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Abstract

Current scholarship on empire considers those Britons engaged in processes of colonisation as culturally homogeneous, but this view negates their cultural complexity. From the first forays of the Port Phillip Association, Jewish settlers and investors have been attached to Melbourne. Although those settling in Melbourne were themselves predominantly British, they brought with them not only the networks of empire, but also the intersecting diasporas of European Jewry and the new and expanding English-speaking Jewish world. This thesis considers how the cosmopolitan outlook and wide networks of the Jewish community helped shape Melbourne.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agunah</td>
<td>A wife deserted by her husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashkenazi</td>
<td>Literally the Jews from Germany, but referring to Jews from Central and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’al Kore</td>
<td>The individual in synagogue who chants Torah from the scroll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Mitzvah</td>
<td>A ceremony for boys at the age of thirteen, at which time they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>considered responsible for their actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Din</td>
<td>Jewish Court of Law, consisting of three Rabbis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit</td>
<td>A circumcision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chazan</td>
<td>The vocalist in the synagogue who leads the congregation in prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheder (plural Chederim)</td>
<td>Traditional Jewish School teaching Hebrew and religious subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuppah</td>
<td>A canopy under which a Jewish marriage ceremony is performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converso</td>
<td>Those who converted to Catholicism during the Inquisition (or their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descendants).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypto Jews</td>
<td>Those who converted to Catholicism, but secretly continue to practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judaism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eruv</td>
<td>The rabbinic provision which permits the alteration of certain Sabbath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get</td>
<td>Formal document of divorcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guir/Guersits</td>
<td>Convert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halachah</td>
<td>Jewish Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskalah</td>
<td>The Jewish enlightenment, initiated in Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehillah</td>
<td>Community, semi-autonomous communal structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kest</td>
<td>Room and board provided to a newly married couple.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketubah</td>
<td>Marriage Contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Glossary of Hebrew and Yiddish Words
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kosher/ Kashrut</td>
<td>Jewish dietary rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magen David</td>
<td>Star of David, regarded as the primary symbol of Judaism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzah</td>
<td>Unleavened bread eaten at Passover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikvah</td>
<td>Bath used for ritual immersion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishna</td>
<td>The first interpretation of the Jewish oral tradition, a collection of Jewish laws and ethics which forms the basis of the Talmud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmud Torah</td>
<td>School for children of modest means teaching elementary Hebrew and religious studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikun Olam</td>
<td>Acts of kindness to repair the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minyan</td>
<td>Quorum of ten adult males required for communal prayer (and women in reform congregations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minhag</td>
<td>Custom or rite used for synagogue liturgy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishpacha</td>
<td>Extended family by blood or marriage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitzvah (plural Mitzvot)</td>
<td>Commandments by God, a good deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohel</td>
<td>The person who performs circumcisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sephardi</td>
<td>Literally Spanish, referring to Jews from Spain and Portugal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shochet</td>
<td>Ritual slaughter of meat, according to Jewish Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shul</td>
<td>Yiddish for synagogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefer Torah</td>
<td>Scrolls containing the five books of Moses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkah</td>
<td>A temporary dwelling constructed during the festival of Sukkot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmud</td>
<td>The collection of ancient Jewish writing, commentary and laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsedakah</td>
<td>Charity, one of the tenants of Judaism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

EMHC      East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation
MHC       Melbourne Hebrew Congregation
PROV      Public Record Office of Victoria
St KHC    St Kilda Hebrew Congregation
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In 1860 Nathaniel Levi (1830-1908), head covered and swearing on an Old Testament, was the first Jewish Parliamentarian to take his seat in Victoria. Levi, a native of Liverpool, in many ways exemplified the typical settler of nineteenth-century Melbourne (Figure 1). Born to middle-class parents, originating from and educated in a regional English city, Levi had been first attracted to the Californian goldfields, but after parental intervention postponed the journey in favour of a ‘temporary’ sojourn in Victoria. Realising quickly that greater prosperity could be achieved through commerce than through mining, Levi established a number of manufacturing and commercial enterprises. As a parliamentarian, as founder, trustee and president of the Chamber of Manufacturers, and as president of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, he attests, like many of his generation, to the integrated position felt by Anglo-Jewry.

Figure 1 Nathaniel Levi


Jews have been present from the outset of Australia’s colonisation and members of the community have been at the forefront of settlement in many of the Australian colonies. In Victoria, Jews were sponsors of the Port Phillip Association, investors in land at the first land sales, and early settlers across the city. Although the Jewish community of Australia has always been small (throughout the nineteenth century it constituted approximately 0.5 percent of the population), members have participated widely in public life, perhaps the most high profile being Sir Isaac Isaacs (1855-1948), appointed the first Australian-born Governor General in 1931, and Sir John Monash (1865-1931), commander of the Australian troops in World War One, while architects such as Nahum Barnet (1855-1931) and developers such as Benjamin Fink (1847-1909) were instrumental in shaping the fabric of the city.

The Melbourne of the 1840s in which the first Jewish settlers found themselves was a small city, a mixture of free settlers and those for whom immigration had been under sentence—convicts and ex-convicts—establishing an economy founded on the production of wool and supported by mercantile interests (Figure 2). Melbourne was established at a time of vast European migration, and the discovery of gold in 1851 stimulated a flow of new colonists, transforming the population and its economy. Included in this mass migration were several thousand, primarily Anglo-Jews, settling on this new frontier in the burgeoning city of Melbourne, which quickly rose to be one of the wealthiest cities in the world.

**Figure 2 Collins Street – Town of Melbourne, Port Phillip, NSW, 1840**
These Jewish settlers fashioned a society that was at once integrated within the wider community, and proudly Jewish, emphatically positioning themselves as equal citizens of the metropolis. They expressed the values of nineteenth-century Jewry—‘distinct, rather than abnormal’—considering themselves a part of ‘the ethnic heterogeneity’ of the colony. This identification was overlaid with that of an international perspective developed through their diasporic history. Jews are considered ‘quintessential cosmopolitans—a transnational community that was at home everywhere (and nowhere)’. Outside the nation state, their transitional connections provided support for other Jews and Jewish communities, while willingly or unwillingly they experienced expectations of acculturation and integration within host societies. Cosmopolitanism provided a third path, but one which itself has been fraught with danger, and at times has been something to fear. For those arriving in Melbourne, their British birth provided a normalcy of settlement and a shared settlement experience, expressed through strong and repeated loyalty to Britain and her Empire; yet their cosmopolitan values allowed an outlook and connections independent of those of other British settlers. These proved beneficial not only for personal and professional gain, but were employed in the international positioning of this emergent society. A tiny community, these Jews influenced the development of the city intellectually and physically: as arbiters of public policy and public opinion, designers and builders, politicians, newspaper proprietors, international correspondents, businessmen and financiers. As with other Jewish communities in the large centres of the world, they responded to the freedoms of an emancipated society, maintaining their religious beliefs while manifesting contemporary social values and fashionable appearance.

A number of recent historians make critical linkages between concepts of identity and place in the context of British imperial history. Historian Stuart Ward conceived the term

---


6 Ibid., 1.

‘Britannic nationalism’ to describe the connection of Australians and Canadians, not only to Britain, but to the concept of a wider Empire. In a similar vein, geographer Doreen Massey describes ‘local uniqueness’ as a product of the wider connections and global forces beyond the place itself. Bearing these frameworks in mind, this thesis considers how an acculturated Jewish community, settling as equal citizens in a new society, created an identity and Jewish community reflective of their values and aspirations. As engaged citizens, this group used its considerable networks to influence the intellectual and physical fabric of the city in ways which have not previously been considered. This thesis therefore pays new critical attention to the ways in which this acculturated community came to a novel settler society without pre-existing communal institutions. It further considers how the institutions they created and their social interactions exhibit their values, how they assisted in the intellectual and physical formation of Melbourne by employing the networks of empire and of the Jewish diaspora, and how they ultimately became active participants in framing a new and wealthy society.

Historiography

Urbanism

Urbanism for Jews has been a multi-faceted beast. It has been structured as a space of confinement in ghettos and millah, transforming in the nineteenth century into a place of promise and modernity. Yet it has also simultaneously been a threat to Jewish identity and a stimulation to the theological reimagining of culture and religion through the emergence of new pluralistic forms of Judaism. This dichotomy has led scholars to see an interdependency between urbanisation and secularisation. A number of historians have explored the growth of cities and their impact on religious observance. Hölscher argues that urbanisation not only changed social structures but also the idea of ‘religion’ itself, its perception and practice in

---

10 Tobias Metzler, "Secularization and Pluralism: Urban Jewish Culture in Early Twentieth-Century Berlin," Journal of Urban History 37, no. 6 (2011): 872, while others have seen a growth in the construction of churches and synagogues throughout the nineteenth-century see Steinhoff Anthony, "Nineteenth-Century Urbanisation as Sacred Process: Insights from German Strasbourg," ibid.,
the modern world. From a Christian perspective Hugh McLeod and Owen Chadwick observed a decline in religious attendance from the mid-eighteenth century. Endelman charts the loosening of the bonds of the Kelliah as cities expanded from the late-eighteenth century, particularly in the two largest urban Jewish populations, London and Amsterdam, which as modern cities offered a range of distractions to their citizenry. Here, Jews participated without abandoning their religious affiliations. These were also cities with significant Sephardi populations, communities whose historic migrations had resulted in experience on the margins of two religions. For many scholars, Amsterdam and London are not central to the narrative of Jewish urbanism; rather, the central urban experience is Germany, with Berlin epitomizing the model of urban Jewish modernity. This has been retrospectively perceived within the framework of the waves of anti-Semitism culminating in the Holocaust. This model equates urbanism with the abandonment of Judaism and Jewish values, negating the specific circumstances of time and place. The model also perceives only the threats to the community, rather than appreciating issues of communal sustainability. A prime example is the emphasis on marriage statistics as a symbolic measurement of the strength or decline of communities. In countering the negativity of this perception, analysis by such scholars as Lowenstein demonstrates that although high rates of out-marriage occurred in Berlin and other centres, the vast majority of Jews continued to marry endogamously, while developing networks of educational, cultural, charitable and religious institutions. Importantly, urban centres provided educational opportunities unavailable in small homogenous rural communities. The changes brought about by modernity need not be a threat: for Melzer, modernity and the city were central to new developments in reclaiming and expanding new territories for Judaism and the Jewish experience.

In pre-emancipatory societies Jews were excluded from formal participation in political life as ‘their political status was inseparable from their religious status. There was no Judaism outside the Judaism of the Kehillah,’ and the kehillah was structurally responsible for a number of legal, social and philanthropic activities. No communities are static, as witnessed in the loosening of rabbinic authority, brought about through the power exerted by wealthy merchants and court Jews. In Australia, South Africa, England, the Americas and in other parts of the English-speaking world, religious affiliation was a private and personal affair, without a requirement for formal affiliation. In societies where Jews were not excluded, new opportunities for a variety of interactions and social involvement offered alternatives for members. If we accept Berkovitz’s assertion that acculturation was a part of the diaspora experience, then we can consider the distinct responses by communities, without judging these destructive of Jewish identity.

Australian Jewry provides a unique illustration of the urban Jewish experience. As Jews flocked to the large cities of Europe in the nineteenth century, Melbourne became an alternative for those brave enough to sail vast distances into the relative unknown. Unlike the settler society of America or the large cities of Europe, where the new arrivals came from small rural communities, Victoria was settled by predominantly urban English Jews. In contrast, for many European immigrants, England had been a stepping stone of forward migration to the colonies. For some, this was an ongoing and peripatetic existence, moving between the English-speaking colonies, seeking economic improvements and familial connections.

Anglo-Jewish Historiography

Those Jews settling in Melbourne were predominantly English, arriving as political emancipation within Britain reached its final stages. Michael Clark has described Anglo-
Jewish history as the ‘Black sheep’ of Jewish and British historical research, disregarded by Jewish historians as provincial and lacking in exciting drama. Cannadine dismissed Anglo-Jewish history as ‘little more than a bland and lukewarm chronicle...neither very interesting nor very exciting [and] in the context of British History...not at all important’. This criticism reflects the ultimate success of Anglo-Jewry, who over time, developed sustained economic and social progress, creating what Cannadine considered a ‘successful minority’ without suffering the persecution experienced in much of Europe.

This thesis is buttressed between two focal points of historical interest: the readmission of the Jews to England in 1656 and the subsequent campaign for emancipation on the one hand; and mass immigration of Eastern Europeans following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II on the other. From a broad perspective, the impact of the enlightenment and Jewish emancipation can be characterised by three prevailing views. The first, described by Clark as the ‘East European School of Jewish history’, sees the Jewish and wider enlightenment as negatively impacting on Jewish intellectual and cultural life, diluting Jewish religious practices through the evolution of new secular ideas. This is in contrast to the shtetl communities of Eastern Europe, isolated from the cultural shifts of the enlightenment, which were able to retain a ‘purer’ form of Judaism. The contrary view contends that the growth of European urbanism led inextricably to greater levels of secularisation and engagement with a world outside the confines of the Ghetto, allowing Jews to absorb intellectual and cultural ideas of the general community. The final contention, a Germanic-centric view, reasons that it required the self-conscious reappraisal of Judaism by Moses Mendelssohn and his circle within the Haskalah which created an intellectual reappraisal of

---


23 Ibid., 12, see also Suzanne D. Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora; Two Centuries of Jewish Settlement in Australia* (Sydney: Brandl & Schlesinger, 1997), 6-7.

Judaism, which subsequently flowed to Britain. This view has been somewhat superseded by recent scholarship which explores how diverse ideas occurred in diffuse places in the modern world, influenced by the cultural experience of individual communities. Thus Endelman and Ruderman reason that the Hasidah was outside the experience of British Jews who responded to the intellectual and cultural shifts of the wider English society, while Sorkin has led the way in perceiving the influence of Sephardi ‘Port Jews’ in defining a new consciousness and social position within the trading societies of the Mediterranean and Atlantic.

To understand the response of Melbourne’s Jewish settlers, it is important to consider their political and cultural background. Commencing with the seminal work of Cecil Roth in the 1940s, modern Anglo-Jewish history has traced its development from the readmission under Cromwell at a time of great social and religious upheaval. This readmission was permitted through a combination of factors: governmental economic self-interest, recognising the trading advantages that the Sephardi community afforded; growing political religious dissent within society; and Protestant philo-semitism, stemming from a contemporary bibliocentric preoccupation, which emphasised Hebrew as the language used by God to create the universe, and as such, assisting in providing a clearer understanding of God’s message. Protestant England was also experiencing a resurgent religious self-confidence. Having overthrown the ‘idolatry’ of the Catholic Church, it was assumed that England could play an active role in facilitating the Millennium, which required the conversion of the Jews, with readmission necessary to ensure Jewish proselytes.

---


27 Cecil Roth, A History of the Jews in England (Oxford Clarendon Press, 1964). This work has been criticised by subsequent historians for focusing on toleration and the success of the community in its integration within British society.


