INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

ITLE	"Emancipation and Identity"
. May circ . Is restr Note: T o I unders for se) for Ph.D. icted [XX] for years.) thesis the Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years. tand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis curity purposes.
. The Libr	ary may sell photocopies of my thesis. XX yes no
March 17, Date	1975 <u>Stephen Ludwig Sniderman</u> . Signature of Author 7
Library Record	Microfilmed 7/16/75

EMANCIPATION AND IDENTITY

The Interrelation of the Struggle for the Removal of Jewish Disabilities in England With the Christian Image of the Jew and the Jew's Conception of Himself

Stephen Ludwig Sniderman

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion 1975

Referee, Professor Michael A. Meyer

Thesis Digest

EMANCIPATION AND IDENTITY Stephen Ludwig Sniderman

This thesis is an examination of the interrelation of the struggle for the removal of Jewish disabilities in England in the nineteenth century upon the Christian image of the Jew and the Jew's conception of himself.

A survey of trends toward emancipation and options for identity in Europe was presented. The change in Jewish status in England from the resettlement in 1656 to the admisssion of Lionel de Rothschild to the House of Commons in 1858 was examined. The arguments of the opponents of Jewish emancipation, both Jewish and Christian, were analysed. Then the arguments of Jewish and Christian proponents of emancipation were analysed. As a result of the successful struggle to remove Jewish disabilities, the identity of the Jew changed, as did his self-image, as did the image non-Jews had of him. This thesis examined the changing nature of Jewish identity, Jewish self-images, and images of the Jews in the context of the struggle to remove political disabilities in England. FOR BARBARA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter One. TRENDS TOWARDS EMANCIPATION AND	
OPTIONS FOR IDENTITY IN EUROPE	7
Chapter Two. THE CHANGE IN JEWISH STATUS IN	
ENGLAND: 1656-1858	21
Chapter Three. THE OPPONENTS OF EMANCIPATION	38
Chapter Four. THE PROPONENTS OF EMANCIPATION	55
CONCLUSION	74
NOTES	77
BTRTTOCRADHY	80

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my teacher, Dr. Michael A. Meyer, Professor of Jewish History at the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, for all his help in the preparation of this thesis.

I would also like to thank Dr. Jacob Rader Marcus for his friendship especially during the last year and a half.

My deepest thanks are expressed in the dedication.

iv

INTRODUCTION

Wherever Jews have settled they have tried to adjust themselves to their surroundings and make their lives as safe and as prosperous as possible. Once they were assured of physical security, they strove for economic emancipation, for the removal of those disabilities which prevented them from making a decent living and enjoying a somewhat comfortable existence. In more recent history they also strove for cultural integration and then for political emancipation, for the removal of those disabilities which prevented them from entering the political life of the countries where they lived. When Jews began to demand political rights, they showed that they were now no longer concerned just with the fate of the Jewish community. They wanted to identify themselves primarily with the states where they lived and not alone with their fellow Jews throughout the world. This study is an examination of how entering the political life of one country affected what it meant for the nature of Jewish identity in that country, what changes took place in the Jews' self-image, and what changes took place in the image their non-Jewish neighbors had of them.

The term "Jewish Emancipation"¹ possesses a definite and particular meaning for the history of the Jews in the nineteenth century. Its significance in this context should not be confused with other meanings of the word

"emancipation" as, for example, the freeing of slaves. The term "Jewish Emancipation" is often used in the broad sense of referring to the removal of various social, economic and political restrictions and disabilities - the transformation of the Jews "from barely tolerated individuals and communities into full fledged citizens."² But in the context of nineteenth century Anglo-Jewish history the term "Jewish Emancipation" refers specifically to the removal of political disabilities, especially those which prevented Jews from being members of Parliament. The origin of the term dates back to the struggle to remove Catholic disabilities in England. Jacob Katz has concluded that

> ... the year in which ... [the term "Jewish Emancipation"] appeared, 1828, [was] the year of the great debate about the Catholics' accession to Parliament in England. In connection with this, the claim of the Jews to the same right was mentioned; ... As the Catholic aspiration had long since been called the "Catholic Emancipation," it was most natural that a sequel - Jewish Emancipation - began to be discussed.³

When we speak of Jewish identity, we refer to what the individual Jew classifies as Jewish. For the modern Jew, being a Jew no longer encompasses his whole being. As Michael Meyer has put it:

For the Jew in the modern world Jewishness forms only a portion of his total identity. By calling himself a Jew he expresses only one of multiple loyalties.⁴

The Jew who strove for political emancipation was not the same kind of man as the earlier Jew who did not have any interest in being part of the political process of a non-Jewish state. His Jewish identity was changing. He did not have the same image of himself as a Jew. And non-Jews would begin to have a quite different image of him as a Jew. In the context of the struggle for political emancipation we will ask: What new Jewish identity emerged? What new self-images did Jews have? What images did non-Jews have of them? What hopes and what fears were expressed by the opponents and the proponents of Jewish emancipation?

The removal of the political disabilities of the Jews in Western Europe and their assimilation into the stream of its political life are among the most important aspects of recent Jewish history. These aspects have attracted the attention of many historians. Most of their interest has been directed toward German Jewry whose. struggle for political rights has perhaps been the most significant on account of the influence of German Jewry's intellectual history on world Jewry. Historians have constantly returned to the German example, and

general studies of Jewish emancipation have tended to overemphasize the German experience at the expense of other Jewish communities.⁵ This tendency leads many to think of Jewish emancipation in German-Jewish terms.

German Jewry has also attracted the attention of students of modern Jewish identity.⁶ The outward struggle and the inner conflicts that faced German Jews in their attempts to define their identity as Jews through the various changing periods of modern German history have likewise had their influence on world Jewry. But not all Jewish communities followed the German model.

The English example of this phenomenon in Jewish history differed from the German. The Jews resettled in England in the middle of the seventeenth century. The Jews of England did not inherit a mass of anti-Jewish legislation and anti-Jewish restrictions from the middle ages. No traditional Jewish society, reinforced by centuries of uninterrupted existence, had to be broken down. We will be examining the effects of Jewish emancipation on Jewish identity in a context that lacked a tradition of specifically anti-Jewish legislation, state-sponsored anti-Jewish policy, or those long-held memories of Jewish-Christian contact which could support anti-Jewish sentiments. We cannot deny that in England there were traditional stereotypes of Jews which prevented

them from achieving social assimilation and political emancipation. There was enough popular anti-Jewish sentiment to force the repeal of pro-Jewish legislation in the middle of the eighteenth century,⁷ but these sentiments, however much in the minds and literature of the people, were not created by centuries of ill-feeling caused by mutual segregation and mistrust.

In the first chapter we will examine general trends toward emancipation and options for identity in their European background up to the beginning of the nineteenth century when the struggle to remove Jewish disabilities in England successfully began. In the following chapter we will outline the situation of the Jews in England since the resettlement with special reference to the period from 1830 to 1858 when the active struggle for political emancipation took place. In the next two chapters we will look first at the position of the opponents and then that of the proponents of emancipation. We will see what image the Christian and Jewish opponents of emancipation had of Jews and what images and fears they had regarding an emancipated Jewry. We will see how the proponents of emancipation, Christian and Jewish, saw the image of the Jew and what image of the Jew they envisioned after emancipation. Finally, the success of emancipation will be examined.

Hopefully this study will increase understanding of the specific problem under examination and serve as a partial contribution to the more general question of what kind of Jewish identity results from Jewish attempts to achieve political emancipation in modern secular states, and what self-image Jews have and what image non-Jews have of them in their struggle for political emancipation.

Chapter One

TRENDS TOWARDS EMANCIPATION AND OPTIONS FOR IDENTITY IN EUROPE

7

Jewish Emancipation is a phenomenon of recent history. With the exception of individual thinkers, only since the period of the French Revolution has the idea been considered seriously that Jews along with everyone else could have complete political rights without special restrictions, conditions, obligations, or privileges. Only recently has the political equality of all men, including Jews, been a possibility. It has been created by the transition from medieval to modern society.

In this chapter we will first see what kind of Jewish identity was possible in pre-modern Europe. We will then see how the images pre-modern Europeans had of the Jews were challenged and what hopes were put forward for the modernization of European Jewry. We will note some trends in Jewish self-images and identity that resulted from modernization. Although the struggle to remove Jewish disabilities in England is distinct from that of the continent, still it has to be examined in the context of general European Jewish history. Only then can the special characteristics of the struggle in England be appreciated.

In pre-modern Europe, Jews were a group set apart. Obstacles to integration came from both Jews and Christians. As these obstacles were removed, social and political integration became possibilities. But first the Christians had to view the Jews differently, as potentially equal members of society without the requirement of social initiation by baptism. And the Jews, for their part, had to adapt their customs and way of life to the general culture. The Jews had to feel at home in whatever country they lived and associate their future and the future of their descendants with its future. A new Jewish identity had to be created.

Both Christians and Jews had to reject the notions commonly held in pre-modern Europe that religious differences should have social and political consequences. They had to create a society where all men were equally bound by the same law and where all men had equal opportunity to be chosen to determine the political future of that society. Thus both special discrimination and special privileges had to be abolished. But often certain groups, like the Jews, were exculded from the benefits of the abolition of social, economic and political distinctions on the grounds that they were not fit to be part of general society. On the other hand, there were those who felt that all that was needed was the removal of the obstacles to integration, and Jews and Christians could live together equally in an improved society.

What were the obstacles that prevented integration?

The Jewish concept that the dispersion of the Jews was temporary set them apart. There were many prayers in their liturgy for the coming of the Messiah and for the physical and political restoration of the Jews to the land of Israel. The Jews were a nation living in exile; they were not part of the peoples among whom they lived. Their internal affairs were regulated by their own religious law. They continued their own way of life without regarding the society of their Christian neighbors as their reference group. The traditional Jewish society had its own legal system and courts. The Rabbinic concept that the law of the state is the law only applied in matters of direct concern to the non-Jewish government. Religious law was defined so widely that it encompassed practically all aspects of life. Adherence to Jewish religious law meant keeping the Sabbath and not working when the rest of society was at work. This limited the possibilities of Jews and Christians engaging in common business enterprises. The dietary laws severely restricted social contact. The social importance of groups eating together cannot be overemphasized, yet when one group cannot eat the food of the other, integration on any social level is almost impossible. Differences in language and dress also set Jews apart. Jewish life, religiously, socially, culturally, politically, and legally was separate

and different from that of the larger society. It would not occur to the pre-modern Christian or Jew that these societies could be integrated or that the gulf between them could be crossed except by conversion.

Many Christians and Jews felt that the two religious groups ought not to integrate for theological reasonseven in social externals - but should follow their own special roles set out by the respective theologies of each.

The successful Christianization of Europe had resulted in the exclusion of the Jews from a dominant Christendom. The Jewish religion was not even allowed to compete freely with the majority religion. Judaism was different, and therefore it was wrong. It set Jews apart. Since Jews were set apart by their theological errors, how could they be part of a society which was Christian? There were special areas where Jews had to live. They were excluded from the professions and the guilds. They had to wear distinguishing badges or styles of clothing. Their settlement in any area was based on suffrance, not right. They needed special permission from the rulers to make a living. They were severely restricted in the right to own land, thereby almost always being excluded from agriculture. Supposedly degrading occupations, such as money lending, were forced upon them. They could be expelled from any locality at the whim of the ruler. while

wherever they did live, their whole social and occupational structure set them apart. These restrictions were then supported by the theological argument that the Jews had been scattered as exiles as punishment for their sin of rejecting Jesus as the Christ.

By the beginning of the modern period of European history, in the seventeenth century, we see changing attitudes toward society in general, attitudes that would also have an effect on images of the Jew. The end sought for in this new society was the acquisition of wealth, the improvement of life in this world, or the consolidation of national political power, not salvation. The religious wars between Catholics and Protestants ended in a stalemate settled by the compromise that there would no longer be religious uniformity in Christian Europe. Toleration, which began as a necessity, soon became an ideal. The ideal of tolerating the various Christian denominations and minority sects would soon be extended, at least in theory, to the possibility of tolerating the Jews. This possibility was increased by growing awareness, contact, and interchange with the Jews during the Renaissance and Reformation. Political leaders trying to build united, secular states would use whatever human resources were available in their struggle against those medieval forms and structures that impeded centralized political control and economic expansion. If the Jews

could be of service in this struggle, they were used. <u>Raison</u> <u>d'état</u> replaced theology as the justification for political actions.¹

In pre-modern Europe several secular and ecclesiastical jurisdictions existed side by side. Each corporate group had its own special rights, duties and privileges. The Jews were one of these corporate groups, and it was due to the lack of social and political homogeneity that Jews could survive as a corporate body. The process of modernization involved removing distinctions, dissolving the separate corporate groups, and unifying society. Some felt that the problem of a separate, segregated, pre-modern Jewish community could be disposed of by integrating the Jews into general society. Others opposed this by arguing that integration was impossible. But those who supported integration felt it could be easily achieved once general society was improved and made less prejudicial and once those factors that debased Jewish life were eliminated. They wanted to change the identity of the Jew from a theologically condemned social outcast to that of an improved and loyal member of an efficient, modern society. The medieval notion of what it meant to be a Jew and what the social and political status of the Jew had to be was beginning to be questioned.

