miscarriages that went undocumented or the number of children women registered in other cities. Technological advances make it more likely that in the future the synagogue records across Australia will be entered into a unified database on the internet, which would help to confirm family planning patterns.

Orthodox Jewish couples had differing ideas about what it meant to provide women with a high status when compared to reforming Jews. Orthodox women were expected to pride themselves on their role as mothers but the Reform movement’s valuation of small families and their willingness to abstain from attending the mikvah and following the family purity laws meant that women could control their fertility through abstinence during the most fertile part of their menstrual cycles. When the use of religiously-oriented bathing facilities declined among Anglo-Jewish women, it was sustained by Jewish men and by female migrants from Europe who arrived in London and Sydney in the last third of the century. The ceremony of conversion was sanctioned in the 1870s and necessitated immersion in the mikvah, which prompted the Sydney community to establish more formal arrangements for their bathhouse.

An increase in the number of Jewish families in the Sydney area promoted a resurgence of some religious customs that were difficult to maintain in Australia’s colonial period. Orthodox-Jews adopted more aspects of the Reform Movement than has been recognized, even when they continued to consider themselves members of an Orthodox congregation. Women in Sydney and London attended synagogue regularly and in some Reform synagogues they may have outnumbered men at certain times of the year. The majority of Jewish men wanted women to attend synagogue and they sanctioned a wider range of activities for women within the synagogue, even if men continued to exclude women from management and leadership positions. Women’s
increased inclusion in the synagogue made conversion less appealing to women who sought public venues for their expressions of piety, and simultaneously it deflected criticisms from Christians who asserted that Jewish women's exclusion from public worship was socially detrimental. Non-Jewish observers assume that Jewish women resented the lattice partition in the women's gallery, and failed to consider that the railing provided women with a private space to focus on their prayers, by safeguarding young children from falling over the balcony. By the last quarter of the century, women at the Great Synagogue were highly integrated into the public life of the congregation, showing that it was an accepted if not preferred location for them to express their religious devotion. Although women's role in the synagogue choir was initially contested, this controversy should be viewed not as an issue of women being devalued, but instead as a matter related to Orthodox congregation members rejecting a variety of innovations that included men's choirs, the addition of an organ, and the use of sermons and English as the language for prayers. The Confirmation of girls was challenged by some and applauded by others, yet throughout the century only a few girls participated in this ceremony. Confirmation for girls was a sign of progress toward women's ordination as rabbis later in the twenty-first century. Hebrew was the traditional language of prayers and sacred texts, but fluency in this language had declined by the 1830s. It was reinvigorated in a variety of ways after that point, particularly by the members of the Bevis Marks congregation in London where authoress Grace Aguilar and her family were influential. The introduction of sermons and prayer books in English empowered individuals who were not fluent in Hebrew to join in the prayers of the congregation. Jews were willing to alter traditions because religious apathy was widespread and those who attended Orthodox services were dissatisfied with their experiences, as was evident in the writing of the women from the de Rothschild family, particularly among older women who did not understand the Hebrew within the services. In Sydney, women were strong supporters of the synagogue and were active in the choir after the Chief Rabbi of London sanctioned women's singing in the
synagogue as part of mixed-gendered choirs. Many females had learned Hebrew through the Jewish Board of Education classes in Sydney and London’s Jews’ Free School.

Jews in London and Sydney reported a decline in women’s overall ability to cook. When young Jewish women had to be taught cooking skills it challenged the idea that domestic skills were an innate part of women’s abilities. While women were indifferent about some aspects of kosher cooking, they often retained selected aspects of these practices, such as not eating pork or shellfish, or by clearing their house of chametz at Passover. Women’s cooking was influenced by financial constraints, sanitary considerations, the availability of produce and commercially-prepared products, as well as to traditional recipes of older family members. Jewish culinary traditions were distinctive from Catholic and Protestant traditions even when they shared some of the same recipes. The presumption that British-Jewish cooking styles were based on traditions from Germany, Eastern Europe and Russia was challenged in this research. It was shown that Anglo-Jews were more strongly influenced by recipes from the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain and Portugal. Women and girls took a more active role in helping to prepare the succah on behalf of elderly residents at the Sydney Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, where food was a central component of holiday gatherings. Women also donated food for Passover seders as well as preparing it and serving it in an environment that was cleaned and decorated appropriately for the occasion.