Unlike Central Europe, where legal and financial restrictions were placed on Jews, the Anglo-Jewish community had petitioned for readmission as ‘dwellers here with the same equalness and convenience which your inland born subjects do enjoy’.30 These civil and legal rights were never formally clarified, nor were ancient and restrictive statutes such as the Statutum de Judaismo of 1275 ever removed.31 No charter or legislation regularising Jewish residence was established, leaving Jews in an ambivalent civil and social status within a statutory vacuum.32 Within this legal void some latitude was shown. As early as 1667 Jews were first permitted to give evidence in a court of law, sworn on an Old Testament, and flexibility was provided to accommodate Jewish witnesses who were not required to appear on the Sabbath and as we will consider, Jewish marital practices remained distinct from those of their Christian brethren.33 Jews were excluded economically by guilds and trades. Non-British-born Jews were unable to purchase land and most importantly, until 1830, Jews were debarred as Freeman of the City of London, preventing them from operating commercially in the City. The Oath of Abjuration effectively disqualified Jews from several other civil activities including universities, the judiciary and as Members of Parliament.34

The motivations for Anglo-Jewish emancipation differed from those in other parts of Europe. Nineteenth-century England was a tolerant society of prevailing liberalism formed from centuries of religious turmoil following the reformation. While the assertion of authority by the Church of England, as the established Church, resulted in a variety of philosophical and theological debates. Of particular importance were Locke’s views on a separation of state and religion, while the Catholic and non-conformist Churches similarly fought to gain greater civil and political rights. England was not philosophically isolated, and the ideas expressed in the American and French constitutions, the impact of the American War of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man also played a part in

changing values within British society. With the repeal of the Test and Corporations Act in 1828 and the introduction of the Roman Catholic Relief Act the following year, Jews remained the only segment of society excluded from political life due to their faith. The remaining disabilities of the Jewish community ‘were of little consequence in day-to-day affairs. [But] Barriers to public office and elite institutions implied that Jews as a group were inferior, not altogether English, and untrustworthy’. Many Protestants also considered the historic mistreatment of Jews by the Catholic Church as exemplifying un-Christian behaviour, which they wished to surpass. Supported particularly by the Quakers and Unitarians, political agitation continued for full Jewish recognition. As the population of British-born Jewry rose, there was a corresponding lessening of the rigid social constraints between Jews and Christians. New metropolitan diversions such as theatres, coffee houses, Masonic lodges and other social milieu presented opportunities for increased interaction. Although anti-Semitism existed, particularly in private amongst the upper class, in public Jews were treated as equal. Civil restrictions took longer to be dismantled and gradual reform occurred in the period 1830-1858, the final act of emancipation deemed to be the accession of Lionel Rothschild to his Seat in Parliament, a seat that he had won eleven years earlier, but was unable to fill due to the religiously restrictive nature of the Oath.

Raz-Krakotzin describes traditional Jewish self-perception as one of ‘exile’—exiled from a homeland, adrift and wandering, rootless. This was particularly acute for Yiddish speakers, who lacked access to the vernacular, whereas Anglo-Jewry’s mastery of English


37 Snyder, "Rules, Rights and Redemption: The Negotiation of Jewish Status in British Atlantic Port Towns, 1740-1831," 149.


40 Clark, Albion and Jerusalem: The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Post-Emancipation Era, 236.

provided a sense of intellectual and social connectedness. Proficiency in English helped Jewish philosophers engage with the intellectual debates of their day. Independent of the Haskalah, and within the wider English Enlightenment, English Jews fashioned their own philosophical and Anglo-centric views. Anglo-Jewish writers challenged conventional ways of thinking, creating and examining religious, philosophical, social and political issues. Ruderman points to a number of English philosophers—including David Levi, David Nieto and Abraham Tang—who developed a religious identity based on their interactions with English intellectual thought. Responding to religious reform and cultural redefinition shaped a new conceptualisation of religion, a concern for ‘identity and definitions of Judaism’, and a reassessment of rabbinic authority. In engaging with notions of modernity, synagogue practices were amended and redesigned to address the externals of observance rather than liturgical ritual itself. Unlike in Europe, the wealthiest (and by implication most acculturated) members of the community exerted change while remaining within Orthodoxy.

Williams defined what he called the ‘anti-Semitism of intolerance’ whereby Jews were validated ‘not on the grounds of their Jewish identity but on the basis of their conformity to the values and manners of bourgeois English society’; in response Jews attempted to create a cohesiveness and compatibility between Englishness and Jewishness. Britain was fundamentally a religious society, which provided the space and climate in which Jews could express their religious identity and ‘justify adherence to Judaism’. This was an expression of an ethnic identity compatible with participation in a secular world, while still remaining loyal to Judaism; tempering Judaism with a sense of middle-class propriety to create an orthodoxy
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with ‘piety and dignity, modernity of method with strict adherence to traditions’. This sometimes directed the community into an ambiguous position. To counter the anti-Semitic rhetoric that perceived Jewish culture as exclusive and insular, the community avoided conspicuous manifestations of ‘Jewishness’. This included insecurity around overtly Jewish institutions and sometimes tempered the solving of communal issues. A similar unease was expressed by British politicians, who, unlike their Australian counterparts, were careful to be identified as MPs first and of the Jewish persuasion second. Nonetheless, English Jews maintained a strong attachment to institutions which epitomised Jewishness—Synagogue, welfare agencies and family cohesion.

Australian Jewish Historiography

As with Anglo-Jewish history, Australian Jewish historical research has been of interest to a small number of historians and sociologists, supplemented by articles written by amateurs associated with the Australian Jewish Historical Society. Unlike other forms of social, economic or political history, Australian Jewish historical research is focused on a community explored via its religious observance and cultural development, analysing the community through its organisations, achievements and the public perception of high profile individuals. And like its English counterpart, discussion of this minority community is absent from the general histories of Victoria, although individuals are identified in the works of many scholars.

---


written as a chronological and isolated narrative, rarely perceiving any connections to either the wider Jewish world or the Empire in which the community was established.

The scholarship on Victorian Jewry falls into three ‘schools’. The first is focused on the details of communal formation, starting with the densely written history, self-published by Rabbi Lazarus Goldman, and followed up by a number of congregational histories. The second is the attempt to paint the community as outside the ‘normalcy’ of Jewish experience, perceived to be some idealised pre-emancipatory eastern European shtetl. Much of this research has relied on the primary research by Goldman and has not explored issues of communal development, nor appreciated the context of the new colony within wider urban Jewish or empire history. This lack of context has resulted in some unfortunate assumptions. Perhaps the most pronounced is the interesting statistical analysis undertaken by Price for the Australian Jewish Historical Society, using analysis of census and naturalisation records to provide a historical narrative on nineteenth-century Jewry. This primary material produces a natural bias, and is coupled with no historiography and very little historical research. By using naturalisation records, Price negates the experience of the numerically dominant Anglo-Jewish community. His analysis is based on contemporary national boundaries, and thus the nuances of emancipatory experience of various states and the impact these had on their Jewish communities is lost. He states that ‘during the gold rushes so many European Jews, particularly Germans, came to into the country that ten years later British Jews and their children made up no more than half the total Jewish population’, further estimating that seventy-five percent of the non-English community was German and Austrian. This statement does not allow for the natural population increases experienced in any society. Analysis within this thesis (using contemporaneous national boundaries) has identified that those from the German provinces (including Prussia) contributed the largest non-English speaking population to Melbourne (48% of those born outside an English speaking country), but were only approximately 8% of the total Jewish population. Contemporary literature


examines the development of the unique characteristics of Anglo-Jewry as a response to the social and political conditions of post-readmission Britain. In opposition, Price claims that the only valuable forms of Anglo-Jewry, including the Chief Rabbi himself, were German. His lack of understanding of urban or wider Australian history leads him to make erroneous generalisations about place, particularly his analysis of Melbourne where he describes 1850s and 1860s East Melbourne, Carlton and Fitzroy as ‘working class areas’ of Jewish settlement. This dismissal of the value of the settlement experience is also followed in the writings of Rutland and Medding, who again contextualise the community from a pre-emancipatory position.

The final ‘school’ of Australian Jewish historical writing includes the substantial histories by Hilary and William Rubinstein, proving an overview of the Australian Jewish experience. With a particular focus on the colonial period of Australian history, Rabbi Dr John Levi has published extensively commencing with his co-authored *Australian Genesis: Jewish Convicts and Settlers, 1788-1860*, and his important dictionary of biography, *These are the Names, Jewish Lives in Australian 1788-1850*. He is also the author of biographical works on Rabbis Danglow and Sanger, which give more nuanced accounts of individuals and communal histories. His oeuvre contains some of the few works which do not rely heavily on Goldman’s initial primary research. The political position of Australian Jewry within the colonial period has been chronicled by the Russian historian Israel Getzler, presenting a fascinating analysis and charting the politics of individual governors in shaping colonial Jewish relations, detailing the impact and politics of exclusion created by the Church Act of 1836.
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Empire historiography

The diasporic history of Jews has often left them outside the historiographic constructs of the nation state and within a separate discipline. Likewise, histories of the British Empire have conceived of Britain as a homogenous community, ignoring the reality that British immigration encompassed ethnic solidarities whose diversity was not always easily accommodated by straightforward national labels. In parallel, current scholarship has provided new understandings of the spatial organisation of the British Empire, as with other economic and social history, this scholarship has been generalised in its reading of the cultural diversity of the Empire. Similarly, the contribution of Jews and Jewish communities is rarely perceived in Australian history. Figures such as Sir John Monash or the artist Emanuel Phillips Fox (1864-1915) are seldom considered as part of a wider Jewish dialogue by non-Jewish writers. The national narrative of Australian colonialism is one of an Anglo-masculine force conquering the frontier; a force not only devoid of women, but also eliding those merchants and tradesmen who came from urban centres and perpetuated an urban existence. This funnelling of scholarship is further narrowed in Australian Jewish history, which is considered almost entirely in isolation from any global perspectives and lacking broader contextualisation. This thesis asserts the importance of a transnational perspective in taking as its case study the ethnic heterogeneity of the colonial experience. From cooking to architecture, from philosophical concepts to folklore, Jewish culture has absorbed concepts and been adapted by the societies which Jews have inhabited.

Where new imperial histories have perceived a model of networks to and from the metropole and horizontally across the empire, Jewish historiography has also developed new perceptions of the networks and connections operating transnationally in the Jewish world. David Sorkin in his work on Port Jews (and those who have followed this model) opened the field, while Ava Kahn and Adam Mendelsohn have explored connections across the
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nineteenth-century English-speaking diaspora. Strong links existed between New World English-speaking Jewish communities, connected familiarly, through trade, by modern communications, and through the transnational careers of a number of Rabbis who moved across the New World servicing spiritual needs. Although these strong links existed, the communities did not share similar patterns of acculturation; rather, acculturation was a response to individual communal circumstances, ethnic origins and differing economic foundations. Melbourne was connected to the Empire, with the Anglo origins of Australian Jewry providing a strong identity and adherence to British institutions, particularly that of the Chief Rabbi, in contrast to America, where the predominantly European-born immigrants were early proponents of the German Reform movement. Whereas in America, European immigration resulted in ethno-specific communal organisations, the predominantly English origins of Australian Jewry occasioned a greater level of homogeneity. Like others in the British Empire, those in Melbourne attempted to stay connected to and render their own particular concepts of ‘Britishness’.

The English-speaking diaspora provided a route for step migration, an approach previously employed by Sephardi traders in pursuit of their mercantile interests. Movement
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offered opportunities to gain commercial credibility, to train the next generation in the tools of the trade, (and for the Sephardi community to practise their religion outside the inquisition). Thus, as with others in Victorian society, concepts of the British Empire and the peculiarities of a frontier settler society shaped the practise and culture of the Melbourne Jewish community.

Methodology

As Elizabeth Vibert has noted, the ‘the personal records of empire’, including family histories and personal documents, provide a layer of insight, not only into the domestic lives at ‘home and abroad’, but into relationships between the metropole and the colonies. The primary task was to understand and identify who constituted the Melbourne Jewish community. Initially to provide the data for the thesis I developed a prosopographical study of 5,350 individuals, identifying 3,530 resident in Melbourne until the 1890s (see attached disk). These are interrelated individuals: unravelling family connections is therefore vital for analysis of their actions and to further define their networks. Prosopography is a collective study of the shared background characteristics of a homogenous group, with an emphasis on their external similarities and differences. In order to create the dataset the methodology requires the collection of information across a number of defined characteristics. Although closely related to biography, prosopography differs through the emphasis on trends identified within a group, rather than studying an exclusive individual, identifying exceptional personalities only to clarify the ‘collective and normal’. To capture the data I used the University of Melbourne’s Online Heritage Resource Manager (OHRM)—a relational database (Figure 3). The study entailed the application of a number of other supplementary

---
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methodologies to gather additional information and to analyse this within the thesis framework. Illuminating this required more than abstracted concepts, and necessitated the application of biography and micro-history to identify specific narratives.\textsuperscript{75} A limited number of individuals have previously been explored in detail, and I attempted to include the lives of others who were equally as interesting, but had not necessarily been previously considered. To appreciate the impact of the community on the physical environment of the city, local history techniques were integrated.

This is an era of enormous migration, and the fluidity generated did not result in a simple redistribution from the Old World to the New. Many continued to search for economic prosperity or familial attachments, moving between New World cities or returning to their former homelands. For a study such as this, tracking individuals is difficult, as their documentary footprint can be hard to find. Further, for this Jewish community, the limited range of biblical names used for personal and family names can make identifying specific individuals across time and space difficult. To create this data a variety of sources were interrogated. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with twenty-two descendants of the families in the study to assess any primary sources they might hold. Family histories were developed from lifecycle records, both handwritten registers of the synagogues and birth and deaths information collated by government agencies. Unfortunately the synagogues did not necessarily keep complete records, and in the case of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, the largest set, these were only partially completed, lacking identification of parents and place of birth.\textsuperscript{76} Marriage records were elaborated and extended from information gained in personal notices placed in newspapers, obituaries, wills and cemetery records. Personal notices are valuable in identifying and connecting family members and their place of residence, but these were only inserted by families who could afford the cost and therefore provide an uneven source. Similarly, Doreen Berger has published two volumes of personal notices from English Jewish newspapers for the period 1860-1880 which were on occasion
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useful in connecting families and identifying family relationships. The database ‘Synagogue Scribes’ was used to help identify London synagogue records for the period preceding and immediately subsequent to the introduction of civil registration. The primary complication in relying on life-cycle records is identifying people who were not married, and those who spent time in the colony, but did not marry or produce children here. Research on nineteenth-century English and American communities was assisted by census data, which identifies individuals and includes a range of useful demographic and familial information including household structure. In the case of the United States, census records also identify the languages spoken and immigration history. In comparison, the Victorian census contains no identification of individuals, limiting the ability to track social mobility over time.
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Figure 3 Visualisation showing the interconnectedness of the familial relationships of the residents of the Melbourne Jewish community—data generated from the OHRM
For those born in Europe, ascertaining place of birth can be difficult as records are inconsistent and more difficult to source. For men, naturalisation records can provide information on place of birth, occupation and immigration. In the naturalisation and life-cycle records for European-born settlers, identifying the exact location for a place of birth can be problematic. Jewish communities had specific names for locations different to those used by others. Place names could be a ‘Jewish equivalent derived from an allusive word, the first initials of a group of place names, a pun on the original name or a homonym’.78 Examples include the use of Hebrew initials of German names, so that Bamberg, Bernberg and Birnbaum all become בֶּן-בֶּן. Places could be renamed to sound like places in ancient Israel, or alternatively names could indicate either a Jewish historical connection or describe its commercial character. Many of those filling in marriage registers appear to transliterate names of towns either from their German, Polish, Hebrew or Yiddish names, often making them unintelligible to modern atlases or historic gazetteers. Further, family history sources can sometimes redefine a cultural identification to enhance perceived social standing, while the shifting borders of central European states could change a person’s nationality of political allegiance. In some instances the same name refers to a province or the town within the province, such a Płock Poland, or where several locations share a name such as Gratz Kreise, in present day Poland. The marriage records of Amelia Fraenkel (1856-1917) list her place of birth as Graetz in the Synagogue record and Moshoin (sic) Prussia in her marriage announcement in the Argus.79 Similarly, Barnett Lazarus (c.1818-1880) lists his place of birth as Bachlaston (sic), on his 1854 marriage record, but when applying for naturalisation three years later he identifies it as Kroinig, (possibly Kórnik near Posen).

What is clear from the data available is that the majority of Central and Eastern European settlers to Melbourne came from the regions of Eastern Prussia, particularly in the vicinity of the city of Posen. Of those from Europe at least seventy-six had spent some time in England, either arriving with their parents as children or residing there as an adult, before trying new opportunities in Victoria. Shipping records can also assist with the documentation of family groupings. These too have a number of limitations: the registers are not always
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complete, and the exact identification of individuals is problematic. Wills and probate records identify an individual’s financial position, while also specifying details of family relationships, property ownership, charitable interests and most importantly, the values expressed through the allocation of bequests. Other details can be gained through personal documents; this has proved a limited source, restricted by descendants’ interest in maintaining an archive of family history. After considerable searching, a few letters, scrapbooks, self-published autobiographies and other personal documents were identified from a small number of families interviewed. Newspapers proved invaluable, not only for identifying and connecting families, but to build a picture of business interests, legal issues, financial difficulties, travel and place of residence within the colonies.