One of the first references we have to a new outlook concerning the Jews is found in the writings of John Locke.

In his <u>Letter Concerning Toleration</u>,² Locke argued that all religious opinions should be tolerated as long as they do not politically threaten the state. Specifically he mentioned the Jews. In the eighteenth century, John Toland, the English deist, argued in favor of the naturalization of the Jews of England.³ British law required that one receive the Sacrament before naturalization;⁴ Toland's argument was one of the earliest in favor of removing such religious tests.

The eighteenth century is often remembered as the century of the Enlightenment, a time when little escaped critical analysis. The anomalous position of the Jews came under review. Questions were asked about the Jews' separate status, culture, and way of life. It was asked whether they were innately different from other men and whether there was any hope of changing them and integrating them into general society. John Toland remarked that "The Jews therefore are both in their origine and progress, not otherwise to be regarded, than under the circumstances of human nature."5 To view a Jew as a man essentially just like all other men was a major step in Toland's day. The late medieval Christian mind associated the Jews not with humanity but with the Devil.⁶ As long as the Jew remained a Jew that is as long as he was not baptised - he was beyond hope. There was no possibility of making him part of

society, for his way of life, his manners and his morals were different and unchangeable. The Jew was beyond improvement.

Not all who felt that improvement of the Jews was possible had a favorable image of the Jews. But they attributed the cause of this unfavorable image to the centuries of persecution under which Jews lived, not to something irremediable in their nature. They argued that if Jews were no longer persecuted and discriminated against, they would have the opportunity to live just like anyone else and would soon divest themselves of those customs which set them apart. As Christian Wilhelm Dohm in Germany said, "In order to heal him [the Jew 7 of his prejudices against us we first have to get rid of our own."7 Dohm recognized that much of the problem behind the separation of the Jews from the rest of society and their different customs and practices was due to anti-Jewish feeling and legislation on the part of general society. If these impediments were removed, the Jews would have the chance to improve, that is to become just like everyone else. "More than anything else a life of normal civil happiness in a well ordered state, enjoying the long withheld freedom, would tend to do away with clannish religious opinions," said Dohm. The "Jew is even more man than Jew."8

In France, as well, several voices were heard against the separation of the Jews from the rest of the people. Mirabeau advocated ideas similar to Dohm's. He asked how one could expect the Jew to be a loyal citizen if he was deprived of the rights of citizenship.⁹ L'Abbé Grégoire likewise argued that the condition of the Jews was not their fault. "Et vous exigez qu'il aime une patrie, donnez-lui en une," he urged.¹⁰ But Grégoire had an end in view different from those who hoped for the integration of the Jews into a secular European society. He did not want to wipe out the religious aspects of society after it had been improved. He said that

L'entiere liberté religieuse accordée aux Juifs, sera un grand pas en avant pour les réformer, & j'ose le dire, pour les convertir; car la vérité n'est persuasive qu'autant qu'elle est douce;....¹¹ We will find similar attitudes in England in the

nineteenth century.

The few statements on the improvement of the Jews mentioned here indicate a general trend in attitudes concerning a different kind of image of the Jews and a different conception of what the Jews could be. The nature of Jewish identity had to change, but the problems were not caused by the Jews alone. If the Jews were treated well, it was argued, in return they would

divest themselves of those aspects of their identity which were out of place in the modern world and integrate into society.¹²

For the Jews to enter general society with equal rights the Jewish corporate structure in Europe had to be abolished. As Clermont-Tonnere said before the French Constituent Assembly after the Revolution:

> Il faut refuser tout aux Juifs comme nation et tout leur donner comme individus; il faut qu'ils ne fassent dans l'État ni un corps politique ni un ordre: il faut qu'ils soient individuellement citoyens.¹³

Traditional Jewish society, with its customs and mores, was part of pre-modern society, part of that which the modern world wanted to destroy. As Jewish restrictions were to be removed, so all the special privileges and special considerations accompanying Jewish existence in Europe had to be removed. For the Jews to claim the rights of Frenchmen or Germans - even after these rights were granted to everyone born in France or Germany- they had to act and look like Frenchmen or Germans. What was distinctively Jewish in pre-modern Europe - such as clothing styles, language, and even food - could not be retained. If general society was to integrate the Jews by removing social and legal barriers, Jews, in return, would have to remove the barriers of their own laws and customs. They had to develop a more positive attitude toward general society. The concept of an equal but culturally and legally pluralistic society was out of the question in the eighteenth century.

Such an attitude spelled the doom of Jewish autonomy. State authorities, not motivated by religious considerations, appropriated much in the area of personal and civil law which until that time the Jews considered to be their own. Large portions of the <u>Shulhan Aruch</u> ceased to be applicable to daily life. Jewish acceptance of this end of Jewish autonomy marked the beginning of the changing Jewish identity in the modern world, a situation as true for the Orthodox as for the non-Orthodox, with the differences being in degree not kind.¹⁴

In pre-modern Europe Jews might have resented many of the restrictions imposed on them by Christian society, especially where they impeded economic life, but they saw themselves as a separate group in European society and wanted to remain so. They did not want to break down the distinctions between Jew and Gentile. They might argue for the removal of some disabilities for the sake of convenience, to make life a little easier in a hostile world, but not as a stepping stone to the removal of all disabilities.

On the other hand, by the eighteenth century there

were Jews who wanted to integrate as much as possible as long as they were left with at least some Jewish identity. Many argued that improvement of the Jews was a prerequisite for the social and political integration they desired. The possibility of integration gave them hope for a normalization of Jewish life. They were willing to redefine their Jewish identity to reap its benefits.

In Europe there were several Jewish approaches to integration with the general society and the kind of Jewish identity that was to be fashioned as a result. We will consider two such approaches: those of Moses Mendelssohn and Lazarus Bendavid.

Mendelssohn was satisfied that he had crossed the intellectual barriers between Christian and Jew; he was more interested in intellectual than political emancipation. In the realm of ideas he could declare all men to be the same and equally able to possess the truth, while he himself felt bound to observe the ceremonial law scrupulously. Intellectually he might integrate into general society, and he did enjoy wide social contacts in the Christian world, but his observance of the commandments set him apart.¹⁵

Lazarus Bendavid, an eighteenth century German-Jewish educational reformer, took the opposite stand from Mendelssohn's. He said that:

...wofern die Juden in die mit ihnen vorzunehmende oder vorgenommene Reforme, nicht dadurch eingreifen, dass sie ihre sinnlosen und auf jetzige Zeiten gar nicht mehr passenden Ceremonialgesetze abschaffen, wofern sie nicht eine reinere, dem Allvater würdigere Religion - die Reine Lehre Mosis - unter sich festsetzen - sie nothwendigerweise, selbst nach Annahme der Taufe, Indifferentisten und für den Staat schädliche Bürger bleiben werden.¹⁶

According to Bendavid, in order to be good citizens, the Jews had to abolish their ceremonial law which set them apart from the rest of society. Often this involved a sharp and conscious break with the past. In other cases it took generations. Or it was effectuated by migration from Eastern Europe to Western Europe or to America or England and adapting to a new culture altogether where Jews would not have to go to the extremes of Lazarus Bendavid, where they could integrate into general society without having to surrender all of the Jewish intellectual tradition or all of its ceremonial laws.

In each area and period of Jewish history in the modern world the ways in which a Jew expresses his identity varies. Each stage of modern Jewish history, with its rapid and varied changes, has created new images of the Jews and new self-images. As Jewish history cannot be understood in a vacuum, so images of the Jews and Jewish identity are contingent upon the changing situation of the Jews vis-a-vis their non-Jewish neighbors in the specific place

under discussion. We have seen that in the period of the French Revolution Jews were granted rights as men, not as Jews. Many Jews divested themselves of as much of their Jewish identity as set them apart in any way not acceptable to the larger society. In Germany attempts were made to modernize Judaism and its practices in order to make Jews and Judaism more acceptable to the Gentiles. The Reform movement is but one manifestation of this. In America outward Jewish customs and practices often disappeared as rapidly as the immigrants strove to assimilate and prove their loyalty and Americanism. In England changes took place not so much in terms of disposing of the outward signs of Jewish identity or in the development of a Reform movement, which never really had much success, but in the Anglicization of traditional institutions and practices. External adaptations obviated the need for deeper changes in terms of content. A typically Jewish variety of the Victorian Compromise took place, and a new Anglo-Jewish identity developed. This new identity was conditioned by the particular political and social aspects of Jewish life in England after the readmission to that country in 1656.

Chapter Two THE CHANGE IN JEWISH STATUS IN ENGLAND 1656-1858

The nature of the struggle to remove the disabilities of the Jews of England was greatly determined by the circumstances surrounding their readmission to England in the middle of the seventeenth century. These circumstances were indicative of new trends in Jewish history and new options for Jewish identity. As repeated expulsions of the Jews characterized much of pre-modern history, so at the beginning of the modern era new Jewish settlements were established in Holland, England, and America.

The Jews had been expelled from England in 1290. But by the seventeenth century there was a Marrano community in London, and Menasseh ben Israel, in Holland, appealed for official permission for Jewish resettlement in England. A conference summoned by Oliver Cromwell to examine Menasseh's request decided that "there was no law which forbade the Jews' return into England."¹ The expulsion of 1290 only applied to those Jews who were in England at that time.

The conference that Cromwell called was also asked to decide on what terms the Jews should be allowed to

resettle. Until recently it was believed that no decision was made, the conference was dissolved, and no formal permission for readmission was given. Cecil Roth has pointed out. on the basis of new discoveries. that this was not the case.² He concluded that permission for resettlement was given on 25 June 1656, but Menasseh's specific request was not granted. He had petitioned Cromwell "requesting that all the laws against the Jews should be repealed and that they should be readmitted to the country, on precisely formulated terms."3 Menasseh was not aware that the expulsion order of 1290 no longer applied. And since he did not get the "precisely formulated terms," he thought he had failed. However his failure proved to be the ultimate success of his mission to resettle the Jews in England. Roth concluded:

> ... Formal readmission by a public act, as the result of the Whitehall Conference, would inevitably have been reversed with the Restoration. In addition, it would have implied conditions, which Menasseh himself had indeed suggested from the outset: and conditions must necessarily have implied differentiation, if not humiliation, such as was the lot of the Jew at this time everywhere in Europe. But since there was no formal agreement, no conditions could be laid down. Hence the Jews began the new stage of their history in this country under circumstances of what may be termed general social equality, such as were now known

in no other country of Europe, or indeed of the world - not excepting even Holland. For by and large, it is true to say that from the period of the Resettlement native-born Jews enjoyed the same rights, protection and privileges as other non-Protestant Englishmen.

This is the key to the specific quality of the modern period of Anglo-Jewish history.⁴

In England in the latter part of the seventeenth century there was an established church. Only members of that church could hold government office, and Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters suffered under many legal and social restrictions. Jews suffered from these same disabilities, but when contrasted with the situation of the Jews in continental Europe, the situation of the Jews in England was much less restricted legally and socially. And the restrictions that did exist could not seem so harsh as long as all religious minorities, not just Jews, suffered under them. Indeed it was only in England of all the countries of Europe that many religious denominations could live together in relative peace.

In England the Jews did not have their own areas of settlement defined by law. They could live wherever they wanted. There were no occupational restrictions <u>per se</u>. Certain professions were closed to the Jews because of the wording of special oaths one had to take before being

admitted to those professions. But the intention of the oaths, which were formulated before the resettlement, was not to exclude Jews.

In England there was no "central and controlling body for every phase of Jewish communal life, as was, and to a certain extent is, the position of the <u>Gemeinden</u> in some Central European countries."⁵ The Jews, treated as individuals and not as a corporate community, had the same rights and suffered under the same restrictions as all other Englishmen who were not members of the established church. A result of the nature of the readmission of the Jews to England was their acceptance in the same way any other immigrant would be accepted. And Jews born in England were English subjects just as Christians born there were.

Yet before 1290 much anti-Jewish legislation had been passed in England. Since this legislation was not repealed, how is it that it did not apply to the Jews after the resettlement?

The Jews of medieval England were villeins or serfs of the crown,⁶ and the anti-Jewish legislation of the period applied to them in this particular legal status. But the Jews who came to England after the resettlement were free men. They could no longer be considered villeins as that class no longer legally existed in England. Therefore, the disabling statutes enacted before the expulsion did not apply to those Jews who might return and reside here. The disabling acts no doubt applied to "Iudaei" or Jews, ... but the Jews who came back to England in the seventeenth century were free men; they were no longer villeins or quasi-villeins, and were not "Iudaei" within the meaning of the Acts.⁷

This means that the Jews did not have any special legal status reserved for them: the end of the status of villeinage and the lack of conditions accompanying readmission assured this. Certain barriers and restrictions which Jews had to break down elsewhere did not even exist in England. Since all Jews born in England were citizens, they, like other religious minorities, could move to extend their rights. to remove those restrictions which still remained, without first having to prove they were even worthy of citizenship.