In Jewish classrooms in Sydney and London, girls were provided with a wide range of options to study secular subjects, including math and sciences. Jewish literacy rates were significantly higher than for Catholics and Protestants in the same cities, which may reflect that smaller denominational schools were more successful at motivating their students to learn. The last three decades of the nineteenth-century represent a time when Jewish professionalization became attainable for Jews. However, even in the 1870s Jews continued to be disadvantaged when they observed the Sabbath, and on Jewish holidays due to the scheduling of classes and exams on these days.
Jewish men were often excluded from receiving diplomas from non-Jewish universities before 1870, which was the point when women were initially permitted to receive degrees. When Jewish students were provided with equal opportunities, they excelled at their studies. Even when free Jewish schools were available to the poorest Jews, some students continued to attend Christian schools. This sometimes placed children in opposition with their elders because they adopted attitudes that were more closely aligned with Catholics or Protestants. Dora Janetta Barnett provided an example of a Jewish student who successfully integrated her studies at a Christian school while still attending the Hebrew Sabbath School. She remained active within Jewish society. Jewish men wanted their wives to be intelligent and well-educated in secular matters but they did not want to associate with women who were hostile toward them as they advanced in their studies. Female students were still discouraged by many men from in-depth study of sacred texts throughout the century, which hindered their ability to teach religious subjects.

Successful teaching applicants in Jewish schools were typically expected to perform multiple duties in addition to providing lessons and women were excluded from filling most of these roles. Women were not trained become the congregations rabbi, their mohel, or their chazzan, but a few women were trained as sochetim. These multifaceted positions excluded women who were not trained for these types of responsibility without stating directly that women were not welcome to apply. However, when women were hired to be teachers of infant and girls' classes they were highly valued. In spite of high literacy rates of Jewish students in Sydney, their large class sizes and inadequate teaching resources challenged the ability of teachers to provide the level of instruction they aspired to, irrespective of the gender of students or the teachers. Louis Pulver, the Jewish Board of Education’s school headmaster, and other rabbis who taught at the school, strived to provide female students and teachers with opportunities for their intellectual growth. Women's complaints about the conditions at the school were identical to the male teachers, which is evidence that they were accorded similar resources and
consideration. When female teachers left the school, it was most often because they were promoted in some way or received a higher salary. When students were absent from classes it was often because they were kept at home to assist their mothers, because their parents could not afford to pay the tuition, because they moved, or transferred to secular school. Specialized libraries provided women and girls with additional opportunities for unstructured study outside of the classroom and Jewish women were known for their habit of avidly reading novels.

Life within Australia was rugged and required most women to engage in work in unclean environments or at physically demanding tasks rather than sedentary work that required high levels of dexterity. Jewish occupational trends in London and Sydney were distinctive, and it was less common that Jews became tradesmen or professionals due to educational restrictions that prevented them from receiving the training they needed in order to become doctors, dentists, nurses, barristers and a variety of craftsmen until the last few decades of the century. Instead, men and women continued to work in a variety of jobs that related to selling and manufacturing of goods, including working as hawkers, merchants, tobacco rollers, garment workers, jewelers or shoe makers. Jewish men and women were strong supporters and participants in the arts but they were rarely paid a living-wage as artists, actresses, singers and musicians.

Women living in areas with small Jewish populations had a greater need to join together to create supportive institutions. Sydney’s Jewish community was small but vibrant and Jewish women’s role in communal affairs was integrated with men rather than subordinate to them. The inclusion of younger girls in charitable events and communal groups meant that Jewish mother’s were praised rather than criticized for their engagement in the public sphere, because it could not be argued that they had abandoned or neglected their maternal role in order to devote time to matters outside the home. Jewish men relied upon women to organize fund-raising events and without their assistance it would have been difficult for the Great Synagogue to buy the land they needed for the building site, or to
construct and then maintain the building. Women's donations were not limited to cash contributions but also included donations of ornate goods, such as covers for the scrolls of law, and even a carpet for the women's gallery. Although younger single women did not generally have their own income to donate, they gathered small donations from numerous individuals in order to promote various causes. They also spent many hours sewing and providing service to the Chevra Kadisha and organizations such as the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, so that those who were elderly and dying received the attention they deserved. There were few incidents in communal records to indicate that Jewish men resented women's involvement in communal affairs or treated them in a disrespectful or condescending manner. Women were sometimes limited from communal involvement by other women, such as in the case of the matrons of the Montefiore Home who were criticized and then dismissed as a result of their cleaning routines, allocation of supplies, and for their refusal to cease socializing with Christian men while in the Home. Jewish women's involvement in communal matters differed from Christian women in that they were not trying to 'save souls' or substantially curtail alcohol consumption, rather they wanted to promote greater regard for the Sabbath and they wanted to uphold the right of Jews to drink alcohol in moderation. Karla Goldman finds that when American-Jewish women were granted greater participation in the synagogue after 1850, their traditional activities in the home were reduced, which was a significant alteration to centuries of home-based religious traditions. Jewish women shifted their religious focus out of the home and into public spaces, including the synagogue and communal groups. This situation was so pronounced that critics suggested Jewish women in London did not know how to cook basic foods, such as a potato, a dish served at most Anglo-Jewish meals. Jewish women's reluctance to work in domestic service provides another example of women's reluctance to engage in domestic chores. Women took an active role in public-fund-raising groups, social events and their sustained presence within the choir of the synagogue, where they regularly attended.