To understand how the community operated within or outside legal frameworks, Acts of Parliament for England and the Australian colonies were utilised, as well as online databases of colonial common law. Official records such as census compilations, government Blue Books and other governmental statistical publications provided further data. For those who had been a witness or defendants in legal cases for either the civil or criminal courts in England, the online trials from the Old Bailey and reports published in the Government Gazette and the London Times were sourced. For those transported, once in Australia their convict records provide insights into the background, crimes and document the behaviour of individual convicts. Those for Tasmania are most easily accessed through both the ‘Founders and Survivors’ website and the Tasmanian archives.80

For the Melbourne population, directories, electoral rolls, rate books and newspapers give details of residence and property ownership. Maps also proved a source of information about Melbourne’s built environment. These vary from sales notices for subdivisions, to the Vardy map of St Kilda which provides fascinating details of property ownership in the suburb at a particular date. This map, like the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works plans which were also employed, depict an outline footprint of structures, giving an indication of buildings and land size, particularly useful for understanding now demolished buildings. The University of Melbourne holds the Sydney Arnold and Best Collection, a

fascinating source of auction notices, with hand annotated sales results for the period 1919-1934. Many of these were for deceased estates and from these volumes, patterns of property ownership emerged as well as the identification of a number of property portfolios.

In Melbourne, as the community established institutions, minutes were kept and letter-books recorded correspondence. Unfortunately it is only recently that these records have been systematically collected by the Australian Jewish Historical Society and these have been lodged in the State Library of Victoria, where they can be accessed by arrangement. The Melbourne Hebrew Congregation chose not to follow this path and their records were stored with the Jewish Museum of Australia. Unfortunately this has resulted in some important records being lost, especially the Minute Book of the Jewish Congregational Society from the 1840s, and the community’s first letter book, requiring me to source the information contained in these from secondary sources. Similarly, no records have survived from the establishment of the *Beth Din* in the 1860s.

**Structure**

This thesis concerns the space the Jews of Melbourne occupied and the place in which they created their community. To develop these ideas, the thesis is structured through a number of thematic chapters:

**Jewish Space and Place**

Barnavi in his *Historical Atlas* explains the basic tensions arising in concepts of ‘Jewish place’, ‘The word “Jew”, whether it is used pejoratively or not, immediately evokes the association with mobility, a propensity to wander, to move from one place to another… the Jewish perception of space is marked by a uniqueness of characteristics: it comprises a notion of multiple spaces, rather than a single space; and between these spaces a void…Jewish consciousness constantly shifts between awareness of physical spaces (the birth-place, for example) to spaces of reference (the ancestral homeland, Hebrew, etc.), a shift which actually constitutes the Jewish spatial experience.’

The political, social and economic treatment of Jews and their subsequent mobility has resulted in particularity of lived experience. Taking

---

Barnavi’s epistemology, I explore the theoretical, religious and intellectual constructs of space, as well as the lived experience of various urban forms.

**Forebears and Founders**

To understand the values and motivations of those arriving in Melbourne requires an appreciation of the tenets which were brought with them from their place of birth. Thus the experience of three exemplary communities is examined. First, that of England where the majority of the Melbourne Jewry originated; secondly, the German provinces, home to the second largest group of Melbourne Jews (in much of the literature, it is the German experience which is considered the exemplar of the Jewish urban experience); finally, that of Jamaica where a significant number of Melbourne Jewry was born. Jamaica was also an element in British colonial rule and links the Melbourne community to wider colonial considerations, as a primarily Sephardi community, Jamaican Jewry also provide a perspective of difference to the Ashkenazi narrative.

**Jewish identity in a New Land**

From these introductory chapters the thesis focuses on Melbourne, considering first how the Jewish community instituted and adapted itself to meet the challenges of a new urban society. While communities encounter modernity in individual ways, exhibiting varying levels of acculturation; this in itself did not lead to the communal loss of attachment to Judaism. Melbourne, as a settler society of largely acculturated Anglo-Jewry, met these new circumstances, attempting to find a course of integrated modernity. This chapter considers communal structures, from the establishment of synagogues, the authorisation of kosher food, the formation of philanthropic organisations, to liturgical and religious reforms. These were both theological and pragmatic, as the community responded to the social and demographic position it found itself in.
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Family Identity

This chapter analyses the life-cycle records of the community to provide a demographic understanding of their structure. This chapter examines place of birth, age and marriage patterns including geographic and familial endogamy. Achieving this was often outside secular legal frameworks and the chapter considers how bridging the legal differences between Jewish and secular law was managed, particularly for marriages between close family members as well as for divorce.

Networks

The Melbourne Jewish community was connected through the British Empire and used its considerable networks across the English speaking Jewish diaspora and through Europe to assist in the creation of this new society. The following chapter considers these networks within the context of the current historiography on empire.

Melbourne Jewish Space and Place

From the first settlement of Melbourne, Jews have been investors, builders and developers and chapter seven explores the significant impact that Jews have had on the physical structure of the city, both for secular and religious buildings.

Public Life

The final chapter explores Jews in public life and considers how Melbourne provided opportunities for civic engagement in ways often unavailable in the participant’s place of birth. This chapter focuses on the connection between the networks available to the Jewish community and their contribution to public life.

This thesis does not seek a Jewish exceptionalism in the experience of settlers to Melbourne; rather, it attempts to place the community and its contribution within the hitherto disconnected narrative of Jewish urbanism and in the literature of empire. In so doing, the Melbourne community can be read as an amalgam of their New World experience and the values they brought from the old.83

Chapter 1 Jewish Space and Place

In the twenty-first century, Jewish cultural facilities are no longer the hidden and discrete buildings of pre-emancipatory societies. Jews are assuredly using the architectural talents of renowned architects such as Daniel Libeskind, Peter Eisenmann and the secular works of Frank Gehry to create cultural institutions and monuments of remembrance in contemporary society. This self-conscious use of architecture to reflect and memorialise culture has been employed by the Jewish community only in the last century and a half, as a post-emancipation and post-war phenomena and a public declaration of a community’s place within society.

No place has a fixed identity. Invasions, migration (both forced and voluntary), changes to national boundaries and other geopolitical upheavals influence and create identity and are reinforced through evolving traditions, cultures and language. A consequence of the complex history of Jewish migration has been the formation of local identities shaped by the internal and external connections maintained across time and place. Immigration itself creates a reciprocal process. For minority communities, adaptation to their new home results in varying levels of assimilation and acculturation; while for the host society, national identity is subtly changed by the presence of resettled and minority communities.

Jewish self-consciousness has centred on ‘exile’, both as a physical and a geopolitical identity. Exile created a diaspora, a spatial reality identified with a lack of space, a loss of space and a loss of control over space. This was an exile in which Jews were politically and socially inferior, lacking sovereignty over land, disconnected in time and place. ‘My heart is in the East [Jerusalem], my body in the extreme West [Spain].’ Thus Judah Halevi (c. 1075–1141) describes a ‘space of the heart, a space of the body, and in between them a void’.
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This is not just a socio-political existence, but also a religious one. From a Christian perspective the Jewish lack of a homeland was closely connected to concepts of Christian redemption and the relationship to the divine. A Jewish diaspora has existed for millennia. In many geographic and cultural settings, Jews have been characterised by their high degree of mobility and as a globalised community, reflecting the experience and settlement patterns encountered and adapted through this journey. This has also led to the loss of space, both through destruction and abandonment and from an intellectual perspective, compounded by a focus on ‘anti-spatial’ issues: religion, history and language.

Current thinking challenges this perception, considering the peripatetic nature of the community as a more complex experience. Barnavi argues for a duality in the understanding of space, that of the physical location and that of spaces of reference, combining to create a Jewish spatial experience. Jews have traditionally not been constrained to the nation in which they resided; rather they responded (or were forced to respond) to the legal frameworks, expulsions, changes in economic conditions and at times riots and massacres that were encountered, hoping to find new opportunities in other areas. This experience was transnational and multi-rooted, disinterested in the borders between political entities and identifying space through emotional, familial, cultural or economic constructs. Thus, as Jews considered history outside the Christian linear progression towards Grace, so too was their connection to a particular location understood from a fundamentally different perspective.

Anglo and Australian Jewish history has been written from the vantage of the minority within the nation, but this is a community epitomised by global and local connections. Jewish identity and communal affiliation have not followed a single format of observance or social and political interaction; rather the experiences of communities within the early modern and modern worlds have been far more complex and nuanced. Jews across
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the world experienced differing and changing urban environments, and those settling in Melbourne brought with them a familiarity with a diversity of lived space. This chapter examines those spaces, linking these to current scholarship which interrogates space and place as symbols and ‘repositories for social meaning’ with respect to Nora’s concepts of identity and memory. There is no one overarching consensus to this analysis, rather I perceive the literature as encompassing a number of thematic areas: Israel, religious ritual space, immigrant space, places of remembrance and text.

Israel

Israel as a spatial notion is a thesis topic in itself and will only be considered as it connects to the philosophical framework outlined in this thesis, attempting to summarize the current discussion within the overriding theoretical framework supplied by the other categories. Israel is the antithesis of a diasporic experience: the conceptual and physical structuring of society from a secular, religious, political and biblical perspective. The settlement of Israel was considered a transformative process, crucial for national redemption and which by marking, historicising and naming, became a national space. The Hebrew word for space is ‘Yishuv’ and within Israeli historiography, the Yishuv Period refers to the era of settlement from the 1880s until the establishment of the State in 1948. Transformation of the land itself becomes an act of place making. Historically, Israel had been referred to as ‘the land of milk and honey’, but early settlers found the desert settlement confronting and outside this image. Thus making the land bloom not only became a national economic imperative, but a form of cultural identity and the realisation of a biblical promise. Concepts of space are further reinforced through the physical process of nation building, through urban and
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regional planning where ‘Jewish space’ becomes a natural element of urban development. For Barnavi the creation of the State of Israel did not ‘normalise’ the idea of space for the Jewish community, rather it shifted it. He considers that the isolated shtetl now applies to Israel, isolated as a democracy in a totalitarian region, a western orientated country in the ‘oriental desert, a besieged fortress whose hinterland lies elsewhere.’

Religious space

The land of Israel and Jerusalem in particular are the historical and metaphysical centre of Judaism. This is a perception of space which has fundamentally shaped Jewish practice and Jewish thinking. For Halbwachs, religious space provides an opportunity for shared ‘thought and remembrance formed and maintained there through the ages’, providing a collective memory for a group. Space was of fundamental importance to ancient Jewish life, represented in the symbolism of the structure and layout of the Temple in Jerusalem and its hierarchy of religious significance. This spatial imperative was transferred through the rabbinic interpretations of the Talmud, into abstract and symbolic representations in religious practice and religious ritual. Space, in other words becomes a physical expression of religious practices, reflected in the built form in permanent structures such as synagogues, in theoretical forms such as the eruv or in the more ephemeral, in the Sukkah, built and demolished annually for the festival of Sukkot.

Whereas traditional notions of space focus on a specific location, ritual and religious space create a symbolic place of belonging. Synagogues are both emblematic and physical spaces, defined by their liturgical function, providing meaning and memory for the participant: ‘religion is expressed in symbolic forms that unfold and cohere in space. This condition alone guarantees its continued existence’. Synagogues and synagogue architecture have been public manifestations of Jewish identity. Prior to emancipation, synagogues were characteristically small places for Jews to gather, providing space for study
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and worship, to meet socially and to conduct community business. These tended to be
discrete from the outside, but could contain lavish interiors. Post emancipation, throughout
Europe, Britain and the New World, synagogues reflected a confident public style. Presented
as monuments to emancipation, a public articulation of the new ‘spirit of Judaism’, these
buildings were designed to present the Jewish community as an integrated presence within
the nation (Figure 1).

Figure 1.1 Florence Synagogue, 1874-1882

‘Eruv’ means 'to mingle' and creates a mingling of space between the private and
public. An eruv is a spatial definition and expression of communal identity, a symbolic and
conceptual understanding of space, designating a community by defining an area whereby
prescribed activities can take place on the Sabbath.105 The eruv is a ‘wall’, interspersed by
‘doorways’, which encloses an area (often a suburb or suburbs) designating it as domestic
space. This is a ‘place’ created as a response to the biblical injunction found in Exodus 16:29,

105 Davina Cooper, "Talmudic Territory? Space, Law, and Modernist Discourse," Journal of Law and Society 23, no. 4
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‘Mark that the Lord has given you the Sabbath; therefore He gives you two days’ food on the sixth day. Let everyone remain where he is: let no man leave his place on the seventh day’.  

The Talmud defines thirty-nine acts prohibited on the Sabbath including employment, travel, financial transactions or the carrying of objects outside the home. The Talmud further delineates activities which can be undertaken within the home on the Sabbath and those which are prohibited in public space. The eruv is an orthodox response to defining private space in the public sphere, by creating theoretical domestic space and thereby allowing activities which would otherwise be prohibited. Public space ceases to be a place of exchange and activity and becomes one of limitation, whereas the opposite is true for private space, which is expanded into the public domain to become a place of interaction.

Structurally the eruv is erected from poles and wires. It is a structure which is at the same time powerful in its function and symbolism, yet flimsy in its construction. The commandment defining this form of Sabbath activity is found in Exodus, a book which chronicles the Israelites’ escape from Egypt. Herz identifies the significance of this connection, the desert as the ultimate state of placelessness, experienced en route to nationhood and stability transforming ‘nomadic tribes into a nation of settlers’.

The sukkah creates a temporary space, a symbolic house, constructed annually to specific biblical specifications for use during the festival of Sukkot. This festival and the temporary dwelling again recall the exodus from Egypt and the forty years spent wandering in the desert. The sukkah represents the flimsy shelters built by the Israelites and, for the seven days’ duration of the festival families are expected to live in this symbolic structure. The sukkah becomes a building which combines architecture, symbolism and Jewish culture,
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to create an emblematic and physical space, composed of four ‘real and imagined places: the local, the Land of Israel, the Bible as the portable homeland and God’s presence’. The location of the sukkah, although temporary, provides symbolic meaning to the sites on which it was erected.

**Immigrant Space**

The study of minority space is excluded from much of the intellectual discourse on space, resulting in a lack of depth to our understanding of urban places and of the ebb and flow contained within them. The construct of the nation has until recently comprised the territory and collective identity. New notions of collective identity, considering migratory and diasporic groups, have broadened the debate to examine space from a transnational and transformative perspective. Green argues for the importance of this comparative analysis to understand the experience of migrants and the ‘other’ within society. Using the neutral term ‘French Jews’ she demonstrates that by considering religion, ethnicity and nationality, the subject becomes a

pretext for very different questions: the place of religion in the nation-state; the importance of ethnicity for acculturation; the impact of the Diaspora on the Jews. In the first two cases, French Jews are compared to their compatriots in France; their ‘Frenchness’ is essentially being scrutinized. However, in the third case, the Diasporic perspective highlights the differences among Jews around the world; the French Jews’ Frenchness becomes a given.

The immigrant, both as an individual and as a representative of a group, craves reintegration and identity as a non-foreigner within its host society. The migrant does not conceive their identity as an ‘ethnic community’; rather the reality of the immigration experience defines ethnicity. As Green establishes, however, the space and acceptance of a
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particular group is influenced by the host society as much as by the migratory group itself.\textsuperscript{116} For the immigrant, current space can be reflective of past space, acting as a trigger for remembrance, whilst migration changes both the host and recipient location. Concepts of immigrant space also have a connotation of class, distinctions between the newly arrived and the host society, as well as disparities of occupation and settlement patterns. Migration in the nineteenth century was also tied to rapidly expanding industrialisation, with migrants not only seeking escape from the violence of repressive regimes, but economic opportunities in the industrialised west.

Places of Remembrance

Places of Remembrance also have a duality within Jewish thinking. Traditionally these have been considered places of destruction. Mann explores how Nora’s ‘sites of memory’ can be incorporated to explore the concept within Jewish tradition, maintaining that the liturgical calendar of festivals and the Talmud itself become sites of memory.\textsuperscript{117} These sites of memory ‘envelop the Mobius strip of the collective and the individual, the sacred and the profane.’\textsuperscript{118} Places of remembrance and destruction are particularly poignant for Jewish communities, reinforcing the image of placelessness and the metaphor of the Wandering Jew. Places of memory exist, as the real places are lost.\textsuperscript{119} These are often spaces of post-war experience, death camps, Holocaust memorials and extinct ghettos.