What then were the Jewish disabilities in England? We have already mentioned that certain occupations were closed to the Jews because of the oaths that were required. Many oaths in England ended with the words "upon the true faith of a Christian," words which a conscientious Jew could not pronounce. In 1830, John Elijah Blunt, an advocate of Jewish emancipation, summed up in a study of Jewish disabilities the effect of the oaths. He wrote:

A Jew is of course shut out from filling any situation where these [words, "upon the true faith of a Christian] are required: from this cause he is prevented from sitting in Parliament, from holding any Office Civil or Military under the Crown, and from filling any situation in Corporate Bodies; and may be excluded from practising at the Bar, or as an Attorney, Proctor, or Notary, from voting at elections, from enjoying any exhibition in either University, and from filling some other offices of minor importance.⁸

At the time of the resettlement and for some time after it, the Jews of England were not too concerned about their political disabilities for Jews suffered from political disabilities everywhere and no one expected England to be an exception. The Jewish population of England was never large, and for a long time the majority of it was foreign born. In 1850, in the midst of the struggle to remove political disabilities, there were only about 35,000 Jews in England.⁹ But in the nineteenth century there were many Jews who were born in England and had achieved some economic and social importance. They began to be concerned about their disabilities.

What image of the Jew do we have as a result of the disabilities? Many Jews saw themselves as part of the prospering middle classes in both economic and social

terms, which was the case. They, like many non-Jewish Englishmen, wanted to remove the legal barriers which prevented these classes in general from exercising a role in the political affairs of the state. The obstacles preventing Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics from sitting in Parliament were removed in 1828 and 1829. After 1829 the Jews, with minor exceptions, were the only religious minority that suffered from political disabilities. This raised questions that not all Jews liked, for there were those who argued that it might be wise to give political rights to Christians who were not members of the established church, but to give those rights to Jews was one step too far. Jews did not suffer from economic discrimination. They had equal rights in legal proceedings. But there were those who separated ordinary legal rights and those rights which would enable Jews to have a say in the affairs of state. The accidental restrictions that came from the oaths helped many cultivate an image of the Jew that deemed him outside the bounds of those who had complete political rights. They thought the oath must be there for a good purpose. But the purpose of the oath was not to exclude Jews, and much energy was spent trying to amend it.

The first serious attempt to remove Jewish disabilities

took place in 1753, but here the concern was economic, not political. England had a special procedure for the naturalization of aliens. This had significance in an age of mercantilism since only nationals of the states concerned could benefit from the trade of those states. If only English subjects could benefit from English trade, we can readily see why foreign-born Jews resident in England wanted to be naturalized. But British law required that one receive the Sacrament according to the rites of the established church before naturalization, so the Jews were excluded. Special legislation was passed to remove the restriction, but popular pressure forced the government to repeal it.¹⁰ Little more is then heard about the removal of Jewish disabilities until the 1830's.

The struggle to remove Jewish disabilities was part of a much larger struggle toward political reform in England that openly began to manifest itself in the early nineteenth century. The structure of traditional English society and politics was challenged. Religious discrimination in politics and an antiquated apportionment of seats in the House of Commons, which virtually disenfranchised the new industrial classes, were among the abuses pointed out. This liberal political climate helped the Jewish emancipation struggle. We have mentioned that the disabilities of Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics were removed,

In 1832 Parliament passed the first of several Reform Bills which made a step toward changing the apportionment of seats in the House of Commons. Those who wanted to keep as much of the old order as possible were losing ground. The struggle to remove the disabilities of the Jews must be seen as part of the political struggle in England between the old order and the new.

Attempts to remove the disabilities of the Jews began while the disabilities of Christians who were not members of the established church were being removed. As early as 1828, when Parliament was debating the removal of restrictions on Protestant Dissenters, a leading English Jew, Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, influenced his friends, Lord Holland and the Duke of Sussex, to oppose the wording of a declaration to be taken by all members of Parliament in place of the Sacrament. The declaration had been amended with the words "upon the true faith of a Christian" added. The attempt to oppose the amendment was unsuccessful.

After the so-called Catholic Emancipation Act was passed in 1829, the idea of Jewish emancipation was suggested to the leaders of the government. It was hoped that all the Jewish disabilities caused by the wording of the oaths could be removed at once. But the government did not think it was wise politically to take so drastic a step so soon

after Catholic Emancipation. Catholic Emancipation was motivated and encouraged by the Irish Problem: a severe political necessity made Catholic Emancipation a reality. The Jewish community was too small to make their request a pressing need.

Still, in the 1830's successive measures for Jewish emancipation were proposed in Parliament. The first of these, in 1830, failed to pass in the House of Commons. In 1833 the measure passed in the Reformed House of Commons but was defeated in the House of Lords. Thus began a pattern that was to continue until 1858 when the last disabilities preventing Jews from becoming members of Parliament were removed. Jewish Relief Bills were proposed in the House of Commons, and they eventually passed each time. They would then go to the House of Lords where they would be defeated.

The struggle to remove the political disabilities of the Jews can be seen also in the context of the struggle between the House of Commons elected by the people - however limited the franchise - and the more conservative and hereditary House of Lords. Jewish emancipation is just one aspect of this struggle between the two Houses of Parliament which began with the first Reform Bill and lasted until the powers of the House of Lords were curtailed in 1911.

The opposition of the House of Lords resulted in the attempt to remove Jewish disabilities piecemeal, a strategy that succeeded.

In 1830 Jews were admitted to the freedom of the City of London, and they were allowed to take the oath on the Old Testament. In 1833 Francis Goldsmid, the son of Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, was the first Jew to be called to the Bar. In 1835 David Salomons was elected Sheriff of London. Parliament passed special legislation so he could take the oaths of office. In the same year the power of presiding officers at elections to administer oaths to the electors was abolished. This power was seldom carried out, but when it was, Jews could not vote. And also in 1835 Jewish jurymen could be sworn in on the Pentateuch. In 1845 Jews who were elected to municipal offices could take their seats.¹¹

In each case where Jewish disabilities were removed, the law recognized what was in fact an altered condition of Jewish existence. Jews could no longer be restricted in their economic activities in the City of London. It no longer made sense to prevent Jews from being barristers. There had been Jewish solicitors since 1770 when Jews were permitted to omit the objectionable words in the required oath.¹² The removal of Jewish disabilities regarding municipal offices followed the career of David Salomons who would later be Lord Mayor of London and a Member of Parliament.¹³ When he was elected Sheriff of London, the Sheriffs Declaration Act followed. It was due to his efforts that all municipal offices could be opened to Jews in 1845. But all of his achievements were accompanied by long, drawn out struggles to remove each disability one by one.

An important disability still remained. Jews were unable to sit or vote in the House of Commons. Again the problem was caused by the wording of oaths. No law existed forbidding Jews from offering themselves as Parliamentary candidates or even getting elected, though some denied the constitutionality of having Jewish members of Parliament. But the last of the three oaths, required by law of all members of Parliament, ended with the words "on the true faith of a Christian." The form of the oath was standard for all except those specifically exempted. Jews were not exempted, and no conscientious Jew could take the third oath as it stood.

The oaths required of members of Parliament were those of Supremacy (of the Crown over the Church of England), of Allegiance (to the sovereign, coupled with abhorrence of Papal pretentions), and of Abjuration (of the claims of

the former Royal House of Stuart).¹⁴ There was no reason why a Jew could not take the first two, or the third for that matter had it not contained words offensive to his religious belief. For a Jew to take the third oath only those specific words needed to be excluded, and such an exclusion would not change the intention or purpose of the oath. But this could only be done by an Act of Parliament, which meant consent by the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

It was customary to administer the oaths for members of Parliament on the New Testament, and this too would exclude a conscientious Jew. But this practice was only a custom of the House of Commons and could be changed quite simply by a resolution of the Commons alone.

It was generally hoped that a change of attitude would take place once a Jew in fact had been elected to the House of Commons. Cecil Roth has stated that "there was widespread anticipation that no person who was actually elected to Parliament would be refused his seat."¹⁵ Precedents were readily available. After 0'Connell, a Catholic, was elected the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed. After Pease was elected special provision was made for Quakers, who were unable to take any oath.

In 1847 Baron Lionel de Rothschild was a parliamentary candidate for the City of London, a constituency that would most likely elect him. Jews had been unsuccessful candidates in previous elections, but in 1847 it looked like Rothschild could become a member of Parliament. Just a few days before the election, <u>The Times</u>, the leading London newspaper, strongly suggested that Parliament, "now springing from the British people should be furnished with a positive expression of the national will," and if Rothschild is elected, "the whole argument is at an end."¹⁶ The wording of oaths had been changed for other denominations in the past; now it could be changed for the Jews especially since other offices, once restricted, were opened up when Jews were elected to them.

Oaths could be changed to be in accordance with the conscience of those required to take them. As early as 1667, the Court of the King's Bench, one of the highest courts of England, said that Jews, before giving evidence in court, could be sworn on the Old Testament.¹⁷ In 1722 Parliament required all landowners to take the Oath of Abjuration which ended with the words "on the true faith of a Christian," but Jews were exempted from saying these words.¹⁸ It was wellknown that the offensive words were originally added to oaths to make them more binding. This had a political

origin in the challenge of many Roman Catholics to the legitimacy of the dynasty and their consipracies against it. The purpose was not to exclude Jews, and as we have seen, as early as the first decades after the resettlement oaths were changed so Jews could take them.

Rothschild was elected in 1847. A debate was held in Parliament on whether he could take his seat. Session after session of Parliament considered the matter from 1847 until 1858 when it was resolved. Bills to change the form of the oath and thereby remove the Jewish disabilities were presented, passed in the House of Commons, but rejected in the House of Lords. Rothschild was re-elected in General Elections and even took the Chiltern Hundreds (<u>i.e</u>. he resigned his seat) and was then re-elected in special elections twice. He proved to the opponents of emancipation that the electors of the City of London still wanted him to be their member of Parliament. Otherwise he patiently waited for Parliament to change the oath.

David Salomons was not so patient. He was elected to the House of Commons in 1851. He presented himself to take the oaths, took them in a form not objectionable to his conscience, and took his seat and voted in the House. Objections were raised which resulted in his being expelled from the House of Commons and being sued in the courts

for sitting and voting in Parliament without being sworn in properly.

The government itself was trying to remove the Jewish disabilities. Rothschild and Salomons were Liberals. Their party was in office for most of this time except for a few short periods. The Liberals for the most part supported Jewish emancipation, but they were in a distinct minority in the House of Lords which would not budge on the matter. In 1858 a solution was suggested. The Lords had once again disagreed with a measure to remove Jewish disabilities passed by the Commons. They amended the measure by cutting out its key words so both Houses appointed committees to settle the disagreement, as is the custom when the Commons does not accept amendments to its bills passed by the House of Lords. Since members of these committees do not have to be sworn in as members of Parliament first, Rothschild was appointed as one of the Liberal members of the committee. The government, which at that time was Conservative, knew a compromise could no longer be avoided. A solution was found. An act was passed giving each House of Parliament power to determine how to swear in their own members. The Commons then passed a resolution enabling Rothschild to take the oath in a way binding on his conscience as a Jew, and he took his seat. 19

According to this compromise special resolutions had to be passed so that each Jewish member of Parliament could take the oath. In 1860 a Standing Order of the House of Commons set the procedure for all Jewish members in the future, and in 1866 all oaths and declarations required of members of Parliament were replaced with a new oath that did not contain the words "on the true faith of a Christian." This applied to the House of Lords as well as the House of Commons, and in 1885 Rothschild's son Nathaniel was raised to the peerage.²⁰

The struggle to remove Jewish disabilities was political in form, but behind the political struggle was an ideological struggle. Jewish disabilities were artificial and accidental. Those who supported the retention of the disabilities used the formulation of the oath as a point of departure. They elevated the words in the oath that were objectionable to the Jews into an immutable principle which would at least exclude Jews from Parliament if not from municipal government and other means of serving and directing the state.

We now turn to an examination of the arguments of these opponents of Jewish emancipation in England.

Chapter Three

THE OPPONENTS OF EMANCIPATION

Those who opposed the removal of the political disabilities of the Jews of England wanted to retain the oaths required of members of Parliament in their traditional form. They did not have a positive program of their own and thus made no effort to handle the inconsistencies in Jewish disabilities. Where there were no disabilities, the opponents of emancipation did not argue for their imposition.

The basis of the argument against political emancipation was religious difference. The oaths were formulated with Christians in mind. Since Jews are not Christians, they cannot be expected to be able to take these oaths. The opponents of emancipation argued that Christianity was part of the law of England. There was an established church, and before 1828 everyone who wanted to hold public office had to observe the rites of that church. After the disabilities of the Protestant Dissenters were removed in 1828, conservatives could no longer argue that one had to be an Anglican to hold public office. The constitution was no longer Anglican, but at least it was Protestant. When Catholic disabilities were removed in 1829, the conservatives argued that at least the constitution was Christian. But however open the conservatives could be to Christians outside the established church, they could still argue that rights were only being extended to Christians and that the Christian nature of the constitution was not threatened. Removal of Jewish disabilities would seriously challenge the validity of the concept of a Christian constitution in a Christian country.