The Hebrew Standard of Australasia published an article about the
use of telephones in Paris hospitals. The article advertised that the operator was always on the line as a beneficial safety measure that prevented patients from revealing too much information and thwarted any potential for illegal activity among hospitalized criminals. The board of management for Sydney’s Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home discussed their need for a telephone. The *Jewish Chronicle* of London had a telephone number where they could be reached, and by 1898 Sydney’s Great Synagogue had a telephone number printed on their letterhead.\(^2\) Jewish women seemed unenthusiastic about the prospect of electric lights and telephones, in comparison to how they wrote about their love of novels and the liberation of having a bicycle. Cars and movies were not yet an expected part of their lives and were not mentioned in Anglo-Jewish newspapers prior to 1900. Interestingly, these new technologies generated little debate or conversation in regard to how they should be utilized on the Sabbath, since answering the phone constitutes ‘work’ within current ultra-Orthodox communities. The young girls who arrived in Sydney in the early 1850s from England and Europe had no way of anticipating that on their fiftieth birthday, at the end of the century, they might find the sanctity of their Sabbath interrupted by the sound of the telephone ringing, nor would they have expected that they might have electric lights that made writing on the evening of the Sabbath more tempting. They also probably did not expect that their daughters or their granddaughters might become Hebrew teachers who traveled to and from their lessons, not by foot, train or tram, but by the power of a push bike.

Future scholars of Anglo-Jewish life may wish to investigate the following areas, which were outside the boundaries of this study, but that would likely be supported by existing historical records. The registers of London’s Bevis Marks Synagogue from the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries are published, yet have not been carefully analyzed for what they reveal about the marriage patterns of England’s Sephardic population. Women’s birth spacing could be evaluated for evidence about the group’s attitude toward family planning and the family purity laws. These records also contain substantial information about the usual occupations of grooms and the
bride's father. The congregation's death records are available to establish the life expectancy of individuals. Census information related to English-Jews, which is known to reflect rough estimates of the population, might be substantiated or challenged by these records and others that are preserved from other congregations but that are not yet published. Similarly, the minute-books of Jewish charities in London might reveal additional details about individuals and families before they moved to Australia or after they lived in Australia if they returned to England.

Although this research was more cross-cultural than most studies of Jewish life, it was beyond the scope of this dissertation to provide a comprehensive comparative analysis between Jewish women and Protestants, Catholics, Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims and Aboriginal Australian women in Sydney and London. Jewish communal records left little evidence of their contact with individuals from these groups, other than mentioning social events that were attended by the Protestant and Catholic members of the community. Future scholars who are familiar with the previously mentioned religious communities may provide additional insight into their interrelationships with Jews through letters and diaries that mention incidental contact between them that is not currently cross-referenced in the indexes of Jewish archival records.

Migration scholars have provided exhaustive research into the chain migration of family-groups moving between Britain and various colonies, but women's reverse migration is rarely discussed because it is poorly documented. Men's reverse migration tends to be associated with business activities or military service, which usually provide historians with documentation, whereas women's reverse migration is primarily recorded through anecdotes in newspapers and unpublished charity records and might be best categorized as 'reverse travel' since migration carries an implication that the move was related to employment. Women usually relocated due to poor health, to visit people they knew, or because they were on a leisure trip.

This research was approached by investigating a broad range of subject areas that were valued by Jewish women. The outcome of
systematically reviewing Jewish newspapers for content on these themes provided a basis for arguing that Jewish men and women in colonial Sydney, and the well-established cosmopolitan city of London, were relatively harmonious and that women held positions of regard more often that previous scholars had established. This dissertation provides a basic foundation for understanding Anglo-Jewish women and their desire to be treated as equals within in British cultural settings, and enhances our knowledge of the experiences of Jews in America, New Zealand and Europe, since there are many aspects of Jewish religious culture that were shared by Jews across national boundaries in the second half of the nineteenth century.
Notes for Conclusion.

1. Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home (Sydney), Box 103, January 20 1901.

2. “Telephone to Cheer Up Patients,” Hebrew Standard of Australasia, March 4 1894, 7, for use of telephone in Paris hospitals; Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home (Sydney), Box 103, August 31 1895, October 15 1896, November 20 1896; Great Synagogue, Sydney, Box 86, 1898.
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