Remembered space can pertain to Jewish themes which are superimposed and defined by non-Jewish agents, creating a nostalgic ‘constructed cultural space’ and a homogenous community identity.\textsuperscript{120} Lost Jewish space can also become a major tourist attractor, as has happened in Prague, where the once thriving Jewish community has been reduced from a pre-war population of 96,000 to 1,600, but where the Jewish quarter of
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Prague is now marketed as a major cultural attraction with synagogue tours, visits to cemeteries, museums and historic sites.

Text

Jews have long been considered an urban people and literary descriptions of city life can be traced back to the biblical Babel and forward to modern Jewish literary writing, often ‘preoccupied’ by its urban setting. Space conceptualised through text can reposition a community within a place, defining its identity through this relationship. Text ‘becomes a space in which collective identity can be formed without territory and consequently it can be a metaphor for exile and homelessness.’

Text allows the imagining of Jewish place and space in many forms—from travelogues to sermons, novels, descriptions of place and rabbinical discourse, creating ‘signifiers of an urban state of mind.’ Religious text also provides an abstraction of space, ‘neutralising space in the physical sense... to live in metaphorical places.’ As the Talmud and Bible formed conceptualisations of the Jewish universe and Jewish history, so too were conceptualisation of space created within these writings—the Holy Land with its flora and fauna. Landscape can also be imbued with meaning to create a ‘Jewish space’ and this is noticeably encountered in the legends of Jewish Poland, where the countryside becomes an element of the geography of the Jewish imagination, giving meaning to place through feelings and beliefs. This is reinforced through the Judaization of Slavic place-names providing Biblical and homiletic meaning to the stories being told. Here, the importance of names and the meanings ascribed to them are linked to the Bible and rabbinic language of the Talmudic era, endowing a continuum of understandings to the stories. Bar-Itzyak describes these legends as ‘sites of memory’, preserving the collective memory of Polish
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Jewry from its settlement to its destruction in the Holocaust. Contemporary textual space is also virtual space, providing a forum for Jewish identity and culture within online blogs and journals.

Lived Space

The models outlined above provide a summary of the theoretical framework of a Jewish conceptualisation of space. This philosophical context is important not merely to understand the intangible perceptions of space, which are at best a disinterest in the physical manifestations of space, a hypothesis which asserts that we ‘interact through space and only secondarily in space.’ This theoretical construct does not fully describe the experience of place on individuals, or how this impacts on community identity and community development. To realise this requires an investigation of the various urban models Jews have known over time.

Judaism has been largely an urban or semi-urban phenomenon. Recent historiography has analysed the diverse experiences of urban Jewish communities including those in the developing centres of nineteenth-century Europe and the New World, in Islamic cities and detailed studies on the Sephardi trading ports. Analysing the impacts of modernity and urbanisation on the values, acculturation and religious reforms of these societies connects migration studies and transnational cultural transfer. These paradigms of self-identity and interaction within the wider urban environment provide useful guides and analogies for conceptualising Jewish space within the context of nineteenth-century Melbourne and other settler societies of the British Empire.

Ghetto

In the conclusion to his 1927 article ‘The Ghetto’, Louis Wirth describes the ghetto as a ‘socio-psychological, as well an ecological phenomenon; for it is not merely a physical fact,

but also a state of mind.'

Ghettos became the primary urban Jewish experience in much of Central and Western Europe from the sixteenth century. European Christian attitudes to Jews reflected the different and complex theological arguments concerning the nature of God held by the two religions. Christians believed that Jewish exile was inflicted by God as a punishment on the Jews’ repudiation of Jesus as the Messiah and thus, the submission of Jews proved the truth of Christianity. Jews could be tolerated only to the extent that their conversion was to herald the second coming. Over time this ideological propaganda was exploited as a means of excluding Jews from wider Christian society, both as religious dissenters and as economic competitors.

Ghettos have a dual consciousness, that of forced cohabitation and that of a welcoming community in which group traditions are maintained. Jews, like other groups within medieval society, chose to reside near family members and to live in close proximity to the synagogue and other community institutions. Often these places were identified as Jewish areas through place names and localities: rue des Juifs, Judengasse, Judaeorum.

Ghettos initially established as cultural, linguistic or familial spatial groupings, developed as an urban form controlled by the community. This voluntary urban structure enabled the subsequent formal segregation and restriction of Jewish residents. Ghettos came to represent a physical ‘ exile’, displacement and exclusion from the wider city; a physical barrier, isolating inhabitants from the rest of the community.
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exploited to restrict economic activity, while ostensibly providing ‘incentive’ for Jews to convert to Christianity.\textsuperscript{138}

Within both Ghettos and in rural Shtetls, Jews were considered by the ruling authorities, not as individuals but as a ‘community’ and were governed as such. Marriage, divorce and inheritance became judicial communal matters, and collective responsibility was held for the community’s actions. Although subject to civil laws, authority was undertaken under Talmudic law, a legal system which was employed for civil matters including litigation between individuals.\textsuperscript{139}

Prior to 1516, the date taken as the instigation of the first European ‘ghetto’ in Venice, specific Jewish residential requirements had been raised only twice on an international level, once in regard to keeping Christian slaves in the homes of Jews and Saracens (Third Latern Council 1179) and again in 1434 when the Council of Basel precluded the cohabitation of Jews and Christians, forcing Jews to live as far from Christian churches as possible.\textsuperscript{140} A number of restrictions on Jewish habitation begin to appear from the fourteenth century, limiting Jewish space and restricting the community’s access to the city. In Cologne, Jews had been voluntarily residing in close proximity to one another but in the 1320s were confined by gates leading to their section of the city (and expelled in 1424).\textsuperscript{141} Similarly in Vienna, the houses of the Jewish quarter opened into a square, their backs creating a natural boundary. Again, gates and towers were erected on the streets leading to this quarter, enclosing the community. There was not complete exclusion and a few Viennese Jews continued to own property outside the defined space and a small number continued living in the wider city.\textsuperscript{142} In Spain during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, Jews and Moors were segregated from the Christian and New Christian communities on the grounds that their proximity was inflicting damage on Christians. In particular, concern was raised over the lack of segregation for New Christians, an issue which
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proved pivotal in the final expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula. In cities such as Aragon in the fourteenth century, attacks on the community led to requests for gates to ensure their protection from the mob. Ghettos spread from Venice, Cologne, and Frankfurt to Rome, Avignon, Cracow and Vilna, while in cities such as Kiev and Moscow, Jewish residence was banned outright. The oppression intensified and in 1555, Pope Paul IV issued a bull enforcing a strict segregation of all the Jews of the Papal States into ghettos, while his subsequent successor Pope Paul V expelled the Jews from all papal territories except the entrepôt ports of Ancona and Rome, thereby destroying dozens of communities which had existed since ancient times.

The etymology of the term ghetto is somewhat debated, but it is generally agreed that it was first used in Venice in 1516, when the Jewish community was required to relocate to an island (Ghetto Nuovo) which had previously been a metal foundry (Figure 1.2). Many believe that the term ghetto derives from the Italian gettare, meaning pouring or casting metal, although Debenedetti-Stow also considers a derivation from the Hebrew get meaning to divorce or separate, applying to the segregation of the community from wider Christian society.
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Jews within ghetto environments were not entirely isolated from the world at large. Rather, they resided on the fringe of two worlds: the internal world of the ghetto and the external space of the majority society from which they were excluded. Wirth sees the forced segregation of the community as providing a self-conscious identity, that was at once warm and intimate and tied to an ‘inner solidarity’ by family life. The ghetto formalised a separation of the economies of the two communities, with Jews engaged in limited occupations deemed permissible or useful to Christian society, often limited to money-lending or trade.

Initially ghettos were established with adequate areas for the community, but as populations expanded, the space was not increased and they became severely overcrowded and insanitary. Ghettos were also not entirely segregated from the outside world. Within this limited structure there was movement of people for education and business. Renowned religious academies (Yeshivas) attracted youth from across Europe, while trade continued. Business connections were maintained at a basic level by peddlars moving goods across
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regions and throughout the more prosperous realms of upper-class bankers, court agents and purveyors. The enlightenment and subsequent Jewish emancipation led to the devolution of ghettos in Europe, as formal barriers were removed and increased communication throughout society was achieved.

Shtetl

Historiographic convention has defined the quintessential Jewish experience of that of Central and Eastern Europe. This is a prototypical encounter, not of urbanism, but of the rural and semi-rural Shtetl communities which practised a form of Judaism linked closely to Talmudic interpretation.

Throughout the history of the Jewish settlement of Eastern Europe (and in Turkey), following the expulsions from Spain, Germany, Italy, France and the Papal States in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, communities were established in Poland, Romania and Russia. Initially as immigrants from Western Europe, these newcomers were themselves culturally isolated from the local Jewish community, speaking Judaeo-German (Yiddish) rather than the vernacular of the region. The large number of people migrating in this period resulted in the dominance of these new communities, who imposed their cultural practices and language on the pre-existing Jewish communities. Although strictly restrained in economic and social mobility, with over 2,000 regulations restricting their activity, as with the ghetto dwellers, these Eastern European communities were largely self-governed within the constraints placed by the state.

Shtetls were settlements with a Jewish ‘centre’, in which Jews were the majority of the population, ‘a small settlement of less than 300 houses, which dealt mostly in agricultural produce, and at least 40 per cent of whose total urban population was Jewish’, and like
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ghettos these were often overcrowded.\textsuperscript{157} There is some debate over the date for the establishment of the first \textit{shtetls} in a recognisable form, and they were certainly in existence by the eighteenth century if not a century prior.\textsuperscript{158}

Following the partition of Poland in 1772, Tsarina Catherine II further restricted Jewish occupation within her empire, in 1791 creating the Pale of Settlement and in so doing assembling a one million square kilometre prison for the Jewish population, further excluding Jews from civil life. This effectively froze Jewish conditions for the majority of Jews in Eastern Europe, socially and physically isolating them from the rest of the population. Outside the Pale in Galicia, Hungary and Romania, \textit{shtetl} life was less restricted but in all instances ‘the shtetl fostered its own language—Yiddish, developed its own culture and took Judaism into new and exotic byways unknown in other parts of the world.’\textsuperscript{159}

Education within the \textit{shtetl} was limited, focused on Talmudic study. The impact of western education and acculturation of western European Jewry was viewed with concern by the orthodox \textit{shtetl} dweller.\textsuperscript{160} Mandelbaum provides an analysis of the importance of an egalitarian attitude within the \textit{shtetl}, in which voluntary associations were used to exert social control and maintain social equilibrium, organisationally maintaining the status quo, and structuring educational and charitable support at a communal level, rather than for the betterment of any one individual. Similarly, he asserts that these communal organisations did not develop ‘aesthetic, athletic or economic’ outlets or activities for ‘the pleasure of the senses’, which might have benefited individuals ahead of the community, creating values whereby the ‘community is the brother and guardian of every other’.\textsuperscript{161}

The experience of segregated life for the Jewish community was varied, and changes in the philosophical, religious and political expectations of states influenced their treatment. These pressures differed across Europe, reflecting the divergent philosophical and economic
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developments of east and west. Scholars have differing views on the seclusion that *shtetl* life imposed. In Endelman’s opinion, in comparison to the ghetto, the *shtetl* isolated Jews less from their neighbours, providing closer contact (although rarely intimate contact) between the two communities. Conversely, Wirth considers that Western European Jewry was less isolated, more likely to be urbanised and more intellectually integrated into the wider community than that of the east, reflecting ideas and social values of post-Renaissance thought. The Jewish communities of Russia, Poland and parts of Romania, however, existed in rural societies, isolated from broad European intellectual ferment and they associated with ‘peasants and an uncultured, decadent, feudal nobility.’

In the post-emancipation period and especially after a sharp rise in government-condoned anti-Semitism from the 1880s, Eastern European migrants began fleeing their homes. Throughout England and particularly London and the manufacturing centres of the midlands, in France, Berlin and New York, these ‘foreign Jews’ crowded into the Jewish working-class areas of cities. Within post-emancipation communities, these migrants were themselves seen as the ‘other’, uneducated, not speaking the language of their host country and espousing an ethnic solidarity to their place of birth, an attitude which was perceived as being disloyal to their new country. These areas of voluntary association were themselves seen as ghettos, segregating communities by economics and poverty, language and customs as well as by occupational necessity.

Islamic Space

In many parts of the Muslim world, ancient Jewish communities existed that were established prior to the rise of Islam, with some dating back to the Babylonian exile in the fifth century BCE. As Islam spread across the Middle East and North Africa, Islamic theology imposed structural systems on society informing the urban fabric of cities, while

---

163 Wirth, "The Ghetto," 64.
165 Parks, "The Jewish Quarters of Interwar Paris and Tunis: Destruction, Creation, and French Urban Design," 70. For a comparison to the concentration of communities by village of origin, see Connell, "The Jewish Ghetto in Nineteenth Century Leeds: A Case of Urban Involution."
manifesting local ethnic responses. The treatment of the Jewish community in Islamic countries varied greatly from Europe, based on the divergent theological views of Christianity and Islam in regards to Judaism. Whereas Christianity contrasts itself to Judaism through complex theological issues described above, Islam’s doctrinal position is different; Islam believes in its ‘superiority’ to other belief systems.166

Islamic law considered all non-Muslims (Jewish, Christian, Hindu or Zoroastrian) living within Muslim countries as dhimmi, protected yet inferior communities.167 The status of dhimmi allows residence, non-forced conversions and protection in return for tax and other prohibitions (which were not constantly enforced), but could include prohibitions on the repair or rebuilding houses of worship, and the wearing of special attire.168

Morocco had the largest Jewish population of the Islamic world and much scholarship has been invested in understanding the particular urban response to the coexistence of the two populations.169 Morocco was the only North African nation outside of Ottoman rule and 90 percent of its large Jewish population lived in urban or semi urban areas.170 The Jewish community had a dual ethnicity initially established during the Phoenician era, comprising an indigenous Jewish community and later a significant Sephardi population, migrating (as did many Muslims) after the expulsions from the Iberian Peninsula in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.171 This Sephardi population itself was complex, with a transnational identity maintained for centuries. Further, elements of the Sephardi community were Conversos, who moved backwards and forwards between the two societies,
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before settling as either Jews (in Morocco) or Catholics (in Spain). This oscillation promulgated a Portuguese or Spanish identity for generations.

Abu-Lughod defines a number of characteristic requirements of gender segregation, reflected in the architectural structuring of houses and the arrangement of suburbs and finally, the relationship between family and neighbourhoods in managing these interactions. Islamic cities are defined by their various ‘quarters’ and the overlapping nature of these areas. Quarters could be based on economic, social or ethnic foundations, although these were generally ethnically and socially diverse. Moroccan cities developed a tripartite plan with the kasshab for the ruling class, the medina for the Muslim population and in some areas, the mellah for the Jews. The mellah was traditionally a walled and gated area, located close to the royal compound of the city, regulated through Jewish intermediaries, rather than by Islamic officials. The location was justified as protection for the inhabitants and to be convenient for both the Sultan and his employees, many of whom lived within the space.

The mellah was a unique response from the Islamic rulers to this dual Jewish and Muslim population, developing a particular urban fabric for the cities in which it was imposed. Mellahs were not built consistently throughout the country and differed in urban form, depending on the demography, political and environmental situations of each place. The first mellah was established in Fez in 1438, imposed, according to legend, after civil strife erupted when Jews were accused of putting wine in the lamps of the mosque. Similar stories
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of religious deviance justified the building of mellahs in other cities. Gottreich provides a rationale for a more prosaic establishment of mellab, seeing their development as a response to local circumstances, particularly population pressures brought about by the integration of large numbers of Jews and Muslims from Spain (20,000 Jews were estimated to have arrived in Fez alone) into a society with a fragile ecology. This integration was hindered by communal conflict resulting from Catholic proselytisation, particularly on the Jewish community. In Marrakesh the mellab became a tool of political control, coinciding with the dynastic positioning for authority and legitimacy of the Sa‘di dynasties (1549-1830). The creation of the mellab becomes a concrete expression of the theory of the dhimma, which defines the non-Muslim within the state, protecting yet humiliating a community. Thus segregation became a judicial response to maintaining the purity of the ‘Islamic’ space and assigning the role of the Jewish community as exceptional, rather than an integrated element within the wider society.