During one of the many debates in the House of Lords concerning the removal of Jewish disabilities, the Archbishop of Canterbury expressed his opposition, not, he said, in any anti-Jewish spirit. Instead he

> desired to preserve the Christian character of the Legislature and to prevent a body who disbelieved in Christianity from passing laws which would be binding upon a Christian community.¹

Most of the opponents of the removal of Jewish disabilities argued for the preservation of the Christian character of the constitution. Sir Robert Inglis, one of the most vocal of the opponents from the beginning of the struggle in 1830 to its conclusion in 1858, said in 1830 that

> It has been the doctrine of the law of England for three centuries, and is the basis of all the institutions of this country, that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of England.²

Twenty-eight years later, in 1858, he said that "power in

this Christian land was confined to those who profess Christianity."³ This point continued to be argued with the intent of excluding the Jews despite Lord Coleridge's decision in 1833 that Christianity was not part of the law of England.⁴ In 1859, even after Rothschild had taken his seat in Parliament, John Sibbald Edison, in his pamphlet <u>The Question of the Admissibility of the Jews to</u> <u>Parliament As Yet Undecided</u>, claimed that Rothschild still took the oath improperly despite the remedial legislation that was passed the year before. He answered the question in the title of his pamphlet this way:

> Now Christianity being part of the laws of England, and having been so time out of mind, it stands to reason, that the Jews resident in England must necessarily form an exception to the general rule which recognises all persons born within the king's ligeance as natural born subjects.⁵

Rev. Robert Bruce Kennard argued similarly that

He who is not a Christian, though his family may have lived for generations on the same soil with us, though they may have been protected by our laws, and paid taxes in return for that protection, is yet essentially not a citizen, but a sojourner.⁶

But if the admission of the Jew, as <u>Blackwood's</u> <u>Edinburgh Magazine</u> put it, "into a Christian parliament

is wholly inconsistent with common right, common duty, or common sense,"⁷ how could one reconcile Jewish disabilities with the rights Jews had? One member of Parliament who opposed the admission of Jews into Parliament but tried to accept them as sheriffs and magistrates suggested this answer:

> It was one thing to place a man in a situation where he was responsible to the law; it was quite another thing to place him in a situation where he would make the laws which were to bind Christian people.⁸

This answer, representative of the approach of the opponents of emancipation to the inconsistencies in the position of the Jews, indicates that the opponents were not as anti-Jewish as their words might sometimes seem to say. They did not attempt to be consistent in denying Jews political emancipation by extending Jewish disabilities to those areas where they did not exist. They argued less on the basis of religious differences than on the principles of conservatism and containment. They had an image of England that they wanted to retain. Jews had to be excluded because they were not Christians. But there was a stronger reason emotionally: namely, they were the avowed enemies of Christ.

It does not take much imagination to know what came to the minds of churchgoers and Bible readers when Jews and

Jewish emancipation were mentioned. In England, as elsewhere, there was an anti-Jewish tradition supported by the churches for generations. Many of the images presented by the opponents of emancipation came from this tradition.

John Sibbald Edison summed up these beliefs in his reference to "Jewish alien-enemy inhabitants of England, who, if true to the faith of their forefathers, must abominate Christianity."⁹ The explanation for the Jewish abomination of Christianity was theological. Unlike other non-Christians whose belief was just incorrect, Jews held beliefs that were in direct opposition and competition with the true belief in Christianity. The Archbishop of Canterbury argued that Judaism

> considered in its relations to Christianity, ... is not mere unbelief but a direct contradiction of the truth. Its profession involves the assertion that the Saviour, adored by Christians as the Son of the Most High God, was a wicked imposter, who justly suffered death.¹⁰

A loyal Jew, if elected to Parliament and allowed to take his seat, would have to devote his efforts to the destruction of Christianity. Lord Stanley, who as Earl of Derby was conservative Prime Minister three times, held that whatever position a Jew would take in Parliament would be dictated by his conscience,

which conscience, if it be worth anything, must lead him to vote for measures hostile to the established religion of this country, and to Christianity itself.¹¹

William Cobbett claimed that the Jew

regularly blasphemes Jesus Christ in the synagogue, and once a year crucifies Him in effigy.¹²

General fears were expressed concerning what would happen once Jews could take seats in Parliament. Colonel Lowther, a candidate for Parliament in 1847, expressed his concern by saying, "I should be sorry to see our Sabbath-day changed, and Jews hawking about our streets old clothes on Sunday."¹³

The Jews' rejection of Jesus as the Christ had evoked Divine wrath. The Jews were punished by God for their misdeeds, and it was the obligation of Christians to see that the punishment continued:

> ... as divine justice has driven the Jews out of that land, and has scattered them among the nations, the attempt to entrust them with political rights in a Christian state is disobedience to the will of God.¹⁴

This image of the Jew as despised by God was not easy to change, and it served as a major barrier to the removal of Jewish disabilities.

As there were those who said the Jews of England were

not English for religious reasons, so there were those who said the Jews were a separate nationality and were not English for national reasons. Any clear distinction between religious and national opposition to the removal of Jewish disabilities would be artificial. Many Christian, and many Jews for that matter, saw the Jews as a nation living in exile, even though membership in that national group was determined by religious allegiance.

In 1857 the Earl of Derby argued that "the Jews maintained unbroken faith in their nationality," and he described them as "a nation within another nation."¹⁵ Years earlier he elaborated on this point:

> Practically, the Jews in this country were not of this country, but of a nation apart. They were temporarily resident within this country, entitled to hospitality and protection, but having no special British interest any more than any special German or French interests. They had the interests of the Jews, they had not British interests; above all, they had not Christian interests. ... Neither in name, nor in title, nor in undivided interest, was Baron Rothschild to be considered a British subject; ...¹⁶

There were always foreign-born Jews in England, but when the opponents of emancipation said that the Jews were not English, they referred to all Jews, even those born in England. Since Jews hoped for the coming of their Messiah

who would take them back to the land of Israel, they could not be considered English. This hope was a central part of the Jewish religion, and it was argued that even the Jews considered themselves foreigners. When Sir Frederick Thesiger, a strong opponent of emancipation, was forced to admit that the oath of abjuration was intended to be directed against Catholics and not Jews, he fell back on the Jews' desire to return to Palestine as the main reason for refusing to remove their disabilities.¹⁷

Jews were to be excluded because of their future return to Palestine for religious reasons also. Lord Shaftesbury, who worked for the conversion of the Jews as a genuine friend of the Jews, along with his associates,

> opposed Jewish emancipation because they considered the Jews as citizens of another and nobler country, and because they were afraid of weakening the ties binding these to the inheritance of their ancestors by permitting the bonds attaching them to the land of their nativity being drawn more closely.¹⁸

The return of the Jews to the land of Israel had its place in Christian theology. Shaftesbury was afraid that if the Jews became part of England they would forget their sacred role in history.

The opponents of Jewish emancipation often argued that

the Jews themselves were opposed also. Sir Robert Inglis said that he "did not think that the Jews themselves felt any dissatisfaction at being excluded from Parliament."¹⁹ Generally it was argued that emancipation

> is only sought after by a few wealthy individuals unactuated by a desire to promote the welfare of their brethren, but who merely wish to gratify <u>their</u> ambition of filling high offices and obtaining seats in Parliament, and that the truly pious Jew considers himself an alien in England, though by birth a British Jew, as he looks upon Palestine as his native land.²⁰

In fact there was Jewish opposition to emancipation. The <u>Voice of Jacob</u>, an Anglo-Jewish newspaper, divided the Jewish community into three groups based on attitudes toward emancipation: those who demanded complete equality at once, those who would "deal with each disqualification as the opportunity serves," and

> those who dread a diversion of the Jewish mind from the religious interests of the Jews, as a people, through the seductions offered by the opening of new avenues to personal ambition, the ardent pursuit of which, they maintain, is calculated to estrange the individual from certain higher duties, that evolve upon him in common with all Jews. These hold that there are public offices which a pious Jew cannot conscientiously discharge with efficiency.²²

<u>The Voice of Jacob</u> was concerned with Jewish opposition to emancipation for religious rather than national reasons. But <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u>, another Anglo-Jewish newspaper, was reluctant to mention that the Jewish community was divided since it was in favor of emancipation without reservation. Israel Finestein has noted that "<u>The Jewish</u> <u>Chronicle's</u> efforts to decry such misgivings suggest perhaps that this layer was numerically not insignificant."²³

The misgivings were most significant in the 1830's when the struggle to remove the political disabilities of the Jews began. In 1833 a group of Jewish notables wrote to Sir Robert Grant who was pleading the cause of political emancipation in the House of Commons, denying

> a report that only two or three individuals among the Jews take a warm interest in the removal of the disabilities affecting them, and that the community in general and even the most influential of the persons who compose it regard the subject with indifference.²⁴

But there was evidence that not all Jews favored emancipation. In 1829, Joseph Crool, a Hungarian-born Jew, said that Jews would have to remain separate, anticipating the Messianic restoration to the land of Israel. He feared that emancipation would weaken Judaism. His views were often quoted by non-Jewish opponents of emancipation, and in 1833 he wrote to Sir Robert Inglis that "wherever the Jews

spend two days or two months or twenty years in a country, they are equally strangers and sojourners....²⁵

In the 1830's we do not find the Jewish support for emancipation that existed later. There were those Jews who were only interested in making a living, who perhaps wanted some disabilities removed, but felt that it would do more harm than good to demand too much. And there were those who felt that the religious committment of the Jewish proponents of emancipation would weaken if not disappear.²⁶

Occasionally letters appeared in the Anglo-Jewish press denouncing the struggle for emancipation. Two such letters appeared in 1845. "Judaicus", in a reaction against the new Reform congregation in London said:

> We English Jews, <u>in</u> this country, but not <u>of</u> it, pray constantly to return to Jerusalem and our own land; we want, therefore, no modern assimilating plans to draw us nearer to the Christians, and gradually pave the way for a gentle slide into Trinitarianism and emancipation.²⁷

The letter appeared in <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u>, and in the following issues attempts were made to refute it.

The Voice of Jacob published this letter which also voiced an anti-emancipation sentiment:

... I am conscientiously of the opinion that it is not proper for the Jews, as a body, to originate any movement the object of which is to claim the right, and to incur the obligation, to discharge public functions inconsistent with their paramount duties as Jews. ... many sincere Jews in this country, entertain opinions adverse to the movement in question, and still a larger number are wholly indifferent thereto, ...²⁸

These anti-emancipation statements by Jews were greatly outnumlered by those favoring emancipation. Still it should not be surprising to find some Jews not particularly eager for their fellow Jews to be able to enter political life. Not enough Jews were in England long enough or were sufficiently well-off to care about politics.²⁹ or to be able to understand that entering politics did not mean the end of Jewish practice.

There were those who saw political emancipation as a potential danger since it could lead to the end of Jewish observance. Sir Moses Montefiore, an observant Jew and a firm supporter of emancipation, ³⁰ wrote in his Diary: "I am firmly resolved not to give up the smallest part of our religious forms and privileges to obtain civil rights."³¹ Israel Finestein has argued that

> If the price of emancipation had been presented as a relaxation of their Jewish interests or a diminuition of their Jewish associations,

that would not have been a price which they would have consciously have paid.³²

There were Jews favoring emancipation who shared some of the concerns of those Jews opposing emancipation. They did not want to make religious sacrifices but differed over whether these sacrifices would be a result of emancipation.

One section of Anglo-Jewry, however, has not been represented in what we have said concerning Jewish opposition to emancipation. The Sephardim were the first group to organize a congregation after the resettlement. In the rules they set for themselves they resolved that they would not participate in public life. They considered themselves an alien community that did not want to arouse fear on the part of the English. The Sephardi community generally kept to their resolution. Those who had political ambitions for the most part left the community. The rest were politically indifferent.³³ In 1857 a petition prepared by the Board of Deputies - the representative body of Anglo-Jewry - in favor of removing political disabilities was circulated among the leaders of the Sephardi community, "but it was made clear that the petition, so far as the Sephardi Community was concerned, was from individuals, not from the congregation as a corporate body."34 And in 1858, when Rothschild took his seat in

Parliament, the event "passed, so far as the Congregation was concerned, unnoticed."³⁵

We now turn to a different kind of opposition to Jewish emancipation, one motivated by moral judgement. Here we do not find Jewish support, for the main thrust of the argument was that the Jews lacked the moral qualities to make them worthy of emancipation. A corollary to the argument was that the Jews were incorrigible.

What did it mean to say that the Jews lacked moral qualities? Behind such statements, of course, are Christian beliefs that the New Testament surpasses the Old Testament in morality, that the God of the Old Testament is one of law and justice while the God of the New Testament is one of morality and love. With this as part of their thought patterns, many Christians took a look at the Jewish community in England.

The Jews had their own separate customs. Many of them had their own language, dress, and general cultural and social patterns. Jews often kept to themselves. This made them particularistic and anti-social.