Gottreich shows that this segregation was psychological rather than physical and never complete. She demonstrates in some detail the Jews’ presence and interaction within the city both socially and economically. Based on the Prophet Muhammad’s mercantile background, Islam had a positive attitude to commerce, although Islamic concern with usury resulted in restriction in trade for certain products including precious metals. For this reason, Jews in Morocco became artisans particularly skilled in this area, along with trading in textiles, upholstery, food preparation and wider international commerce. Jewish international and long distance trade was essential to the economy and functioning of Moroccan cities. Jews operated businesses outside the mellab, trading and engaging socially and civically in wider city activities. The Muslim community interacted with the mellab,
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exploiting a range of specialty goods and services (including alcohol) which were unavailable in other parts of the city. Daily economic interaction occurred between the two groups, with the Islamic community providing specialist services such as baking to the Jewish community, enabling bread to be baked on the Jewish Sabbath. Similarly, a few Jews had shops in the medina and acted as middlemen between producers and consumers throughout the city. This interaction contests the belief that the mellah and its community were isolated from the rest of the city; rather the city and its ‘Islamic’ identity were influenced by the community as a whole, creating a collective experience of ‘being a Marakeshi but not Muslim’. This interaction was two way, providing intellectual and experiential stimulus to both communities.

Interactions between the two communities were also of a religious nature, and Sharot describes how in its formative stages, Islam integrated many of the legal and moral concepts of Judaism. Later a number of beliefs and practices continued to be shared by both religions. These included elements of ‘popular’ religious observance, outside doctrinal conventions and otherwise heterodox activities such as pilgrimages to the tombs of saints to seek the Saints’ intercession and protection through offerings and rituals. Similarly, the style of religious service of the Mosque with short intense prayer influenced Middle Eastern Jewish practice, which ‘displayed far more decorum than European Jewish services’. Jews in the Middle East spoke Arabic and conducted secular activities and some religious scholarship in the vernacular. Jews in Berber areas of Morocco also spoke the Berber language. Although great regional variations of religious practice and acculturation existed, Jews in Islamic countries shared more of the culture of their non-Jewish neighbours than communities in Europe.
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Throughout Morocco, the confinement of the Jewish communities was inconsistent and in many cities communities were integrated, even owning property in common. Jews were not confined to any one location and could settle throughout the country. Where the mellah existed, it constituted ‘Jewish space’ but not an isolated part of the city. It was a locale from which the Jewish community interacted with the city as a whole, and with the wider world. Although specific cultural traits were expressed through the mellah, it also represented the social structure of the urban society. Jews and Muslims were defined by space, but the identity of the Jews was formed through their interactions with the wider Muslim Community of which they were a part.

Port Jews

‘Port Jews’ is a term developed to describe Sephardic and Italian international traders, who in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries created thriving Jewish communities within non-Jewish cities of the Mediterranean, the Adriatic, and along the Atlantic sea boards and later the Black Sea. Current historiography examines the cultural interactions of these communities, principally their development of a modern sense of Jewish self-determination and integration within the world, prior to and independent of the German Haskalah. As a diaspora united through trade and familial ties they ‘extended the boundaries of the Jewish world and imagined its contours’. As post-expulsion Sephardic communities (including many Conversos and New Christians), they had familiarity and interactions with the wider society prior to fleeing Spain, Portugal and the Inquisition and brought these experiences and expectations to their new homes. These refugees from the Inquisition were permitted to settle as Spanish and Portuguese merchants in mercantile ports such as Salonika, Trieste, Amsterdam, Bordeaux and London, in the Dutch colonies of the New World and later in
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Odessa. 196 Here they were granted privileges and liberties, utilising their diasporic connections to enable international trade.197

Conversos and Italian Jews had experienced significantly different levels of acculturation to many other European Jewish communities.198 Not all Conversos or New Christians left the Iberian Peninsula immediately after the 1492 expulsions; rather, this was a sustained emigration over time with individuals continuing to re-establish their Judaism until the eighteenth century. In an era before international banking, the large diaspora created by Jews and Conversos leaving Spain and Portugal allowed the communities to develop sophisticated transnational trade networks, connected through family and friends, providing the ability to trade internationally with people they knew and trusted. Within the New World, societies displayed greater flexibility in their rules than did their imperial homelands.199 In the seventeenth century, Port Jews were influential in the establishment and maintenance of trade between Amsterdam and the Dutch colonies of South America.200

Whether Conversos or New Christian reconverts to Judaism, or Jews directly escaping the Inquisition, the experience, interactions and confidence of the communities under the Port Jewry banner provided opportunities to acculturate within their wider societies, while maintaining an independent Jewish identity.201 Sorkin has identified five distinct features that defined these communities by the eighteenth century. They were associated with migration and commerce. They lived and operated in a milieu that valued commerce. They eschewed the traditional autonomous Jewish community, and enjoyed improved legal status which permitted voluntary affiliation with the Jewish community. They were enthusiastic about Jewish education and/or re-education and engaged in vigorous debates both amongst themselves and with their Christian neighbours. Outside the ideas and framework of the
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Haskalah, they questioned Jewish tradition, displaying a form of Jewish ethnic identity. Unimpeded by restrictive medieval laws and valued for their commercial acumen, rather than scorned for their religious beliefs, these communities revealed a different ethos towards Judaism.

Urbanism and acculturation

Although Jews are considered an urban people, Jewish historiography often negates this circumstance, perceiving the impact of urbanisation and modernity as aberrations in Jewish cultural practice, an anomaly which inexorably led to a loss of distinction by communities attempting to merge with the non-Jewish world. This is counter to a broader understanding of the impact of urbanisation on social interaction, cultural development and self-consciousness. Rather, the Jewish response to modernity and urbanism should be perceived as a response to the changes that modernity brought to the intellectual and physical landscape of societies at large.

Individuals are necessarily shaped by the interactions that occur naturally within a heterogeneous city. As Wirth argues:

the city has thus historically been the melting pot of races, peoples, cultures and hybrids. It had not only tolerated but rewarded individual differences. It has brought together people from the ends of the earth because they are different and thus useful to one another, rather than because they are homogenous and like minded.

The proliferation of enlightenment ideas coincided with the spread of urbanisation in Western European cities. These new concepts led to changes in Jewish interaction with the wider society. Gradually civil and political restrictions were lifted, including the removal of barriers to education, trade and place of residence. Communities strove to retain their Jewish
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identity, adapting and adjusting to the new conditions. In Germany, the Haskalah endeavoured to merge enlightenment views with self-awareness and Jewish intellectual study to develop an ‘ideology of modernisation’, while in England, Jews asserted their rights to participate in modern secular society whilst maintaining a Jewish identity. Acculturation within the fabric of western urban centres followed similar patterns, with local manifestations based on communal institutions, education, occupation and residential patterns. It has been posited that ‘the degree to which Jews were involved in the early growth of a city and had achieved a notable and respected place in public and private life.... directly influenced how later generations of Jews were received.’ Acceptance and acculturation acted as a ‘pull’ factor influencing the settlement choices of later immigrants.

Newly-found social mobility allowed Jews to move into the middle-class and to the suburbs, distancing themselves from any identification with the ‘ghetto’. The ghetto became identified as a place of fear and pressure, which traumatised its community. Reaction to the ghetto experience was expressed through ‘antagonistic acculturation’, defining identity and behaviours in contrast to previous modes of existence. Overwhelmingly, nineteenth-century urban Jewries felt that a certain communal vigilance was required to protect them from underlying anti-Semitism. This intrinsic fear tempered outward behaviour, religious expression and notably as late nineteenth century immigration from eastern Europe increased, was reflected in the concern for the ‘otherness’ of immigrants’ habits, appearances and values.

Throughout the modern world, Catholics, Protestants and Jews brought their values to new urban environments and all engaged in debates, defining the role, function and place
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of religion within urbanised society. Jews were at the vanguard of adopting modernity but in so doing, ensued their heritage was retained, ‘developing new modalities of identity and community consistent with and unique to modernity’. As with the wider community, urbanisation led to a decrease in the adherence to strict forms of religious observance. Judaism was not abandoned, and like their Christian middle-class compatriots, Jews adhered to religious traditions, which adapted to reflect evolving values and cultural conditions. Communities developed new forms of Jewish solidarity: secular, ethnic and associational. Where Finestein sees Anglo-Jewry combining a pride in being English with a pride in their Jewishness, Williams describes a tacit agreement between the Jewish and non-Jewish communities of England, whereby Jews would be accepted in return for cultural integration; or as he describes, a form of cultural assimilation was ‘proof’ that the community ‘deserved’ to be considered fellow citizens. For many immigrant Jews, particularly for those in America and Europe, secular Judaism took the form of nationalism, Zionism, Socialism and the labour movement. Lees demonstrates that high population density profoundly altered the way urban populations interacted, reducing connection to moral and cultural communities. Historians such as Williams writing on Manchester and Endelman on

211 Hitzer and Schlor, "Introduction to God in the City: Religious Topographies in the Age of Urbanization," 819-820.
212 Steven M Cohen quoted by ibid., 824.
215 Endelman, "The Legitimization of the Diaspora Experience in Recent Jewish Historiography," 202; Zipperstein, "Jewish Historiography and the Modern City: Recent Writing on European Jewry."
218 Lees, Cities Perceived, Urban Society in European and American Thought, 1820-1940, 5.
Georgian London have elaborated this concept, considering class identity, poverty, social mobility and social aspiration as overriding ethnic attachment.219

American Jewry, particularly that of New York, created an urban fabric of voluntary association, in close proximity to its non-Jewish neighbours.220 New York Jews redefined the meaning of Jewishness through their synthesis of American and Jewish values, creating an ethnicity consistent with middle-class American values. They developed new neighbourhoods, engaged in a secular education, created Jewish religious and philanthropic institutions, while concurrently defining the limits of their assimilation, seeing themselves as ‘a part and yet apart from New York’.221

Education within the ghetto had been the mode of ensuring ‘the traditional mentality of the Jews was perpetuated’.222 In response to emancipation and urban experience, Jewish education was secularised, replacing a purely religious based curriculum with one which incorporated general secular subjects and on occasion, trade skills. The Haskalah considered itself the leader of a moderate and controlled modernisation of Judaism, which could harness education to develop a balanced form of Jewish and humanist education, producing students useful within a modern state.223 In Germany, where the education system was managed by differing religious groups, Jewish children were less likely to attend Catholic and Protestant establishments, while the pluralism of the community was reflected in the reform and orthodox schools established to cater for Jewish children.224 Jewish women responded to the opportunities available in newly-urbanised societies. Traditionally lacking an education and exempt from studying Jewish law, new circumstances provided European middle-class women the opportunity to speak and read in the vernacular, simultaneously learning social graces that would allow them to move within wider society.225
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In England, where anti-Semitism was less overt, middle-class families educated their children in both newly-established private Jewish schools (which taught secular subjects) as well as the non-Jewish boarding school environments, with Jewish education provided by private tutors.\textsuperscript{226} In London, poor Jewish children were catered for in the Jews’ Free School whose population rapidly rose from its establishment in 1817. By 1863 the school catered for 1,800 students, with similar institutions created in Manchester and Birmingham. These schools provided only minimal Jewish education and most students graduated with an ability to read Hebrew and an elementary knowledge of the Torah and little other Jewish education.\textsuperscript{227} A limited number of after-school \textit{Talmud Torah} and orthodox \textit{chederim} were founded, particularly in the East End of London, providing the children of recently arrived immigrants with a more traditional religious education.\textsuperscript{228} These were largely disapproved of by the established Jewish community, who considered them a barrier to integration.\textsuperscript{229} In England the middle-class believed that providing a comprehensive Jewish education was a negative and backward ambition, based on the assumption that to achieve full emancipation and integration into English society required the removal of all barriers between the Jewish and non-Jewish communities, so that ‘feelings of religious distinctiveness and separateness would be muted.’\textsuperscript{230}

A number of American historians have considered the impact of ‘regions’ on the development of Jewish communities. Dash Moore quoting Turner describes a region as ‘any one part of a national domain which is geographically and socially sufficiently unified to have a true consciousness of its own ideals and customs and to possess a sense of its distinction from other parts of the country.’\textsuperscript{231} Dash Moore uses this methodology to consider how regional variations play a part in the development of American Jewry, comparing the
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experiences of Los Angeles and New York. In America, immigration patterns were based on chain migrations, leading to communities reflecting concentrations of immigrants from particular places. As expressed by Wirth, they are a product of previous forms of ‘dominant modes of human association’, which we should not consider as abruptly ceasing, but rather evolving over time.\textsuperscript{232} In a similar vein, Green argues for consideration and analysis of the experience of individual communities in response to their social and economic milieu, showing that the experience of each community is a reflection of the influences upon it by the wider society, and these interactions defined their identification of ‘Jewishness’ or other ethnic identities.\textsuperscript{233} The sheer scale of late-nineteenth century immigration influenced the host countries, with 795,000 Eastern European migrants in New York by 1910. Green argues that the high proportion of Jews in New York, 14 percent of the population (compared to 1 percent in London and 1.3 percent in Paris) led to a lower level of acculturation than in comparable European cities.\textsuperscript{234} Urban neighbourhood structures influenced the development of distinctive characteristics, as groups developed voluntary associations to meet specific needs.\textsuperscript{235} Within immigrant cities, Jews moved to established working-class Jewish inner areas, often forming clusters based on their country of origin. Self-supporting, these communities provided mutual assistance through associations transplanted from home or through the establishment of new organisations.\textsuperscript{236}

Clark characterised ‘the East European School of Jewish History’, as having a negative view of modernity, and a belief that the survival of Judaism can only be achieved through a single identity model.\textsuperscript{237} In contrast, I have argued this to be an ‘ahistorical tendency to invoke a set of timeless values or attitudes to explain concrete historical developments’.\textsuperscript{238} I have demonstrated that alternative views of space can be construed, providing differing views of place and communities’ association with this. By examining a
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variety of urban and political frameworks, a greater understanding of Jewish spatial and community development can be appreciated. These issues will be examined in greater detail through the research undertaken on the Melbourne Jewish community of the mid-nineteenth century and its relationship to the British Empire and various intersecting Jewish diasporas.
Chapter 2 Forebears and Founders

To celebrate the Duke of Edinburgh’s visit to Victoria in 1867, a grand (male only) levee was held in the Exhibition Buildings, ‘such a one as has never been seen in the colony before. All who desired to honour the Prince as we have honoured none who have yet stood on Victorian shores, passed before him yesterday’.239 Given equal entrée with the major dignitaries including senior parliamentarians, judges and the heads of the diverse Christian churches, was ‘the Head of the Hebrew Congregation’.240 The formalities of the event included the presentation by religious and cultural organisations of forty-three addresses to the Prince, including those of the Melbourne and East Melbourne Hebrew Congregations, both of whom expressed their loyalty and attachment to the Sovereign. The Argus published less than half of these, but significantly reported those of the two synagogues in third and fourth place in their list, behind the Anglicans and Presbyterians and before the Wesleyans and Congregational Churches (there was no listing of any Catholic address). Included in the ‘general presentations’ at the levee were sixty or seventy members of the Melbourne Jewish community including the rabbinical leaders of both Melbourne synagogues, five men who were, or would become Members of the Victorian Parliament and a cross section of the Jewish community, from the sons of convicts, to members of some of the wealthiest Jewish families in Britain. Two weeks later in Ballarat, Prussian-born Emanuel Steinfeld (1828-1893) hosted the Prince in his capacity as Mayor of East Ballarat. In return the Prince presented a silver claret jug to Steinfeld, commissioned from the Victorian goldsmith William Edwards and marked ‘by appointment to His Royal Highness’ (Figure 2.1). Those attending these events had been born in England, Scotland, Germany, Poland, Russia, the United States, Jamaica and Gibraltar. Ashkenazi and Sephardi they represented the social and cultural diversity of the local Jewish community. Social acceptance, both as Jews and as members of a ‘respectable class’, was markedly different from that which many of these individuals would have expected in their place of birth, but significantly reflects the sense of place that this small community had forged within Melbourne.
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The mid-nineteenth century saw the culmination of the assertion of rights and emancipatory processes concurrently taking place in many parts of the Jewish world. Those settling in Melbourne brought with them their knowledge of this struggle and their encounter or otherwise with emancipated societies. Jews in Melbourne did not suffer from formal exclusion or restriction and the community endured limited anti-Semitism. These conditions coalesced to create opportunities in a new colony, providing for engaged forms of intellectual, political and physical space. In order to understand the aspirations and acculturation of the Melbourne Jewish community that produced these phenomena, an exploration of the values and conditions that the individuals within this community had experienced in their previous place or places of residence is required.
England

Jewish settlers to Melbourne predominantly came from England, or were increasingly Australian-born children of English settlers and emancipists previously resident in other Colonies. As has been discussed previously, the readmission of the Jews to England in the 1650s happened without formal charter or decree. Although there were some occupational, educational and limited civil restrictions, these disqualifications were far less restrictive than in most of Europe. The initial and small immigration of the 1650s was followed by varying and successive waves of migrants. These succeeding groups were not homogeneous in character, but reflected various socio-demographic, religious and ethnic Jewish communities, which were in turn absorbed into an evolving and burgeoning English Jewish community.

The tenor of English Jewish interactions had been established by the acculturated position of the Sephardi community who first resettled from Holland, a community familiar with operating in a diverse environment. This fluency stemmed from the ethnic diversity of Iberian society, which had led to a cross fertilisation of intellectual contact between the communities. The Jewish community’s experience as Conversos and through the subsequent displacement resulting from their expulsion, further expanded intellectual contacts, and resulted in an education with a secular rather than religious focus. This provided the new ‘Spanish’ and ‘Portuguese’ traders within British society with an outlook markedly in contrast to the culturally and socially isolated Jewish communities of Central and Eastern Europe.  

The early Sephardi community was comprised of merchants engaged in wholesale and international markets, utilising their familial and social diaspora to manage financial transactions in a pre-banking era. Their business initially centred upon the exportation of English wool and the importation of bullion, later expanding to other products. As merchants they traded with other Sephardi communities in Leghorn, Turkey, the Caribbean and the Atlantic colonies. As with those who established themselves in the Caribbean, uncertainty of nationality worked to their advantage, opportunistically allowing

circumvention of the restrictions on commerce with Spain and taxes due by British merchants on imported goods.\textsuperscript{244} The expertise that this international Sephardi trade brought afforded a complexity and sophistication of mercantile competence which was otherwise lacking in the English market.\textsuperscript{245}

This initial foothold of Jewish immigration to England provided an opportunity for other Jewish communities to follow. From the seventeenth century Ashkenazi immigrants were drawn to the more favourable social and political conditions of England. The initial Ashkenazi community was founded by immigrants from Central Europe, poor, unskilled, propertyless, Yiddish speaking, with a religious rather than a secular education, immigrants escaping poverty and degradation. By 1720 this community had become numerically dominant.\textsuperscript{246} It has been estimated that six thousand mainly Ashkenazi immigrants settled in the first half of the eighteenth century and a further eight to ten thousand prior to the turmoil of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars at which point immigration virtually ceased.\textsuperscript{247} When immigration resumed in the post-Napoleonic period, it was marked by a significant demographic shift. These later immigrants echoed the economic, social and religious changes that were taking place in Germany, producing émigrés who had been educated outside a strict and limited Jewish education.\textsuperscript{248} These later immigrants were arriving for economic reasons and to flee the cultural and religious hostility rapidly mounting in Central Europe. The rapid urbanisation of the German-speaking areas provided a level of acculturation and education which resembled their earlier Sephardi counterparts. Unlike the previous generation, obliged to seek unskilled employment as hawkers and pedlars, the next generation arrived with trade experience and occasionally university or other professional
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training.\textsuperscript{249} Throughout the eighteenth century, Sephardim, particularly from Mediterranean countries, continued to migrate in small numbers, their demographic makeup also changed substantially.\textsuperscript{250} Whereas the first waves had been prosperous merchants and those fleeing the Inquisition, the later Sephardim were from impoverished communities.\textsuperscript{251} The two remained culturally and socially differentiated, referred to as ‘German’ and ‘Portuguese’, maintaining separate synagogues, schools and rarely inter-marrying. Although the Sephardi community was numerically smaller, well into the nineteenth century they were disproportionately represented in Anglo-Jewry’s elite.

**London**

Occupational exclusion, particularly from universities and professions, resulted in the slow evolution of a Jewish middle class. This was exacerbated by the community’s concentration in London rather than in the developing centres of the north. By the early-nineteenth century, Anglo-Jewry was divided between a small wealthy elite and a large lower class of pedlars, hawkers and small tradespeople.\textsuperscript{252} The two groups not only inhabited differing worlds, but pursued alternate paths towards acculturation and integration.\textsuperscript{253} Most initially commenced on the lowest economic rung as hawkers, glaziers or other street traders, engaged in small scale occupations, selling oranges, lemons, spectacles, costume jewellery, dried rhubarb, pencils, inexpensive framed pictures, as well as items such as slippers, cakes, glassware, sealing wax and buttons.\textsuperscript{254} In 1800, out of an estimated Jewish population in London of 15,000, nearly 1,500 were ‘old clothes men’, hoping that through street trade they could amass sufficient capital to establish themselves as shopkeepers (Figure 2.2).

Education was perceived as a formula for economic and social improvement. For the wealthier members of Anglo-Jewish society, this was a social concern tempered by self-interest, anxious that poverty stricken Jews could potentially sully the community’s
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reputation, stifling social advancement and political emancipation.\textsuperscript{255} This new focus on education aimed to provide occupational skills for the working class, equipping them for employment and ensuring that the community produced responsible and productive members of British society. To this end, teaching was rationalised to comprise secular subjects such as writing, arithmetic, history and geography, augmented with trade and domestic skills. Although the community maintained an attachment to Judaism, this revised education system was at the expense of advanced religious training, resulting in limited Hebrew literacy.\textsuperscript{256} Ruderman has written extensively about the relationship between English literacy and the changes to the cultural component of Jewish identity, which became ‘linguistically challenged in accessing its cultural legacy through its original texts,’ ultimately reshaping Jewish identity within the English speaking world.\textsuperscript{257} On the fringes of Anglo-orthodoxy were a group of traditionalist, often immigrants or the children of immigrants from Poland, Germany or Holland who continued to maintain a scholarly life studying rabbinic texts, provided for by hebrot.\textsuperscript{258} Anglo education did not prevent an innovative Jewish life developing, or a sustained dialogue with the dominant culture, ‘Jewish modernization was never inarticulate or non-reflective… [but] a constant negotiation and reciprocity between persons of variegated economic, social and intellectual standing.’\textsuperscript{259}
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Many contemporary writers and later historians have endeavoured to analyse the class structure and social position of the Anglo Jewish community. Mayhew writing midcentury estimated the Jewish population of London to be 18,000, and described the increased social mobility that had occurred in the previous fifty years. A contemporary estimate in 1853 by the Rev. John Mills considered that 5,000 Jews could be seen as ‘upper class’, 8,000 as ‘middle class’ and about 12,000, just under half, ‘working class’. Although a poor community,
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this was a wealthier demographic than the general population, where seventy to seventy-five percent of the total population were either working class or agricultural labourers.\footnote{Rubinstein, A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain, 68. This figure is also supported by Vivian D Lipman, "The Anglo-Jewish Community in Victorian Society," in Studies in the Cultural Life of the Jews in England, ed. Dov Noy and Issachar Ben-Ami (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1975), 155.} While by the third quarter of the century this demographic had again shifted, poverty had ceased to be seen as the defining characteristic and the majority of the community were deemed middle class.\footnote{Endelman, The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000, 79.} Significantly, in 1891 Jacobs estimates the average London Jewish income at £82 per head, appreciably higher than the £33 for the country as a whole.\footnote{Jacobs, Studies in Jewish Statistics, Social Vital and Anthropometric, 14.} Although this was a community which experienced economic and social mobility throughout the nineteenth century, Clark warns that this did not diminish a sense of communal solidarity, particularly amongst the lower and middle classes, reinfornced by the restricted occupational nature and ‘schoolism’, an inclination to limit friendships to the community of their synagogue.\footnote{Clark, Albion and Jerusalem: The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Post-Emancipation Era, 237.} These values were again challenged in the 1880s when a fresh wave of Jewish immigrants from the Russian Pale of Settlement flowed into Britain escaping the heightened pressures and restrictions that followed the assassination of Tsar Alexander II.\footnote{Eugene Charlton Black, The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry, 1880-1920 (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1988), 4.} This new resurgence of ‘foreign’ Jewish labour focused debates within the community on religious observance, working conditions and poverty.\footnote{See ibid.; David Cesarani, ed. The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry (Cambridge: B. Blackwell, 1990); Clark, Albion and Jerusalem: The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Post-Emancipation Era; Malcolm Dick, "Birmingham Anglo-Jewry C. 1780 to C. 1880: Origins, Experiences and Representations," Midland History 36, no. 2 (2011); Todd M. Endelman, Radical Assimilation in English Jewish History, 1656-1945, The Modern Jewish Experience (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990); The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000; Vivian D Lipman, "Jewish Settlement in the East End 1840-1940," in East End 1840-1940. Proceedings of the Conference Held on 22 October 1980 Jointly by the Jewish Historical Society of England an the Jewish East End Project of the Association of Jewish Youth, ed. Aubrey Newman (London: Jewish Historical Society of England, 1981); "The Booth and East London Surveys as Source Material for East London Jewry (1880-1930)," in East End 1840-1940. Proceedings of the Conference Held on 22 October 1980 Jointly by the Jewish Historical Society of England an the Jewish East End Project of the Association of Jewish Youth, ed. Aubrey Newman (London: The Jewish Historical Society of England, 1981); Harold Pollins, Economic History of the Jews in England (Rutherford Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1982); Rubinstein, A History of the Jews in the English-Speaking World: Great Britain; Laura Vaughan and Alan Penn, "Jewish Immigrant Settlement Patterns in Manchester and Leeds 1881," Urban Studies (Routledge) 43, no. 3 (2006); Williams, "East and West: Class and Community in Manchester Jewry 1850-1914."}
their disbarment as Freemen of the City of London, and the religious requirements to be within walking distance of a synagogue, created a specific voluntary location in the east of the city.\footnote{Lipman, "Jewish Settlement in the East End 1840-1940," 26. Geoffrey Alderman, Modern British Jewry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 6-7.} The East End, as the area came to be known in the later-nineteenth century, became synonymous with poverty and crime. But this change developed slowly, as the city itself depopulated and the desirable residential districts moved towards the fashionable and newly-constructed West End. Lipman argues that the ‘Jewish East End’ must be defined separately as an area that included the eastern edge of the city, particularly the Aldgate and Portsoken wards, which by 1850 held approximately two thirds of the London Jewish population.\footnote{Lipman, "Jewish Settlement in the East End 1840-1940," 26 and 26; and Vivian D. Lipman, "The Structure of London Jewry in the Mid-Nineteenth Century," in Essays Presented to Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, ed. H.J.Zimmels J. Rabbinowitz and I Finestein (London: Jews College Publications, 1967), 259.} The areas of greatest Jewish residence were focused on Whitechapel, Finsbury Square and Houndsditch and analysis of mid-century census records finds whole streets containing only Jewish names.\footnote{English Census, 1841, 1851, 1861.} Until the second half of the nineteenth century, both the affluent and impoverished continued to primarily live in these areas, with the wealthier inhabiting Goodman’s Fields, Prescott, Mansell, Leman and Alie Streets.\footnote{Clark, Albion and Jerusalem: The Anglo-Jewish Community in the Post-Emancipation Era. 237 and Endelman, The Jews of Britain, 1656 to 2000, 49.} Mayhew gives prodigious contemporary detail of the London Jewish community, identifying both Jewish occupations and their locations and this provides a detailed structural picture of the trades and occupations of mid-century East End Jewry.

The trading’s-class in the capacity of shopkeepers, warehousemen or manufactures, are the thickest in Houndsditch, Aldgate and the Minroies, more especially the ‘swagshops’ and the manufacture and sale of wearing apparel. The wholesale dealers in fruit are in Duke’s-place and Pudding-lane (Thames Street), but the superior retail Jew fruiters-some of whose shops are remarkable for the beauty of their fruit-are in Cheapside, Oxford Street, Piccadilly, and most of all Covent Garden market. The inferior jewellers…are also at the East-end, about Whitechapel, Bevis Marks and Houndsditch; the wealthier goldsmiths and watchmakers having, like other tradesmen of the class, their shops in superior thoroughfares…The Hebrew dealers in second-
hand garments and second-hand wares generally are located in Petticoat-lane...The manufacturers of such things as cigars, pencils and sealing wax; the wholesale importers of sponge, bristles and toys, the dealers in quills and in ”looking glasses” reside in large private-looking houses, where display is needed for the purposes of business, in such parts as Maunsell-street, Great Prescott-street, Great Ailie-street, Leman-street and other parts of the eastern quarter known as Goodman’s-fields. The wholesale dealers in foreign birds and shells, and the many foreign things as “curiosities” reside in East Smithfield, Ratcliffe-highway, High-street (Shadwell) or in some parts adjacent to the Thames. In the long range of river-side streets stretching from the Tower to Poplar and Blackwell, are Jews, who fulfil the many capacities of slop sellers.272

In parallel with the decline in London’s residential population, the second quarter of the nineteenth century saw the upper and increasingly the middle classes moving out of the area.273 Throughout the century the outward symbols of acculturation were witnessed in the change from what was characterised as ‘foreign dress’ with religiously prescribed beards, to fashionable dress and a clean shaven appearance.274

Lipman, shows that the class differences amongst the community tended to be by scale rather than the nature of the operation. Jews engaged in the limited array of commercial activities, principally the manufacture and distribution of consumer products such as footwear, clothing, jewellery, furniture, trinkets as well as luxury items and tobacco related products. As the general population benefited from a rise in its standard of living, so too did those engaged in the supply and manufacture of consumer goods.275 This was especially important in the clothing sector, where Jewish firms fostered an industry of cheap ready to wear clothes, supplanting the previous reliance of the working-class on second hand garments.276 Many of Melbourne’s settlers were themselves or the children of tailors,
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dressmakers, cap makers, or shoe and boot makers. As early as the 1840s more than half the drapers in Melbourne were Jewish.