When many Christians came in contact with Jews they met poor pedlars or old clothes men who seemed to be dishonest and dirty slum dwellers or they met rich financiers who could not be gentlemen.³⁶ The Jewish occupational structure disturbed many Christians. Neither the pedlar nor the financier was considered an honorable man. The Jews were accused of not really working, of not really being part of society. They were described as

> totally distinct from / the rest of the nation / in every characteristic. In the midst of agriculturalists or manufacturers, he is neither an agriculturalist nor manufacturer. The Jew does not labour; the Jew buys and sells at a small profit the fruit of the labour of others.³⁷

Jews were accused of only being interested in money. If they could become members of Parliament, "they would traffic in parliamentary seats for a profit."³⁸ And Jews were accused of bribing Lord John Russell and others to support them in their struggle to remove political disabilities.³⁹

A leading opponent of Jewish emancipation, a Mr Newdegate, outlined the immoral qualities of the Jews. He said that the "Jews consider it lawful to murder an ignorant man."⁴⁰ He argued that Jews were exacted to charge interest and do mischief to non-Jews, that non-Jews were not competent witnesses in Jewish courts, that Jews cannot testify against fellow Jews, that Jews do not recognize non-Jewish marriages and do not see relationships with non-Jewish married women as adulterous, that Jews consider the Rabbis more important than Moses, and that Jews absolve themselves of all oaths they take.⁴¹ Going beyond these specific complaints, <u>The Standard</u>, an English newspaper, tried to prove that the Jews were

> the descendants of all the most wretched and vicious of the ancient Jews; that they were the scum of the earth, and that, reasoning from such premises they are not much better now.⁴²

Given this description, how could Jews be accepted as members of Parliament, as part of the political leadership? Many of those who criticized the Jews felt that once they changed their ways, improved themselves so to speak, they would be worthy. But not all felt that such improvement was possible. In the minds of many Christians, the Jews were incorrigible as long as they remained Jews. Liberals and radicals had no love for Jewish separatism or traditionalism, as they opposed these traits in all religious groups. But they felt that given the necessary social, economic, and cultural changes, Jews could be just like everyone else, with their religion being their own private matter. Many Christians could-not accept this. They had an image of England that was Christian. They argued that Jews were morally inferior as long as they did not convert to Christianity. Since

they were not Christians, they could not become members of Parliament.

Chapter Four

THE PROPONENTS OF EMANCIPATION

Not all religious Christians opposed the removal of the political disabilities of the Jews. There were those, such as the members of the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews, who

> intended to work for the relief of the disabilities to which the Jews were subject, with the hope that through such efforts Jews would come to look upon Christians more kindly and untimately would be led into the "Pale of the Christian Church."¹

They argued that the Jews were reluctant to convert to Christianity because they had been poorly treated by the Christians and therefore had a bad image of Christianity. If the Jews would be treated well and not denied rights because they had not converted, it was argued that they would not be so anti-Christian, and the possibilities of converting them would increase.

However, support from the conversionist societies waned once the struggle for emancipation seriously began. Nevertheless, certain leaders of the struggle for emancipation in the 1830's, such as Lord Bexley and Robert Grant, were members of the London Society. It has recently been argued that the origins of the readmission

of the Jews to England and the removal of their disabilities came from Christians who wanted to convert them with kindness instead of force.² But as time passed and the conversionists saw that the Jews were not about to convert in any appreciable number, they argued that "the Jew would never be totally integrated into society until he converted."³ They began to feel that emancipation would be detrimental to their cause.⁴

Still, the conversionists made a significant contribution to the cause of emancipation. Many Christians took the degenerate social state of the Jews as evidence of moral degeneracy. Conversionists often argued that this was not the fault of the Jews. Lewis Way, a wellknown leader of the movement, ascribed the "vices" of the Jews to the "injustice and inhumanity which they have experienced for so many centuries from men of all confessions and nations."⁵

Another Christian approach, though it may seem strange to call it that, in favor of the removal of Jewish disabilities came from Benjamin Disraeli. He was born a Jew, though baptised in his youth. He considered himself a practicing Christian but was proud of his Jewish "blood". Disraeli made a singular contribution to the Parliamentary debate on whether Rothschild could take his seat. He

asked, "Who are these persons professing the Jewish religion?" And he proceeded to answer that

they are persons who acknowledge the same God as the Christian people of this realm. They acknowledge the same divine revelation as yourselves. They are, humanly speaking, the authors of your religion. They are unquestionably those to whom you are indebted for no inconsiderable portion of your known religion, and for the whole of . your divine knowledge. ... there is <u>prima</u> <u>facie</u> reason to suppose ... that the representatives of a Christian community should not look with disfavour upon such an appeal \sum for the removal of Jewish disabilities 7.⁶

But those who argued for the removal of Jewish disabilities seldom did so on religious grounds.

Their argument was mainly based on the concept of liberty. Judaism was seen as just one more nonconformist religious group outside of the established church. In an age of growing political liberty and the extension of political rights and privileges, religion was considered a private matter, not the basis for political exclusion. In 1834 Robert Grant argued that

> in every civilized and well-constituted community, no man should be excluded from any civil right

or privilege on account of his religious opinions, however different they may be from those of the community at large, unless it can be shewn that such opinions tend to the disorganization of civil society.⁷

Lord John Russell told the electors of the City of London that "no man's religious opinions ought to disqualify him from holding civil offices."⁸

The historian, Thomas Babington Macaulay, was more descriptive in his argument. He said:

But why a man should be less fit to exercise those powers because he wears a beard, because he does not eat ham, because he goes to the synagogue on Saturdays instead of going to the church on Sundays, we cannot conceive.

The points of difference between Christianity and Judaism have very much to do with a man's fitness to be a bishop or a rabbi. But they have no more to do with his fitness to be a magistrate, a legislator, or a minister of finance, than with his fitness to be a cobbler.⁹

Jews too argued for the removal of their disabilities on the basis of liberty. <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u> looked forward to the day when "those rights and privileges which are ours naturally, will then be ours legally."¹⁰ The paper saw the struggle for the removal of Jewish disabilities in the context of a larger battle for liberty and not as a Jewish issue alone. It proclaimed:

To the nation we are nothing in the struggle: it is not for us as Jews, that they persevere in urging our claims on Parliament: we are but the representatives of that great principle of civil and religious liberty, of which they have so nobly made themselves the advocates.¹¹

The Jews of England saw their admission to Parliament as "the one and only way in which they could be recognized beyond cavil or doubt as full members of the British Empire."¹²

We have seen that the disabilities of other religious groups were removed and that gradually even some Jewish disabilities were being removed. On the basis of consistency many argued for the removal of all Jewish disabilities. As modern states removed distinctions and restrictions left over from the middle ages, consistency demanded that Jewish disabilities be removed too. The non-Jewish proponents of emancipation had an image of England that excluded religious affiliation as a determining factor in political participation. This principle had to be applied to the Jews as well. As Salo Baron has written: "Emancipation was a necessity even more for the modern State than for Jewry."¹³ Macaulay argued that the opponents of emancipation could not support their position unless they were "prepared to go the whole length of the Inquisition."¹⁴ If the opponents of emancipation wanted to claim there was a constitutional basis for the exclusion of Jews from some political offices as a matter of principle, they would have to be excluded from all offices. For their part, the Jews were not satisfied with just some political rights once Rothschild was elected.

The non-Jewish proponents of emancipation argued against the idea that there was constitutional support for Jewish disabilities. Lord John Russell said that "there is nothing in the law of the country which was intended to exclude Jews" from Farliament.¹⁵ He tried to make clear that the words "on the true faith of a Christian" were intended to make a "distinction not founded on religious, but on political grounds,"¹⁶ directed specifically against those Roman Catholics who generations earlier may have entered into conspiracies against the Protestant dynasty.

<u>The Voice of Jacob</u> pointed out in detail where the Jews had been emancipated elsewhere, and that no disastrous results ensued. The entire Christian world was not united in believing that Jews could not have political rights.¹⁷

The inconsistency of the Jewish disabilities in England

was also made clear by the lack of those disabilities in some of the colonies. The Barbados and Jamaica were often mentioned as examples of where under the same basic legal system as the mother country, Jews were not excluded from political offices.¹⁸

And of course the inconsistencies in England itself were constantly mentioned. In 1845 the editor of The Voice of Jacob wrote:

> ... a Jew might be Lord Mayor, preside over the Criminal Court in London, take precedence of the Lord Chancellor himself if he attended, sit in judgment on Christians - and yet not be allowed to represent his fellow-citizens in parliament.¹⁹

The proponents of emancipation also argued that while Jews were excluded from Parliament because they were not Christians, many members of Parliament over the years could hardly be called Christians. Bolingbroke, Gibbon, and Hume were not believing Christians, yet they took the oaths, and no one objected to their being members of Parliament. Lord John Russell argued that if a Jew

> felt no objection to use the words in question, no election petition or election committee would afterwards, in conformity with the law, be able to disturb his seat.²⁰

Conscientious Jews were excluded, but it was possible for

someone who did not subscribe to the true faith of a Christian to be a member of Parliament.

English Jews wanted these inconsistencies removed so that they could reap the benefits of a liberal modernized society. They set out to show that they had already modernized themselves in preparation for their social integration into that society.

The Jews no longer considered the Jewish community to be a corporate part of a larger society with its own separate characteristics. Basing their claims on the rights of the individual, they demanded individual rights, not national or minority rights. As Vassal Holland, a leading non-Jewish proponent of emancipation, argued:

> English Jews, born in the allegiance of his Majesty, cannot be subject to the privations and disabilities, any more than they can be entitled to the exclusive jurisdictions, exemptions, and prvileges, which they are said to have enjoyed before the expulsion of persons professing their faith, in the time of Edward I.²¹

In the modern world the Jewish demand for easing or removing disabilities was expressed in a new context. The demand was made for the individual Jew, not for the corporate community. The Jewish proponents of emancipation had to prove to the Jewish community that the removal of disabilities would not weaken adherence to the Jewish religion. It had to be shown that the emancipation of the Jews could co-exist with traditional religious observance. In Germany, Mendelssohn's disciples "saw that observance of the law stood between them and political emancipation, and of the two they were more willing to sacrifice the former."²² For the most part, the Jews of England did not see themselves forced to make this choice, and <u>The Jewish</u> <u>Chronicle</u> called for public meetings to "convince the few who, on religious grounds, might be opposed to emancipation, of their error."²³

Support for emancipation came from the religious leaders of the Jewish community. <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u>, answering the claim that the devout Jews "abhor" emancipation said:

> that our respected Chief Rabbi signed a petition to the House of Lords on the subject, and that among the most strenuous advocates for entire emancipation are to be found the most learned and pious among the Jews of this country, ...²⁴

But not all the opponents of emancipation could believe that someone like the Chief Rabbi could be in favor of it, and they felt that they could freely attribute opposition to him. Nathan Marcus Adler wrote to a

contemporary:

Observing in your report of Mr. Newdegate's speech of last night that, among other hostile and false accusations against the Jews, he mentioned my name as having stated in one of my sermons, 'that the introduction of Jews into parliament would subvert the Jewish law,' I feel it my bounden duty to deny utterly ever having made such or a similar statement. I have, on the contrary, always expressed myself in favour of the measure in question.²⁵

Difficulties that did arise were taken care of. The Jewish belief in the coming of the Messiah and the possible charge of divided loyalty were explained by saying that the Messianic age would be in the future.²⁶ Meanwhile Jews were supposed to be loyal to the states where they lived. If Parliament were to meet on the Sabbath or any other time when an observant Jew might not be able to attend and an important vote came up, the Jewish member could be paired.²⁷

But a difficulty in one area of traditional religious observance could not be explained away. Jewish religious practice provides procedures for marriage and divorce. So does the modern state. Many modern states recognize religious marriages as valid civil marriages. But England and other states do not recognize Jewish religious divorces as valid civil divorces. Some Jews favored emancipation but wanted to retain as much religious control over personal status as possible. They did not consider this a demand for special privileges any more than the right to preserve other religious practices. The Chief Rabbi, Nathan Marcus Adler, and Moses Montefiore took this stand.

The matter came to a head in 1857 with the Matrimonial Causes Act which provided a simple and inexpensive procedure for civil divorce. The Chief Rabbi, fearing that Jews would take advantage of this without also obtaining a religious divorce and thereby making children of subsequent marriages illegitimate under religious law, urged that Jews not be included in the Act. An amendment to this effect was drafted and approved by the Chief Rabbi. But Lionel de Rothschild and David Salomons used their influence to have the amendment dropped, fearing it would support the claims of the opponents of emancipation that the Jews were a group set apart. While Jewish legal autonomy in divorce cases would preserve religious distinctiveness, there were those who opposed the inconsistency of retaining autonomy for any matter.²⁸

Many Jews felt that it was incumbent upon them to divest Jewish life of everything that was not religious

in nature. Otherwise they would be less convincing in their claim for recognition as Englishmen just like all the rest. Jews had to present themselves as a religious and not a national group. Some Jews were more diligent than others in this attempt. There were those who felt that emancipation was withheld because the religious practices of Judaism were foreign. They believed that "if they were to take part in English life, their religious practice had inevitably to be modified."²⁹ The Jewish Chronicle argued

> ... that all emancipation from without is incomplete unless we emancipate ourselves from within. That liberality which the Baron de Rothschild demands from the House of Commons, the Jewish body demands from the executive of <u>their</u> religious affairs.³⁰

But the Reform Movement in England never got much support. Judaism in England was Anglicized and modernized without the development of a strong Reform Movement.

For the most part, Judaism in England was stripped of its national elements. Jews were different for religious reasons alone. As someone wrote to <u>The Voice of Jacob</u>, which opposed the Reform movement:

> The Jews, indeed, are to form a separate people as far as religion is concerned, but in every

other respect their very vocation requires their associating and intercommunicating with other nations.³¹

Religious services in England were more decorous, and this change was not just limited to the Reform Movement. The Reform Movement emphasized the Bible over the Talmud. It was argued that these changes would make Judaism less threatening to the opponents of emancipation.³²

Lome of the strongest proponents of emancipation had a close connection with the Reform Movement. During a discussion of Jewish disabilities in 1830, Moses Montefiore said that he felt the Jews should accept the removal of whatever disabilities possible piecemeal. Isaac Lyon Goldsmid demanded complete emancipation. This was the beginning of a split in the leadership of the community. Goldsmid was later one of the founders of the Reform Movement. The leadership split may well be a motivating factor in the origins of the Reform Movement. This speculation is worth considering, though a deeper investigation would be needed before anything could be said with confidence.³³

The Reform of Judaism was used by some proponents of emancipation to show that the Jews were making themselves worthy of emancipation. Those Jews who felt they had

67

to prove how worthy they were tried to deny the charges that the Jews were foreigners or had lower moral standards. Recognizing that there were aspects of some Jews that were less than admirable, both Jewish and Christian proponents of emancipation argued that these aspects were caused by centuries of maltreatment. Once given a fair chance, Jews would rid themselves of all that was objectionable.

The Voice of Jacob compared the advanced degree of civilization of the Jews of western Europe with the less advanced degree of the Jews of eastern Europe. The paper argued that

> ... <u>if</u> the same race, following the same religion, <u>has</u> attained in the west of Europe the degree of civilization attained by the rest of its inhabitants: it can be due only to the social and political maltreatment to which the Jews are subjected in Eastern Europe _ that some Jews may have objectionable characteristics_7.³⁴

It was also argued that the Jewish occupational structure was caused by the persecution of the Jews. <u>The Jewish</u> <u>Chronicle</u> quoted the following from "A Clergyman's Apology for Favoring the Removal of Jewish Disabilities:"

> ... the admission of the Jews to all rights of citizens would probably lead to the disappearance of what is sometimes objected to in them, namely,

that they chiefly occupy themselves in sordid business, such as traffic in money, and that they are usurious and avaricious. Here, again, have we not created the evil of which we complain? ... how should <u>they</u> exercise their industry and talents who are shut out from all civil privileges, offices, and emoluments?³⁵

When Francis Henry Goldsmid was struggling to be admitted to the Bar, he wrote about the large amount of Jews in trade, and said, "You deprive our energies of almost all other objects and yet are astonished that they should be directed strenuously towards this."³⁶

<u>The Jewish Chronicle</u> argued that the moral development of the Jews "tended to divest the minds of the opponents of Jewish emancipation of the idea, that what we are seeking is for mere self-aggrandisement."³⁷ And <u>The Voice</u> <u>of Jacob</u> pointed out that among other things the purpose of the Anglo-Jewish press was "to remove many false ideas entertained concerning Judaism" and

it should draw the attention of the Christian world to the improvement which has long been, and still is progressing in the intellectual and moral condition of the Jews.³⁸

This the Jewish press along with Jewish pamphleteers proceeded to do.

The Jews, we are informed, are "strictly commanded to

obey the laws of the country in which they happen to be," and we are told that there have been no disloyal acts on the part of the Jewish community of England.³⁹ The loyalty of the Jews has not been called into question for even "the warmest opponents" of opening municipal offices to the Jews "admitted the loyalty and good conduct of the Jewish community."⁴⁰ The Jews were implored to show that to be

true to yourselves, you are also true to the British public: - true to Judaism, you are not faithless to the British constitution.⁴¹ Attempts were made to show that an emancipated Jewry would redevelop its concept of the Messiah. <u>The Jewish</u> <u>Chronicle</u> pointed out that

> since the Jews have been permitted to live as citizens, or as quasi-citizens, in the civilised states of Europe, they have - without changing the doctrines on the Messiah fundamentally manifested a stronger interest in the contemplation of the Messiah as a <u>universal</u> benefactor.⁴²

And one correspondent wrote to <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u> concerning Jewish attitudes toward Christianity that he denied

> that any enlightened and well-read Jew has any other feelings but those of respect toward that religion upon which (next to his own) he must look as the most moral under the sun.⁴³

It was necessary to point out in detail that the Jews were like all other Englishmen except that they were members of a different religious denomination.

At a public meeting dedicated to the cause of the removal of Jewish disabilities, a speaker reminded the audience that

> British-born Jews are in heart, thought, act and sympathy, to all intents, Englishmen. We are Jews only in our synagogues or at our private devotions; but even there, and every where else, we are Englishmen - proud of that title, and anxious to unite with our fellow-countrymen in all their duties and undertakings, whether charitable, political, social or scientific.⁴⁴

It was pointed out that the Jews were making a contribution to English life. They were well-educated and cultured, remarked <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u>, as it looked at their

> patronage of art, and the rewards and distinctions they have gained when they have entered on an honourable career of study in the University of London.⁴⁵

The Jews were charitable, giving not just to their own but to Christian charities as well.⁴⁶ They did not let themselves become a financial burden on the English public for they "support their own religious establishment; they maintain their own poor, and all the foreign poor of their religion."⁴⁷

71

It was pointed out that their public behavior was good. <u>The Voice of Jacob</u> described an election in a Jewish area of London where there was a Jewish candidate:

> It is pleasing to contemplate, that notwithstanding the license usual at popular elections, and the circumstances that the district in which the election took place (near Petticoat-lane,) brought out crowds of the poorest and least educated classes of the Jews, all passed off with excellent humour, leaving nothing unpleasant behind.... [And] no one had a word to say against the moral worth, high commercial standing, business habits, and general fitness of the Jewish candidate,...

In 1848 when there were Christian visitors to a meeting whose purpose was to support Rothschild in his struggle to take his seat in Parliament, <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u> quoted positive press reports and congratulated the Jewish community

> on the specimen the meeting afforded to our Christian visitors, of the tone and temper in which the proceedings of a Jewish public meeting were conducted.⁴⁹

It was necessary to point out that Jews could behave themselves in public.

The only aspect of Jewish life in England that the proponents of emancipation wanted to say was separate and distinct was the Jewish religion. But it too was becoming Anglicized. When the admission of the Jews to Parliament was about to become a reality, Nathan Marcus Adler, the Chief Rabbi, approached the Bishops who were members of the House of Lords for their support. It is recorded that

> he used to tell, with a humorous twinkle in his eye, how one of the Lords Spiritual hesitated to receive him, on the ground that an interview would be useless, as he knew no Hebrew.⁵⁰

But in fact, more and more Jews were speaking English as their only language. They began to look for Englishlanguage preachers for their synagogues, for as <u>The Jewish Chronicle</u> said: "would it not be a disgrace if we were told by our Christian opponents, that the Jews of England are so ignorant that they cannot find a lecturer in the community?"⁵¹

So not only did the proponents of emancipation claim that the Jews were English just like all the rest and deserved all the rights and privileges of Englishmen. They also tried to point out that Judaism as it was practiced in England was English too, and any Anglo-Jew had every right to represent an English constituency in the House of Commons.

73

Conclusion

The struggle to remove the political disabilities of the Jews of England was successful. Rothschild took his seat in Parliament, and in later years more and more Jews would become members of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Jews would become judges on high courts and cabinet ministers.

Once Jewish emancipation became a reality in England it was not seriously challenged. Jews found themselves at ease with their self-image as Englishmen just like the rest. Characteristic Anglo-Jewish customs and institutions developed all the more so as a result of emancipation. The opponents of emancipation became accustomed to it and learned to share the political process with Jews as they did with Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics just decades before. No significant anti-Jewish reaction took place. Jewish emancipation in England was not imposed from above as it was on the Continent. As we have seen, it did not come about suddenly. Rather English opinion changed slowly until the desire on the part of many Jews for integration with the general society was accommodated.

In England, Jews saw themselves as individuals and not as part of a corporate Jewish community. They took that decisive turn in Jewish history which Jacob Katz

74

explains occured when individual Jews "transferred their social goals to the context of the surrounding non-Jewish milieu."¹ The Christians, as James Parkes has said, reacted

> not according to their like or dislike of Jews, but according as to whether they sought to retain the old conception of a Christian polity or whether they had adopted the new political philosophy of the secular State, extending its toleration to all who would obey its laws and advance its interests.²

The struggle for the removal of Jewish disabilities in England was a struggle between a medieval and a modern concept of society and between a medieval and a modern image of what it meant to be a Jew. There were Christians and Jews who resisted Jewish equality with Christians in society and politics. And there were Jews and Christians who felt that Jewish religious differences were irrelevant to their participation in politics.

But no Jewish characteristics can be deemed irrelevant in our examination of the effects of Jewish emancipation on Jewish identity. As a result of a successful struggle to remove Jewish disabilities, the identity of the Jew changed, as did his self-image, as did the image non-Jews had of him. Before long both opponents and proponents of emancipation recognized that the post-emancipation Jew had a new Jewish identity: one held by those Jews who sought positions of leadership in non-Jewish society. The successful struggle for emancipation did not just remove Jewish disabilities; it helped in the creation of a new type of Jew.

NOTES

Notes to the Introduction

 See Jacob Katz, "The Term 'Jewish Emancipation'," in
 A. Altmann, ed., <u>Studies in Nineteenth-Century Jewish</u> Intellectual History, (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 1-26.

2. Jacob Katz, <u>Emancipation and Assimilation</u>, (Westmead, England, 1972) p. ix.

3. Katz, "The Term 'Jewish Emancipation'," p. 18.

4. Michael A. Meyer, The Origins of the Modern Jew, (Detroit, 1967) p.8.

5. A recent example is Jacob Katz, <u>Out of the Ghetto</u>, (Cambridge, Mass., 1973).

6. For example, Meyer, The Origins of the Modern Jew.

7. See Thomas W. Perry, <u>Public Opinion, Propaganda, and</u> <u>Politics in Eighteenth-Century England</u>, (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

Notes to Chapter One

1. See Shmuel Ettinger, "The Beginnings of the Change in Attitude of European Society towards the Jews," <u>Scripta</u> <u>Hierosolymitana</u>, VII (Jerusalem, 1961), pp.193-219.

2. John Locke, <u>A Letter Concerning Toleration</u>, in Maurice Cranston, ed., <u>Locke on Politics, Religion, and Education</u>, (New York, 1965), p. 144.

3. John Toland, <u>Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in</u> <u>Great Britain and Ireland</u>, (London, 1714).

4. Thomas W. Perry, <u>Public Opinion, Propaganda, and</u> <u>Politics in Eighteenth-Century England</u>, (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), p. 15.

5. Toland, p. 20.

6. See Joshua Trachtenberg, <u>The Devil and the Jews</u>, (New York, 1966).

7. Christian Wilhelm Dohm, <u>Concerning the Amelioration</u> of the Civil Status of the Jews, translated by Helen Lederer, (Cincinnati, 1957), p. 21.

8. Ibid., p. 14.

9. Le Comte de Mirabeau, <u>Sur Moses Mendelssohn, sur la</u> réforme politique des juifs., (London, 1787), p. 66:

> On ne peut pas douter de bonne foi que des traitemens meilleurs n'extirpassent les préjugés de religion qui empêchent les enfants de Moyse d'être plus sociables. Le juif est plus homme encore qu'il n'est juif; & comment n'aimeroit-il pas un état dans le quel il lui seroit permis devenir propriétaire?

10. L'Abbé Grégoire, <u>Essai sur la Régénération physique</u>, <u>morale, et politique des Juifs</u>, (Metz, 1789), p. 111.

11. Ibid., p. 132.

12. See H.D. Schmidt, "The Terms of Emancipation," Leo Baeck Institute Year Book, I (1956), pp. 28-50.

 Séance du 23 décembre 1789, <u>A.P.</u> t. x. pp. 756 ss., quoted in Baruch Hagani, <u>L'émancipation des Juifs</u>, (Paris, 1928), pp. 189-90.

14. See Leo Baeck, "Sometimes We must Say 'No'," translated by Jakob J. Petuchowski, <u>CCAR Yearbook</u>, (Spring, 1973), pp. 37-41.