The Jewish community encouraged the acquisition of trade skills in order to assist economic development. Throughout Europe, as a result of the restrictions of Jewish ritual, apprenticeships and business partnerships were more simply organised through other Jews.277 A number of the children of the Reverend Barnett Simmons (1791-1860), reader at the Synagogue in Penzance, migrated to Victoria. In 1851 three were living with their brother Moses (1822-) in Penzance. Moses operated a carving and gilding workshop employing three men including his two brothers, Abraham (1831-1908), who subsequently became a reader in both Ballarat and St Kilda Synagogues and younger brother Levy (1829-) as well as a Bristol born apprentice Barnett Levy (1833-). Simmons’s sister Amelia (1826-1918), who also migrated to Melbourne, likewise lived in her married brother’s household and was employed as an embroider.278

The nineteenth century also saw the growth of a small Jewish professional class, particularly those professions which required practical rather than academic training and a number of Jewish optometrists and dentists begin to appear in England and the Colonies. Melbourne had at least eight Jewish dentists, including the extended family of Louis Philip Eskell (1853-1925). Eskell was the son of a Bristol-born dentist Louis Eskell (1827-) and two of his uncles also followed this profession, including in Melbourne, Barris Meir (1807-).
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Provincial Jewry

The differing economic foundations of provincial towns and cities in Britain created diverse patterns of acculturation for British Jews. Of those settling in Melbourne, just over one quarter came from areas outside London (Table 2.1). By the later eighteenth century the Jewish community had expanded outwards from London with approximately twenty towns recording Jewish communities. By the mid-nineteenth century, the northern towns had the largest Jewish populations outside the metropole (Table 2.2). Many provincial towns had tiny Jewish populations and in a number of cases, their resettlement to Melbourne largely depopulated their Jewish communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>73.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Towns</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Industrial Towns</td>
<td>10.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaports</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa Towns</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 English Place of Birth for the Melbourne Jewish Community

The earliest significant Jewish presence outside London was Plymouth, where a synagogue was built in 1762 (the oldest Ashkenazi synagogue in Britain). Seaports were significant for the provincial Jewish economy, with eight of the initial eleven Jewish communities connected to the sea trade, including the naval ports of Portsmouth, Plymouth and Chatham. The Plymouth community was particularly strong and by 1810 a second synagogue had been built closer to the docks in Devonport. These seaport communities


owed their existence to trade with the navy, which expanded greatly in the period 1740-1820, providing commercial opportunities for Jewish businessmen utilising their skills in retail, clothing and money lending. As the trade with the navy diminished, a significant number of residents from these port towns migrated to Victoria.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>First mention of Jews</th>
<th>Traditional foundation or first mention of community</th>
<th>Jewish population 1847</th>
<th>Synagogue seating or attendance 1851</th>
<th>Seat holders or members 1854</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Victorian Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>c. 1800</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>a, e</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>210 (2)</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>c, e</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>b. 1753</td>
<td>150 adults</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>b, c, e</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>c. 1774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>1750, b. 1742</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>a, c</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>c. 1750</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>a, c</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>71 (25)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>a, c</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>c. 1775</td>
<td>c. 1800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>b. 1762</td>
<td>c. 1770</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>c. 1660</td>
<td>1689, 1822</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>b, c</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>b. 1735</td>
<td>1728, 1763</td>
<td>c. 175</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>1740, 1766</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>b.1765</td>
<td>b.1784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>b.1770</td>
<td>b.1810</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>b.1750</td>
<td>1741, 1792</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey etc</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's lynn</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2. Victorian population compared to historic numbers of regional English communities

Although the navy provided impetus and an economic foundation for new communities, their way was forged in the sixteenth century when Conversos operating through the port of Falmouth capitalised on their uncertain status to engage in Spanish trade with the West Indies. Later, as in London, Ashkenazi Jews originally came to the South West as pedlars, slowly settling and transforming themselves into small shopkeepers. Unlike the communities in London, where the close nature of East End society enabled the creation of communal organisations and ease in the maintenance of religious observations, for these tiny
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284 Cecil Roth, *The Rise of Provincial Jewry*. Sources column from Roth’s table—(a)Account in The Jewish Chronicle, 1842; (b) Margoliouth’s History, 1851; (c) vote in Chief Rabbinate election, 1844; (d) Census of 1851; (e) Statistics in The Jewish Chronicle, 23.vii, 1847; (f) other sources, if not known from the above.

and distant communities maintenance of religious practices was more difficult.\textsuperscript{286} In some instances the financing of pedlars was undertaken by local Jewish businessmen on the understanding that the pedlar would return to the town centre on the Sabbath, ensuring a \textit{Minyan} for services and providing the embryonic foundations of a community.\textsuperscript{287} Jewish pedlars served a number of pragmatic purposes for the wider Jewish community. Providing the funding to set up a pedlar was often facilitated in London, in order to both find employment for the newly-arrived poor immigrant and as a way of removing some of the financial responsibility for yet another poor person.\textsuperscript{288} Although a number of London-born hawkers migrated to Melbourne, only one came from rural England (Exeter): Charlotte Barnard (c.1824-1868), who arrived in Melbourne in 1863, previously listed herself as a General Dealer lodging in Warwickshire.\textsuperscript{289}

As with the street sellers of London, successful pedlars progressed into small-scale shopkeepers. With the expansion of the navy during the mid-eighteenth century, opportunities arose to trade in a variety of consumer goods for this expanding market. Susser’s analysis of the Woolcombe’s Picture of Plymouth of 1812 shows that eighteen of the forty-one small shop keepers advertised as slop sellers, merchants, jewellers, brokers, dealers in navel stores, stoles, silversmiths, umbrella and straw hat makers were Jewish businesses and at least half of these were Naval Agents.\textsuperscript{290} Two branches of Abraham Joseph’s (1731-1794) family settled in Melbourne. Joseph was a Plymouth-based mercer and wholesale slop seller, whose trade card proclaimed him as ‘slopman to his Royal Highness Princes William Henry’.\textsuperscript{291} This was obviously a profitable business; Joseph owned considerable property in Plymouth, leaving an estate of at least £7,000.\textsuperscript{292}
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The navy considerably scaled back from 35,000 sailors in 1740 to just 19,000 in 1817. As a consequence trade declined markedly. Jewish merchants left the port towns for other mercantile centres, with large numbers moving to London, while many took the opportunities that the colonies offered. Analysis of the social mobility of the naval port communities can be witnessed in the career of Charles Marks (1801-1871), father of Edward Isaac Marks (1829-1900) who arrived in Melbourne around 1860. Charles is first listed in 1841 as a Naval Agent, but five years later he became an Assessor for Plymouth. The Exeter-based Alexander Alexander (1805-1887), father of Melbourne residents Moses (1833-1919) and Miriam Alexander (1844-), was an optician, a profession favoured by Jews. He moved to the top of this vocation, writing a number of optometric treatises, including one dedicated to King William IV, he was optician-in-ordinary to their Royal Highnesses the Duchess of Kent and the Princess Victoria, and traded by appointment to Queen Victoria, one of only eight Jews given this honour in the first years of Victoria’s reign.

The Jewish presence in the industrial north of England took longer to develop. This area was initially settled by German Jews trading with the cotton industry in Manchester. Many German migrants arrived after serving apprenticeships in German companies, bringing with them skills and experience useful for large-scale commerce. These were middle-class and secularly educated, able to read and write in German and in many instances other European languages as well. Young men, such as Moritz Michaelis (1820-1902), without capital and with limited connections, migrated intending to find employment as clerks or managers in the factories, offices and warehouses of their compatriots.

Those migrating from the industrial north included former migrants from Central and Eastern Europe, both those who had established themselves and those who were perhaps finding the conditions more difficult. Phillip Blashki (1837-1916) born Favel Wageczewski in
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Blashki near Kalish Poland, arrived in Manchester in 1855, fleeing the repression of Eastern Europe and found work as a tassel maker. In Manchester he met and married a young Polish widow, Hannah Potash (nee Immergut) (c.1832-1920). According to a family story, the couple were due to sail to America, and their possessions had been previously loaded on board another ship which had already sailed without them. The shipping agent erroneously convinced them to sail to Australia that day, claiming that the difference in costs could be borne by the sale of their goods in America. Blashki’s rise in economic prosperity followed a familiar pattern found both in England and Victoria. He initially established himself as a dealer on the goldfields before launching a jewellery business in Melbourne and subsequently in 1894 winning the tender to design and manufacture the Sheffield Shield.

From the eighteenth century, with each wave of immigration, Anglo Jewry experienced a constant and cyclical process of religious, cultural and economic acculturation. These conditions were also experienced by those emigrants seeking new economic opportunities as British settlers to a new colony.

Germany

The multifaceted factors influencing the formation of the Melbourne Jewish community resulted from the composite ethnic and social backgrounds of the settlers and residents of the city. The second largest contingent of Jewish settlers was from German-speaking areas of Central Europe, either immigrating directly or after previous residence in England. Multiple factors influenced the migration of this community to Britain and to the Australian colonies. As German migrants they were products of the mass migration that Germany experienced during the political turmoil of the nineteenth century. As German Jewish migrants, they were seeking refuge from the economic and social restrictions imposed on their community. Ashkenazi settlement of England was predominantly from Germany, so for those who had previously migrated to England, their onward migration to Victoria is an extension of both the settlement patterns of Anglo-Jewry and Germans to the Australian colonies.

299 It has been estimated that between 1830-1910, 200,000 German Jews emigrated. Monika Richarz, Stella P. Rosenfeld, and Sidney Rosenfeld, Jewish Life in Germany: Memoirs from Three Centuries (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 5.
The literature on German Jewish history is immense, focusing on the various expulsions from cities and states throughout its nearly 2,000 year history; the social and political outcomes of the Thirty Years’ War; the expansion of German territories; the influence on the German and Jewish Enlightenments (Haskalah),\(^{300}\) the inconsistent and repressive restrictions placed on individuals and communities prior to emancipation in 1871; and finally the events leading to the Holocaust and the analysis of this catastrophe.\(^{301}\) The emancipatory experience of German Jewry was markedly different to that occurring concurrently in either England or France and resulted from differing political, social and philosophical transformations taking place within the German states themselves.\(^{302}\) This process was not completed until 1871, a generation later than had occurred in Britain and a generation after the political turmoil of 1848. Emancipation coincided with the changing economic foundations for German society, which transformed from the old economies of agriculture, guilds and mercantile interests into new industrial commercial markets.\(^{303}\) German Jews had historically faced greater and more repressive restrictions over all aspects of their lives than those in England, and the removal of these restrictions was gradual and inconsistent. Eighteenth-century German absolutism considered loyalty as a significant political virtue, with Jewish integration dependent on individuals and communities that demonstrated benefit and obedience. German nineteenth-century nationalism defined nationality and citizenship as indistinguishable. Although individual Jews as economic citizens could prosper, the prevailing political system did not allow for improvement in the


collective condition of Jewish communities. Underpinning the debate on German Jewish emancipation was the debased image of the Jew as corrupt and dishonest. In response, the debates over emancipation revolved around a perceived need for Jewish regeneration, and the responsibility and conditions for this to take place.

Historically, Jews of Central and Eastern Europe were not considered citizens of the state and as a result lived in autonomous communities. As Magnus summarises in his description of Cologne:

Jewish toleration…was extended only if perceived as beneficial to the granting authority. If Jews became unprofitable to their protectors because they became impoverished or because the burden of protecting Jews from popular passions or outside meddling became too great, the basis for toleration was undermined. Obviously, if Jews seemed a threat to the ruler’s interests, no grounds for toleration existed.

These autonomous communities required members to have mutual responsibility for the regulation of religious and civil functions while being obligated to manage state-imposed regulations and restrictions. They scrutinised the observance of religious law, public worship and the study of Torah, provided the synagogues, cemetery and mikvot, supervised the distribution of seasonal festival produce such as the wheat for matzah, enforced kashrut, supervised poor relief, and enforced sumptuary restrictions. The self-governing authority incorporated the judicial systems and communal institutions required for a functioning society, including responsibility for a range of civic services from water supply to the removal of garbage. Jewish lives were controlled economically and socially, limiting restrictions on residential locations, population size, occupations and taxation. Residential restrictions resulted in overcrowding within the limited space allocated, placing enormous pressures on housing and necessitating communal authorities to regulate living space,
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ensuring that all available space was used and rents were also controlled to ensure stability and affordability. Residency permits were only available to household heads able to pay a fee and prove possession of an expressed quantity of property. Without a residency permit, Jews were unable to start a family or engage in independent business.

Within Germany, it was occupational restrictions which most defined the community. Excluded from ownership of land, guilds and thus trade occupations, this largely constrained Jews to small-scale commerce, money lending and pawnbroking. In some areas Jews were forbidden from operating retail shops and consequently became pedlars, dealers in second-hand goods and casual traders. This trade evolved into the sale of agricultural products, grain and livestock, with Jews particularly involved in dealing in horses and cattle, areas not controlled by the urban guilds. Jews also travelled to fairs and markets as far afield as Poland and Russia, procuring and selling merchandise, exchanges which presented opportunities for interaction with the wider society.

Jewish education had been defined by the Torah and halachic law and held no requirements for a non-Jewish scholarship. The German haskala argued for a separation between culture and religion, facilitating opportunities for Jews to live in both Jewish and secular worlds. Throughout the nineteenth-century, Jews rapidly acquired German and German cultural habits, in so doing, defining a new middle-class Jewish sensibility. As with
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British Jews, German Jews saw education as a way of improving social status, participation and acculturation within wider society. And, as occurred elsewhere, improvements in secular education saw a diminishing of religious education and a corresponding fall in religious knowledge. In Prussia, a secular education was reinforced by the state, which required students to attend state supervised schools. By 1840 (at a time when only 10 percent of Jewish students in Poland received a state-supervised education) 95 percent of Jewish children in Prussia were studying in the educational system. Although nearly half of Prussia’s Jewish students were educated in Christian schools, in Posen the majority continued to be educated in Jewish schools, where they learned German as well as Polish.316 By the late-nineteenth century there ‘were proportionally five times as many Jews in Prussian secondary schools (Gymnasien) as Jews in the population at large.’317 By 1871, Jews comprised 1.2 percent of the population of the German Empire and 60 percent had attained at least a middle-class status; educationally they comprised 2 percent of German university students.318 Similarly in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in 1873 Jews accounted for 22 percent of the matriculating and non-matriculated students from the Vienna University, a number which rose to 33 percent in 1890.319 This German secular education can be seen in the letters of families such as that of Emanuel Steinfeld, writing from Silesia in a high nineteenth-century formal German, while the Sheffield-based family of his wife, who had left Posen a generation previously, corresponded in English with the occasional Yiddish message or phrase.320

As in England, a broader education enabled the economic position of Jews to rise.

The state recognised that a shift in living conditions could only be achieved by
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improvements in occupational opportunities and responded by attempting to redirect the Jewish community away from commerce and towards agricultural and craft industries, sectors considered more ‘desirable’ by German society. Although opportunities improved, Jews were still excluded from state posts and entrance into the fields of medicine and law.\(^{321}\) Jews did not migrate to diverse fields of interest, rather maintaining and expanding commercial opportunities outside guild control, so that by 1895, 56 percent of Jewish livelihoods were achieved through commerce, compared to 10 percent of non-Jewish Germans.\(^{322}\) This rapid social and economic rise of the Jewish community was also exploited by anti-Semitic forces, who pictured the Jews as the ‘epitome of bourgeois society and bourgeois-capitalist competition’.

Hoffmann describes the transition of Jews in Germany from the eighteenth century as ‘cultural immigrants’, as he perceives an ‘abruptness and intensity’ in the new cultural contacts experienced, not as an acculturation to the Christian majority, but specifically to the educated middle class through bourgeoisieification.\(^{324}\) Bildung combined an educational framework with the importance of culture and the potential of humanity to express ‘a cultured, well-bred personality, an autonomous, harmonious person of refined manners, aesthetic appreciation, politeness and gentility’.\(^{325}\) These concepts were commandeered by the Jewish community with enthusiasm and alacrity. Jewish intellectuals in the emancipatory period expressed a ‘passionate acquisition of European culture and proclaimed themselves eager to integrate into society’.\(^{326}\) They became both consumers and producers of culture in disproportionately high numbers, providing new spaces for the circulation of ideas and for
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wider social interactions. 327 Katz’s oft-quoted statement that ‘Jews have not assimilated into the German people, but into a certain layer of it, the newly emerging middle-class’, defines the dichotomy of the emancipated German Jew. 328 Kaplan expands the contractions that this created, whereby this bourgeois commercial community, who embraced the importance of education, was simultaneously barred from many of the professions, thereby creating a non-capitalist lifestyle of the educated upper middle-class, while being excluded from many of the professions which would generally define this community. 329 Emancipation saw a lessening of the traditional patterns of Jewish life, from the prescriptions of Sabbath observance, to dietary laws and dress; personal names became more Germanic and the relationship of the Rabbi and lay leadership changed. 330 Acculturation was restricted by persistent discrimination and many believed that social advancement could only be achieved through conversion to Christianity, consequently leading to significant numbers of proselytes and higher levels of inter-marriage than occurred in Britain.

Prussia, the most powerful German state, was home to the majority of German Jews. In 1795, with the partition of Poland by Russia, Austria and Prussia, Prussia absorbed Greater Poland and redefined the provinces as Silesia, Pomerania and Posen. In the early nineteenth-century, Prussia was the home to over 50 percent of all German Jews, a number rising to 70 percent fifty years later. 331 Following the Congress of Vienna (1815) the western part of the Duchy of Warsaw became the new Prussian Grand Duchy of Posen, a rural and agricultural region. By 1825, 68,100 Jews lived in this Province, being 6.5 percent of the total population, equating to two thirds of the Jewish population of Prussia. 332 Unsurprising, the
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Posen area was the place of birth of the majority of non-English settlers to Melbourne, centres of pre-existing Jewish urbanism, where 95 percent of the Jewish population resided in cities. Prussia attempted to ‘Germanise’ this new population, most particularly by exchanging Polish for German as the official language. Although the biggest state with the largest Jewish population, Prussia lacked even its own internally consistent policies towards the Jewish community, with disputed authority between the centre and individual localities, who jostled over economic and political life, including Jewish affairs. This political melee was not only over rights, but included debate over the authority of various levels of government to decide on those rights. The differing legal status of Jews in the various provinces was based on historical precedents. In the Brandenburg-Prussian heartland a number of legal restrictions were lifted from the late-eighteenth century, while in early-nineteenth century Silesia, which had experienced greater economic development, Jews were enfranchised and participated in municipal offices. In New East Prussia, Jewish life was less regulated due to pre-existing economic considerations. In the words of one high-ranking official, ‘many places would become wastelands and manorial demesnes would lose most of their income if major restrictions had been introduced.’