15. See Meyer, The Origins of the Modern Jew, Chapters I and II.

16. Lazarus Bendavid, <u>Etwas zur Charackteristick</u> <u>der Juden</u>, (Leipzig, 1793), p. 45.

Notes to Chapter Two

1. Quoted in Cecil Roth, "The Resettlement of the Jews in England in 1656," in V.D. Lipman, ed., <u>Three Centuries</u> of <u>Anglo-Jewish History</u>, (London, 1961), p.10.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 19.

4. Ibid., p. 20.

5. Adolph G. Brotman, "Jewish Communal Organization," in Julius Gould and Shaul Esh, eds., <u>Jewish Life in Modern</u> <u>Britain</u>, (London, 1964), p. 1.

6. John Elijah Blunt, <u>A History of the Establishment</u> and <u>Residence of the Jews in England with an Enquiry into</u> <u>their Civil Disabilities</u>,(London, 1830), pp. iv-v; and H.S.Q. Henriques, <u>The Jews and the English Law</u>, (Oxford, 1908), p. 62.

7. Henriques, pp. 63-4.

8. Blunt, pp. vi-vii.

9. V.D. Lipman, <u>A Social History of the Jews of England</u>, (London, 1964), p. 5.

10. See Thomas W. Perry, <u>Public Opinion, Propaganda, and</u> <u>Politics in Eighteenth-Century England</u>, (Cambridge, Mass., 1962).

11. These details are conveniently summarized in Henriques, pp. 309-11. The chart given is most useful.

12. Ibid., p. 309.

See Albert M. Hyamson, <u>David Salomons</u>, (London, 1939).
 Cecil Roth, <u>A History of the Jews in England</u>, Third edition, (Oxford, 1964), p. 249.

15. Cecil Roth, "The First Jewish M.P.," in Cecil Roth, Essays and Portraits in Anglo-Jewish History, (Philadelphia, 1962), p. 278.

16. The Times (London), 27 July, 1847, p. 4.

17. Roth, A History of the Jews in England, pp. 179-80.

18. Ibid., pp. 214-15.

19. Both Rothschild and Salomons had been elected before 1858, but Salomons lost his seat in an intervening general election.

20. Roth, A History of the Jews in England, p. 267.

Notes to Chapter Three

1. The Jewish Chronicle, 17 July, 1857, p. 1074.

2. Debates in the House of Commons ... and in the House of Lords on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill for Removing the Civil Disabilities of the Jews, (London, 1834), p. 24.

3. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Third Series, Commons, XCV, 1258.

4. H.S.Q. Henriques, <u>The Jews and the English Law</u>, (Oxford, 1908), p. 11.

5. John Sibbald Edison, <u>The Question of the Admissibility</u> of the Jews to Parliament As Yet Undecided, (London, 1859), p. 27.

6. Rev. Robert Bruce Kennard, <u>A Plea for the Maintenance</u> of our National Christianity, (London, 1855), p. 16.

7. <u>Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine</u>, American edition, Vol. XXV (New York, 1847), p. 745.

8. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Third Series, Commons, XCV, 1358.

9. Edison, p. 53.

10. Debates in the House of Commons..., p.59.

11. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Third Series, Lords, XCVIII, 1395.

12. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Second Series, Commons, 16:10, Quoted in Hillel A. Fine, "The Jews and Parliament," (Prize Essay, Hebrew Union College, 1947), p. 7.

13. Jewish Chronicle, 20 August, 1847, p. 221.

14. "Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of the Jews" by a Conservative. Quoted in <u>Jewish Chronicle</u>, 8 November, 1844, p. 21.

15. Jewish Chronicle, 17 July, 1857, p. 1074. Cf. Jacob Katz, "A State within a State, the history of an anti-Semitic slogan," <u>Israel Academy of Sciences and</u>
<u>Humanities Proceedings</u>, IV (Jerusalem, 1971) pp. 29-58, in Jacob Katz, <u>Emancipation and Assimilation</u>, (Westmead, England, 1972), pp. 47-76.

16. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Third Series, Lords, XCVIII, 1394.

17. Jewish Chronicle, 18 March, 1852, p. 185.

18. Ibid., 18 April, 1856, p. 557.

19. Ibid., 4 March, 1853, p. 169.

20. Ibid., 7 February, 1845, p. 93.

21. Ibid.

22. Voice of Jacob, 31 January, 1845, p. 89.

23. Israel Finestein, "On the Centenary of Parliamentary Emancipation," <u>Synagogue Review</u>, 32 (1957-58), p. 267.

24. Lionel Abrahams, "Sir I.L. Goldsmid and the Admission of the Jews of England to Parliament," <u>Jewish Historical</u> <u>Society of England, Transactions</u>, 4 (1899-1901), p. 164.

25. Quoted in Israel Finestein, "Anglo-Jewish Opinion During the Struggle for Emancipation," <u>Jewish Historical</u> <u>Society of England</u>, <u>Transactions</u>, 1959-61, XX (1964), p. 117.

26. David Woolf Marks and Albert Löwy, <u>Memoir of Sir</u> Francis Henry Goldsmid, (London, 1879), p. 22.

27. Jewish Chronicle, 17 January, 1845, p. 80.

28. Voice of Jacob, 28 February, 1845, p. 105.

29. Salo Baron emphasises this at the expense of the other side of the argument. He relies on what "the correspondent of the New York <u>Asmonean</u> reported from London in January 10, 1850." See his "The Modern Age," in Leo W. Schwarz, ed., <u>Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People</u>, (New York, 1956), p. 322. 30. Although Moses Montefiore supported the struggle for emancipation, he was not personally active in the struggle. He was more concerned with the rights and safety of Jews throughout the world than with political ambitions in England.

31. L. Loewe, ed., <u>Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore</u>, I, (Chicago, Belford-Clarke, 1890), p. 111.

32. Finestein, "On the Centenary of Parliamentary Emancipation," p. 264.

33. Albert M. Hyamson, The Sephardim of England, (London, 1951), p. 297.

34. Ibid., p. 298.

35. Ibid.

36. Ursula Henriques, <u>Religious Toleration in England</u>, (Toronto, 1961), p. 194.

37. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Third Series, Lords, XCVIII, 1342.

38. Ursula Henriques, ibid.

39. <u>"Che Sara, Sara," or Lord John Russell and the Jews</u>, (London, 1848), p. 8.

40. Jewish Chronicle, 9 May, 1851, p. 241.

41. Ibid., 16 May, 1851, pp. 249-50.

42. Ibid., 7 January, 1848, p. 381.

Notes to Chapter Four

1. Melvin M. Scult, "The Conversion of the Jews and the Origins of Jewish Emancipation in England," (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis Uiversity, 1968), p. 245.

2. <u>Ibid</u>., and <u>idem</u>, "English Missions to the Jews -Conversion in the Age of Emancipation," <u>Jewish Social</u> <u>Studies</u>, XXV (1973), pp. 3-17.

3. "The Conversion of the Jews ...," p. 263.

4. Jewish Chronicle, 24 December, 1847, p. 362.

5. Scult, "The Conversion of the Jews...," p. 198.

6. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Third Series, Commons, XCV, 1323. See also Benjamin Disraeli, <u>Lord George Bentinck</u>, (London, 1852), Chapter XXIV.

7. <u>Debates in the House of Commons ... and in the House</u> of Lords on the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill for Removing the Civil Disabilities of the Jews, (London, 1834), p. 9.

8. Jewish Chronicle, 23 July, 1847, p. 194.

9. Thomas Babington Macaulay, "Civil Disabilities of the Jews," <u>The Edinburgh Review</u>, January 1831. Reprinted in <u>Critical and Historical Essays</u>, I (Boston, 1900), p. 643.

10. Jewish Chronicle, 16 July, 1847, p. 185.

11. Ibid., 21 November, 1851, p. 49.

12. Lionel Abrahams, "Sir I.L. Goldsmid and the Admission of the Jews of England to Parliament," <u>Jewish Historical</u> <u>Society of England, Transactions</u>, 4 (1899-1901), p. 119.

13. Salo W. Baron, "Ghetto and Emancipation," The Menorah Journal, XIV (1928), p. 524.

14. Debates in the House of Commons ..., p. 31.

15. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>, Third Series, Commons, XCV, p. 1245.

16. Ibid., p. 1241.

17. Voice of Jacob, 10 June, 1842, p. 150.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., 14 March, 1845, p. 116.

20. Jewish Chronicle, 9 may, 1851, p. 241.

21. Debates in the House of Commons..., p. 96.

22. Michael A. Meyer, <u>The Origins of the Modern Jew</u>, (Detroit, 1967), p. 62.

23. Jewish Chronicle, 7 February, 1845, p. 93.

24. Ibid., 13 May, 1853, p. 253.

25. Ibid., 26 March, 1858, p. 117.

26. Ibid., 3 January, 1845, pp. 66-7.

27. Ibid., 21 February, 1845, p. 101. If a member of Parliament knew in advance that he would be absent for an important vote, he would be "paired" with a member from the other party who also would be absent or would not cast his vote when the voting took place. This is a common practice.

28. See Israel Finestein, "An Aspect of the Jews and English Marriage Law During the Emancipation: The Prohibited Degrees," <u>Jewish Journal of Sociology</u>, 7-8 (1965-66), pp.3-21 and <u>idem</u>, "Anglo-Jewry and the Law of Divorce," <u>Jewish</u> <u>Chronicle</u>, 19 April, 1957, p. 11. See also G. W. Bartholomew, "Application of Jewish Law in England," <u>University of Malaya Law Review</u>, III (1961), pp. 83-111.

29. Ursula Henriques, <u>Religious Toleration in England</u>, (Toronto, 1961), p. 204.

30. Jewish Chronicle, 8 October, 1847, p. 258.

31. Voice of Jacob, 18 October, 1844, p. 18. Michael Leigh, "Reform Judaism in Britain," in 32. Dow Marmur, ed., Reform Judaism, (London, 1973), p. 30. John M. Shaftesley, "Religious Controversies," in 33. Salmond S. Levin, ed., A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life, (London, [1973]), pp. 94-5. Voice of Jacob, 10 December, 1841, p. 41. 34. Jewish Chronicle, 3 December, 1847, p. 393. 35. Francis Henry Goldsmid, Remarks on the Civil 36. Disabilities of British Jews, ([London, 1830_7), p. 19. Jewish Chronicle, 8 January, 1847, p. 53. 37. Voice of Jacob, 5 August, 1842, p. 178. 38. Jewish Chronicle, 1 November, 1844, p. 18. 39. Ibid., 7 March, 1845, p. 110. 40. 41. Ibid., 8 January, 1847, p. 54. Ibid., 3 January, 1845, p. 67. 42. 43. Ibid., 4 January, 1850, p. 98. 44. Ibid., 4 February, 1848, p. 420. Ibid., 25 January, 1845, p. 206. 45. Ibid., 8 January, 1847, p. 53. 46. 47. Basil Montagu, A Letter to Henry Warburton, Esg. M.P. upon the Emancipation of the Jews, (London, 1833), p. 29. 48. Voice of Jacob, 4 October, 1844, p. 5. 49. Jewish Chronicle, 4 February, 1848, p. 421. Elkan N. Adler, London, (Philadelphia, 1930), p. 170. 50. 51. Jewish Chronicle, 12 January, 1849, quoted in Raymond Apple, "United Synagogue: Religious Founders and Leaders." in Salmond S. Levin, ed., A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life,

pp. 14-15.

87

Notes to the Conclusion

1. Jacob Katz, <u>Tradition and Crisis</u>, (New York, 1971), p. 251.

2. James Parkes, "The History of the Anglo-Jewish Community," in Maurice Freedman, ed., <u>A Minority in Britain</u>, (London, 1955), p. 40.

Bibliography

Bibliographies:

- Jacobs, Joseph and Wolf, Lucien. <u>A Bibliographical</u> <u>Guide to Anglo-Jewish History</u>. London: The Jewish Chronicle, 1888.
- Lehmann, Ruth P. <u>Anglo-Jewish Bibliography</u>, <u>1937-1970</u>. London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1973. . Nova Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica. London:

```
Jewish Historical Society of England, 1961.
```

Roth, Cecil. <u>Magna Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica</u>. New edition. London: Jewish Historical Society of England. 1937.

PRIMARY SOURCES

Newspapers:

The Jewish Chronicle. 1844-1858.

The Jewish Chronicle. Special Supplement. Tercentenary of the Resettlement of the Jews in the British Isles, 1656-1956. January 27, 1956. The Times. London. 1847-1858.

The Voice of Jacob. 1841-1847.

Government_Publications:

Great Britain. Parliament. <u>Debates in the House of Commons</u> ... and in the House of Lords on the Motion for the <u>Second Reading of the Bill for Removing the Civil</u> <u>Disabilities of the Jews</u>. London: The Mirror of Parliament, 1834.

. <u>Speeches of the Right Hon. Robert Grant et al.</u> <u>Relative to the Civil Disabilities of the Jews.</u> London: The Mirror of Parliament, 1833.

. <u>Hansard's Parliamentary Debates</u>. Third Series. 1847-1858.

Books, pamphlets, and articles:

- Abrahams, Israel. "Text of Mr. Robert Grant's Bill." <u>Jewish Historical Society of England</u>. <u>Transactions</u>. 6. (1908-10) 249-53.
- Abrahams, Lionel. "Sir I.L. Goldsmid and the Admission of the Jews of England to Parliament." <u>Jewish Historical</u> Society of England. Transactions. 4. (1899-1901) 116-76.
- A Barrister. <u>An Answer to the Speech of the Right Hon. Sir</u> <u>Robert Peel.M.P.</u> London: Rivington, 1848.
- Bendavid, Lazarus. Etwas zur Charackteristick der Juden. Leipzig, 1793.
- Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine. American edition. XXV. New York, 1847.
- Blunt, John Elijah. <u>A History of the Establishment and</u> <u>Residence of the Jews in England with an Enquiry into</u> <u>their Civil Disabilities</u>. London: Saunders and Benning, 1830.
- Campbell, Hon. W.F. <u>Substance of a Speech on the Jewish</u> <u>Question</u>. London: Rivington, 1849.
- "Che Sara, Sara," or Lord John Russell and the Jews. London: Parker, 1848.
- A Clergyman of the Church of England. The Anglo-Hebrews. London: Booth, 1856.
- Disraeli, Benjamin. Lord George Bentinck. London: Colburn, 1852.
- Dohm, Christian Wilhelm. <u>Concerning the Amelioration</u> of the Civil Status of the Jews. Translated by Helen Lederer. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1957.

Edison, John Sibbald. The Question of the Admissibility of the Jews to Parliament. London: Rivington, 1859.

- Egan, Charles. The Status of the Jews in England. London: Hastings, 1848.
- Faudel, Henry. <u>A Few Words on the Jewish Disabilities</u>. London: Ridgway, 1848.
- Gawler, Colonel George. The Emancipation of the Jews... London: Boone, 1847.
- Goldsmid, Francis Henry. <u>The Arguments Advanced Against</u> <u>the Enfranchisement of the Jews...</u> London: Colburn and Bentley, 1831.
 - . <u>Remarks on the Civil Disabilities of British</u> Jews. / London, 1830_7
- Grégoire, Henri. <u>Essai sur la Régénération Physique.</u> <u>Morale et Politique des Juifs</u>. Metz: Claude Lamort, 1789.
- "Investigator". <u>Strictures on the Lecturers to the Jews</u>. London: Sherwood, Neely, and Jones, 1810.
- Kennard, Rev. Robert Bruce. <u>A Plea for the Maintenance of</u> <u>our National Christianity</u>. London: Bell and Daldy, 1855.
- "A Levite". Jewish Emancipation. London: Riebau, 1829.
- Locke, John. <u>A Letter Concerning Toleration</u>. In Cranston, Maurice. ed. <u>Locke on Politics. Religion and Education</u>. New York: Collier Books, 1965, pp. 104-46.
- Loewe, L. ed. <u>Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore</u>. Two volumes. Chicago: Belford-Clarke, 1890.
- London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews. <u>The Fifth</u> <u>Half-Yearly Report</u>. London: Wertheimer, 1855.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. "Civil Disabilities of the Jews." <u>The Edinburgh Review</u>, January, 1831. In <u>Critical and</u> <u>Historical Essays</u>. I. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1900, pp. 641-55.
- Mahler, Raphael. <u>Jewish Emancipation</u>: A Selection of Documents. New York: American Jewish Committee, 1942.

Margoliouth, Rev. Moses. <u>The History of the Jews in Great</u> Britain. Three volumes. London: Richard Bentley, 1851.

. <u>The Jews in Great Britain</u>. London: James Nisbet, 1846.

- [Marks, David Woolf and Löwy, Albert.7 Memoir of Sir Francis Henry Goldsmid. London: Kegan Paul, 1879.
- Mirabeau, Honoré Gabriel Riquetti, comte de. <u>Sur Moses</u> <u>Mendelssohn, sur la réforme politique des juifs;...</u> London, 1787.
- Montagu, Basil. <u>A Letter to Henry Warburton, Esq. M.P.</u> <u>upon the Emancipation of the Jews</u>. London: William Pickering, 1833.
 - <u>A Letter to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop</u> of Chichester upon the Emancipation of the Jews. London: William Pickering, 1834.
- Myers, Maurice. "Some Ms. Sidelights on Anglo-Jewish Emancipation." <u>Jewish Historical Society of England</u>. <u>Transactions</u>. 6. (1908-10) 240-46.
- "Phoenix". <u>Scriptural Reasonings in Support of the Jewish</u> <u>Claims</u>. London: Partridge and Oakey, 1850.

Roth, Cecil. Anglo-Jewish Letters. London: Soncino, 1938.

- Salomons, David. <u>A Short Statement on Behalf of His</u> <u>Majesty's Subjects Professing the Jewish Religion</u>. London: Richardson, 1835.
- Samuel, Moses. <u>An Address on the Position of the Jews in</u> Britain. London: Wertheimer, <u>_____1844_7</u>
- Sheil, R. L. <u>R. L. Sheil on the Jewish Disabilities Bill</u>. House of Commons, February 7, 1848. [196?]
- Thornborrow, William. <u>Advocacy of Jewish Freedom</u>. London: Wilson, 1847.

- Toland, John. <u>Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in Great</u> <u>Britain and Ireland</u>. London, 1714.
- Van Oven, Barnard. <u>Ought Baron de Rothschild To Sit in</u> <u>Parliament?</u> London: Wilson, 1847.
- Walpole, Spencer H. <u>Speech of Spencer H. Walpole, Esg., M.P.</u> <u>on the Second Reading of the Jewish Disabilities Bill</u>, London: Hatchard, 1848.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abrahams, Israel. <u>Jewish Life Under Emancipation</u>. London: St. Clements Press, 1917.
- Adler, Elkan N. London. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1930.
- Baeck, Leo. "Sometimes We must Say 'No'". Translated by Jakob J. Petuchowski. <u>CCAR Journal</u>, Spring, 1973, pp.37-41.

Baron, Salo W. "Ghetto and Emancipation." <u>The Menorah</u> <u>Journal</u>, June 1928, pp. 515-26.

. "Jewish Emancipation." <u>Encyclopaedia of the</u> <u>Social Sciences</u>, VIII. New York: Macmillan, 1932, pp. 394-99.

. "The Modern Age." In Schwarz, Leo W. ed., <u>Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People</u>. New York: The Modern Library, 1956, pp. 315-84.

_____. "Newer Approaches to Jewish Emancipation." <u>Diogenes</u>. Spring, 1960, pp. 56-81.

• <u>A Social and Religious History of the Jews</u>. Vol. II. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

Bartholomew, G. W. "Application of Jewish Law in England." <u>University of Malaya Law Review</u>, III, (1961) 83-111. Cohen, A. An Anglo-Jewish Scrapbook. London: Cailingold, 1943.

- Duschinsky, Charles. <u>The Rabbinate of the Great Synagogue</u>, London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Emanuel, C.H.L. <u>A Century and a Half of Jewish History</u>. London: Routledge, 1910.
- Emden, Paul H. Jews of Britain. London: Sampson Low, Marston, [1944]
- Ettinger, Shmuel. "The Beginnings of the Change in Attitude of European Society towards the Jews." <u>Scripta</u> <u>Hierosolymitana</u>, VII. Jerusalem, 1961, pp. 193-219.
- Fine, Hillel A. "The Jews and Parliament." Prize Essay, Hebrew Union College, 1947.
- Finestein, Israel. "An Aspect of the Jews and English Marriage Law During the Emancipation: The Prohibited Degrees." <u>Jewish Journal of Sociology</u>, 7-8,(1965-66), 3-21.

. "Anglo-Jewish Opinion During the Struggle for Emancipation." Jewish Historical Society of England. Transactions. Sessions 1959-61. XX (1964) 113-43.

. "Anglo-Jewry and the Law of Divorce."<u>The Jewish</u> <u>Chronicle</u>, April 19, 1957, p. 11.

_____. "On the Centenary of Parliamentary Emancipation." Synagogue Review, 32, (1957-58) 264-67.

• <u>A Short History of Anglo-Jewry</u>. London: Lincoln-Prager, 1957.

- Goodman, Paul. <u>Moses Montefiore</u>. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1925.
- Gould, Julius, and Esh, Shaul, eds. <u>Jewish Life in</u> <u>Modern Britain</u>. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

Hagani, Baruch. L'emancipation des Juifs. Paris: Rieder, 1928. Henriques, H.S.Q. The Jews and the English Law. Oxford:

at the University Press, 1908.

. "The Question Whether a Jew Can Be Lord Chancellor of England." Jewish Historical Society of England. Transactions. 8 (1915-17) 55-62.

Henriques, Ursula. "The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain." <u>Past and Present</u>. 40. (1968) 126-46.

. <u>Religious Toleration in England</u>. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

Hertzberg, Arthur. The French Enlightenment and the Jews. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Hyamson, Albert M. David Salomons. London: Methuen, 1939.

. "The First Jewish Peer." Jewish Historical Society of England. Transactions. 17 (1953), 287-90.

. The Jews of England. n.d.

. The Sephardim of England. London: Methuen, 1951.

Katz, Jacob. <u>Emancipation and Assimilation</u>. Westmead, England: Gregg International Publishers, 1972.

. Exclusiveness and Tolerance. New York: Schocken, 1962.

. Out of the Ghetto. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

. "The Term 'Jewish Emancipation'." In Altmann, Alexander, ed. <u>Studies in Nineteenth-Century Jewish</u> <u>Intellectual History</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964, pp. 1-26.

. Tradition and Crisis. New York: Schocken, 1971.

Kohler, Max J. "The Doctrine that 'Christianity is Part of the Common Law'." <u>Publications of the American</u> <u>Jewish Historical Society</u>, 31, (1928) 105-34.

Levin, Salmond S. <u>A Century of Anglo-Jewish Life</u>. London: United Synagogue, [1973].

Lipman, V. D. <u>Social History of the Jews in England</u>. London: Watts, 1954.

."The Structure of London Jewry in the Mid-Nineteenth Century." In Zimmels, H. J. <u>et al.</u>, eds., <u>Essays presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie.</u> I, London: Soncino, 1967, pp. 253-74.

."A Survey of Anglo-Jewry in 1851." <u>Jewish</u> <u>Historical Society of England</u>. <u>Transactions</u>. XVII. Sessions 1951-52. (1953) 171-88.

.ed. Three Centuries of Anglo-Jewish History, Cambridge: Heffer, for the Jewish Historical Society of England, 1961.

Littmann, Ellen. "Saul Ascher." <u>Leo Baeck Institute</u> Year Book, V. (1960) 107-21.

Marmur, Dow, ed. <u>Reform Judaism</u>. London: Reform Synagogues of Great Britain, 1973.

Meyer, Michael A. The Origins of the Modern Jew. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.

Montefiore, Leonard G. "David Woolf Marks." <u>Synagogue</u> <u>Review</u>, 36. (1961-62) 67-72.

Parkes, James. "The History of the Anglo-Jewish Community." In Freedman, Maurice, ed. <u>A Minority</u> <u>in Britain</u>. London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1955, pp. 3-54.

Perry, Thomas W. <u>Public Opinion, Propaganda, and Politics</u> <u>in Eighteenth Century England</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

- Picciotto, James. <u>Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History</u>. Revised and edited by Israel Finestein. London: Soncino, 1956.
- Pinsker, Polly. "English Opinion and Jewish Emancipation." Jewish Social Studies, 14, (1952) 51-94.

Roth, Cecil. "The First Jewish M.P." In Roth, Cecil. <u>Essays and Portraits in Anglo-Jewish History</u>. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1962, pp.277-81.

. A History of the Jews in England. Third edition.

. <u>History of the Great Synagogue</u>. London: Goldston, 1950.

. The Magnificent Rothschilds. New York: Pyramid Books, 1962.

. "The Two Cradles of Jewish Liberty." <u>Commentary</u>, XVII, (1954), 109-17.

- Sachar, A.L. "The Jew Enters Parliament." <u>The Menorah</u> <u>Journal</u>, 10, (1924) 333-42.
- Sachar, Howard M. The Course of Modern Jewish History. Cleveland: World, 1958.
- Sacher, Harry. Jewish Emancipation: The Contract Myth. London: English Zionist Federation, 1917.

Salomon, Sidney. The Deputies. [London, 1937]

- Schmidt, H. D. "The Terms of Emancipation." <u>Leo Baeck</u> <u>Institute Year Book</u>, I, (1956), 28-50.
- Scult, Melvin M. "The Conversion of the Jews and the Origins of Jewish Emancipation in England." Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1968.

. "English Missions to the Jews - Conversion in the Age of Emancipation." Jewish Social Studies, 25, (1973) 3-17.

Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1964.

- Temkin, S.D. "Three Centuries of Jewish Life in England." American Jewish Year Book, 58, (1957) 3-64.
- Toury, Jacob. " 'The Jewish Question': A Semantic Approach." Leo Baeck Institute Year Book, XI, (1966) 85-106.
- Trachtenberg, Joshua. <u>The Devil and the Jews</u>. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.

Wolf, Lucien. Sir Moses Montefiore. London: John Murray, 1884.