Social advancement for Jewry was also affected by a range of migrations, local and distant, internal and external, creating a uniquely heterogeneous community defined by people who had migrated east to west and west to east during the previous two centuries. As Jews gained freedom of movement, they shifted from the crowded conditions of the province of Posen to be at the vanguard of urban development in Berlin, Breslau and Königsberg in the East and Hessian and Rhenish-Westphaian centres in the West, several
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decades before other Germans.\textsuperscript{339} In 1871, 20 percent of Jews lived in cities over 100,000, and by 1910 this figure had risen to 58.3 percent, rising again to 70 percent by 1930, whereas for the non-Jewish population during the corresponding period only 4.8 percent lived in cities rising to 21.3 percent by 1910.\textsuperscript{340} Berlin became the centre of German Jewish growth, and by 1910, 25 percent of German Jews lived in the capital. German Jewry combined both indigenous Ashkenazi communities and significant post-expulsion Sephardi communities. This mixed ancestry is observed in Hamburg-born Melbourne merchant Herman Heynemann (1828-1902), the son of David Loffman Heynemann and Henrietta de Banco.

Many of the German Jews who arrived in Melbourne had previously lived in England. Jacob Abraham (1813-) and his family arrived in Victoria on the \textit{Ultonia} in May 1855, after residing for at least five years in England. The 1851 census lists him as a General Dealer, living in Newcastle upon Tyne, sharing a house with his wife, two children, brother and sister-in-law, nephew and three lodgers. His children had been born in Plymouth and Newcastle, indicating significant attempts at resettlement prior to his journey to Victoria. Residence in Britain was not necessarily a positive experience. Gustavus Hallenburgh, later George Halinbourg (1818-), was transported to New South Wales for stealing a watch in 1836. Literate in three languages, Hallenburgh was out of work and living in London where his brother ran a bookshop, when as a teenager this incident occurred.\textsuperscript{341} At the other end of the social scale, Louis Beaver (previously Bibergeil) (c.1820-1879), born in Bromberg, arrived in Manchester in 1840, escaping political repression. Son of a Doctor and nephew of the German scientist Aaron Bernstein, he began his career as a pedlar of jewellery, steel pens and other small items. Within four years he possessed a number of successful Manchester jewellery shops and is listed in the 1861 census as employing three maids. Although an active participant in the Manchester Jewish community, this did not stop three of his children leaving for Melbourne, with sixteen year old Albert (1851-) arriving in 1866, four years before his sisters Evelyn (1847-) and Laura (1852-).\textsuperscript{342}
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\textsuperscript{342} Williams, \textit{The Making of Manchester Jewry, 1740-1875}, 127, 350 and PROV: Index to Unassisted Inward Passenger Lists to Victoria 1852-1923; English Census 1861.
The Sephardi community in Melbourne consisted of individuals and families from London and from many scattered Sephardi communities including Jamaica, Barbados, Gibraltar, Morocco, Egypt and Italy. For Melbourne, the largest non-English Sephardi community originated in Jamaica, and this community brought with it an alternative and singular model of Jewish interaction and of a Jewish urban familiarity. From the expulsion from Spain, the New World had provided economic and residential opportunities for Jews and although these at times proved inconsistent and sometimes impermanent, they forged new Jewish settlements, including the initial establishment of the large and significant communities of the Americas. The unique economic networks of the Caribbean provided a transnational perspective for this community, one forged through its mercantile, familial and educational associations, connecting the Old and New Worlds with new linkages, providing an alternate world view. This was to be displayed in the Montefiore family, whose trading connections between the Caribbean and London included a family base in Barbados.

The Jewish settlement and de-settlement of Jamaica and other parts of the Caribbean is an example of how Jewish sub-diasporas utilised their connections to jointly build a community and an economic base, intersecting on a number of levels with British economic history and Anglo-Jewish history. The dispersion of the Sephardi community provided family connections across national boundaries, connections which were not necessarily severed by expulsion and migration, but which could be harnessed to allow financial collaboration and an international fluidity of capital. These were communities unlimited by national boundaries, transnational in outlook and connected by networks which stretched from Holland to England, France, Germany, North America and other parts of the Caribbean and through the Converso community back to the Iberian Peninsula. They facilitated an import and export trade for the British and Dutch and exploited their ambiguous or dual nationality to circumvent and disrupt trading embargos with the Spanish.

---


This transnational strength could also be a liability; unclear national allegiance was a disadvantage in an era when economic demarcation was judged on a ‘subject’s true allegiance’.  

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the centre of Jewish life in the British colonies of the Atlantic was not North America, but rather the West Indies, with more Jews resident here than in all of the thirteen American Colonies and Canada. By 1720 Jews comprised 10-18 percent of the Jamaican population and in the early-nineteenth century one third of that of Curacao, holding half the wealth and three quarters of its commercial management.

Jews, Conversos and Crypto-Jews fled the Iberian Peninsula, with many establishing themselves in Holland. After the declaration of Dutch independence in 1579, their numbers dramatically increased, and within the new-found freedom, were able to revert to openly practising Judaism. Many of this community later migrated to the Caribbean, bringing with them, not only the experience of acculturation within the multi ethnic realm of medieval Spain, but values and a collective memory that has been described as a ‘blending of Iberian values and rabbinic Judaism [which] constituted a reinvention of ethnicity unequalled in the Jewish world.

Simultaneously, numbers of Conversos and Crypto-Jews were able to flee Spain under an agreement whereby Conversos could settle in the Spanish colonies of the New World, particularly Recife, Brazil. When this area was taken by the Dutch in 1630, many were able to return openly as professing Jews, their numbers swelled by Jewish immigrants from Holland, so that by 1654 the city was reported to have a Jewish population of 5,000, a number greater


than the Christian inhabitants.\textsuperscript{349} Here they were engaged in a wide range of agricultural and mercantile pursuits, from sugar planting to brokerage and commercial trading, creating a commercial network connecting north-eastern Brazil with Amsterdam and Portugal.\textsuperscript{350} In 1654 Brazil fell again to the Spaniards and the Jews were given three months to leave, dispersing along the Atlantic seaboard of North America and throughout the Caribbean.\textsuperscript{351} This occurred at a time when both the Dutch and English, keen to secure possession of their New World colonies, were encouraging immigration.\textsuperscript{352}

Although Jamaica was controlled by Spain until conquered by the English in 1655, as personal property of Columbus’s descendants, it was outside direct authority of the Inquisition. While Jews could not practise openly, the first Jewish settlement in Jamaica is recorded in 1530, although it is unclear how many Jews were resident.\textsuperscript{353} When the English expelled all Spaniards from the island, they allowed the ‘Portuguese’ (as the Jews were known), to remain, thus forming the nucleus of the Jewish community.\textsuperscript{354} Under English control, Jews were allowed to openly practise their religion, and a strong communal life developed, with the first synagogue established in 1704, followed by another four congregations by midcentury. In the late-eighteenth century Ashkenazi settlers began arriving and the first Ashkenazi synagogue was erected in Spanish Town in 1796.\textsuperscript{355} The two groups remained culturally separate and were referred to as ‘Spanish’ and ‘English’ communities, although Ashkenazi Jewry were always a minority.

The Jewish community were not considered equal citizens, disenfranchised and subject to a variety of heavy and disproportionate taxes.\textsuperscript{356} The granting of a franchise and full political rights did not occur until 1832, in parallel with the abolition of slavery, and only
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\textsuperscript{356} Ibid., 303, Jacob A. P. M. Andrade and Basil Oscar Parks, \textit{A Record of the Jews in Jamaica from the English Conquest to the Present Times} (Kingston: The Jamaica Times Ltd., 1941), 9; Delevante and Alberga, \textit{The Island of One People: An Account of the History of the Jews of Jamaica}, Chapter 6 for a detailed discussion on the development and repel of these laws see Snyder, "Rules, Rights and Redemption: The Negotiation of Jewish Status in British Atlantic Port Towns, 1740-1831."
as ‘they would be unable to uphold the image of the superiority of the white man if the franchise was to be extended to the free Negroes but denied the Jews’. Jamaica—as an example of what has been termed the ‘Port Jew’ phenomenon—was a community of ‘betweenness’, middle men in a plantation society; people tolerated but not given full citizenship, caught between competing empires.

As with immigration to the Victorian goldfields two centuries later, the typical seventeenth-century immigrant to Jamaica was ‘single, male and from an urban trading background’. Jews were primarily engaged in mercantile trade, particularly to Europe and British North America, as well as operating as shopkeepers, middlemen and smaller scale merchants. Port Royal operated as a base for 2,000 privateer vessels and Jews acted as agents for and purchasers of loot from privateers, as well as occasionally operating directly as privateers themselves. Due to the high capital costs of establishing plantations and to the religious constraints of slave ownership, few Jews engaged in this field of activity.

In Melbourne, several families had connections to privateering and the slave trade, particularly those descendants from the Lindo family, two branches of whom settled in the Australian Colonies: Elizabeth Lindo (1804-1887) and her husband Benjamin Goldsmid Levien (1806-1890) in Melbourne and subsequently Geelong, while her nephew and Benjamin’s cousin Alexander Lindo (-1838) settled in Sydney. Elizabeth’s father Alexander (1742-1812) was born in Bordeaux of a Sephardi family and had settled in Jamaica by 1765. Lindo initially established himself as a merchant, specialising in the purchase of privateer cargos before investing in substantial property holdings in Kingston and several plantations, becoming one of the largest slave traders in Jamaica (Figure 2.3). His company operated at an international level through financial arrangements with a London branch of the family.

---
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Lindo’s financial affairs became somewhat strained, initially through complications with his Jamaican partners and fatefully in 1802 through his decision to lend the French £60,000 to fund a proposed invasion of the British Caribbean from St Domingue. It has been speculated that Alexander Lindo’s rationale in funding such a venture against his adopted home may have been founded on the perception of Napoleon as the liberator of the Jews, particularly at a time when the Jewish community of Jamaica was disenfranchised and disproportionately taxed. Unfortunately this decision cost him dearly when the French reneged on the loan. Lindo continued business from a base in London, but was eventually killed aboard ship, off the coast of Barbados, ironically from a bullet from a French privateer. Amongst Lindo’s assets at the time of his death were two plantations with a joint slave population of six hundred and thirty nine.
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*Figure 2.3 Notice for a Slave sale by Alexander Lindo*
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The nineteenth century saw the development of a Jamaican Jewish professional class, beginning with the medical profession. Dr Solomon Iffla (1820-1887) was a Jamaican-born and Glasgow-trained physician, who settled first in Adelaide before moving to Melbourne. Iffla rose to prominence in Melbourne where he was conspicuous as a Council member for the Philosophical Society of Victoria and the Vice President (1859), Council Member (1859-1861) and subsequently Life Member (1860-1872) of the Royal Society of Victoria; representing the Society on the 1858 Burke and Wills exploration committee. He served the Jewish community as well, where for many years he volunteered his services as physician to the Jewish Philanthropic Society (Figure 2.4).

![Dr Solomon Iffla](image)

**Figure 2.4 Dr Solomon Iffla**

From the late-eighteenth century, the Jamaican economy suffered a series of downturns. Liverpool increased in significance in the West Indies trade, reducing the importance of London, which was the principal connection for Jewish traders. From the late-eighteenth century planters were able to import and export directly with England, reducing the role of the middleman. The equalisation of sugar duties in 1846 dramatically
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contracted the economic fortunes of the island.\textsuperscript{367} Emigration and inter marriage reduced the once thriving Jewish community of Jamaica.

Melbourne’s Jewish community was overwhelmingly British or the children of previous British immigrants, but also contained a considerable number of immigrants from across the Jewish world. Their experiences and their perceptions of the world influenced the formation of this new settlement. Historically, restrictions on Jewish communities took many forms and Jews responded in a variety of ways to mould, adapt and circumvent these. The historical records indicate that those settling in Melbourne had some secular education, were almost all literate in English and appear to have manifested the outward signs of acculturation, in dress, amusements, occupations and interactions with others in the Victorian community. The following chapters will consider how these values were used to shape a society without formal requirements for communal affiliation and without restrictions on economic, social or occupational participation.

Chapter 3 Jewish identity in a new land

Yes gentle lady you sneer as you pass the Jew, but ask your Christian butcher how he kills his veal?...the explanation given will be sufficient to show that the custom allured to, far from deserving reprobation, is rather entitled to our respect, both as a religious institution and as a safeguard to morality.

*Argus*, 9 May 1851, 4.

Jewish historiography charts the changing nature of collective Jewish identity concentrating on the unique characteristics of specific time and place.\(^{368}\) As we have seen in the previous chapter, communities responded to the challenges of modernity in individual ways, exhibiting varying levels of acculturation, although this in itself did not necessarily lead to the communal loss of attachment to Judaism.\(^{369}\) In new settler societies such as Melbourne, communal identity was structured from the values imported with settlers from their previous place of residence. In Melbourne these initial colonists were audacious individuals pursuing new opportunities, but also seeking to maintain the familiar in the unfamiliar, negotiating relationships and forming structural elements in a society which included convicts, emancipists and free settlers. Where the previous chapters considered how Jewish communities have been moulded by the social, political and economic frameworks of the State, resulting in individual expressions of Jewish social cohesion, this chapter explores how in Melbourne Jews maintained Judaism as a response to the community’s collective experiences, shaped by the tripartite of urbanisation, industrialisation and secularisation.

For Jews in New World cities, their very newness offered an alternative and unique opportunity to become integrated participants of these societies as they developed. In Melbourne, as in other new cities, those establishing communities did so from scratch—providing an opportunity to create and define a Jewish identity as an expression of the personal values of the members, integrated into the wider society, creating a community in

\(^{368}\) Fonrobert and Shemtov, "Introduction: Jewish Conceptions and Practices of Space," 3.
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their own image. In so doing they produced a unique response for the maintenance of the structural elements of Judaism. Every aspect required formulation and implementation, from the community’s attempts at preserving Judaism through ritual and practice, to practical aspects such as the provision of kosher food, to personal cultural identity. It could be argued that these communal pragmatic responses are a reflection of the psychology of the early settlers to Melbourne, a self-selecting group of intrepid individuals immigrating to a fledgling community, which for the most religiously conservative would have been a massive step of profound implications, taking them outside the framework of a secure religious structure.

To understand the perspective of Melbourne Jewry, this chapter investigates how urbanism and modernity affected the outlook of Jews in Western Europe. The chapter then considers how this was transferred to Melbourne, to examine how they established a communal structure from the organisational, private and public perspectives.

By the mid-nineteenth century, Melbourne had a population on par with many European cities, with a Jewish population numerically equal to a mid-sized European city such as Lissa, but unlike these towns where the Jewish population was forty to fifty percent, in Victoria the population was maintained at around half a percent. Unlike many of their neighbours, they were already experienced urban dwellers bringing with them Judaism practised within a modern urban setting. Melbourne also hosted a relatively homogenous Jewish population. The majority were of British birth or from the English-speaking world, supplemented by a number of European Jews, many who had also previously lived in England, and others included a minority from Jamaica and smaller numbers from Turkey and North Africa.

370 This is an argument put forward by Dash Moore in describing the Jewish settlement of Miami and Los Angeles. Dash Moore, To the Golden Cities: Pursuing the American Jewish Dream in Miami and Los Angeles, 30.

371 In a similar vein Heilman describes how the religiously conservative chose not to migrate to America considering it ‘treyfe medine’ a contaminated state, outside the one thousand years of ‘traditional’ European Judaism. Samuel C Heilman, "Orthodox Jews, the City and the Suburbs," in People of the City: Jews and the Urban Challenge, ed. Ezra Mendelsohn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 20.


European Perspective

For the residents of the urban centres of Europe, modernity brought with it requirements to validate their contemporary faiths in light of new philosophical and scientific scholarship and was followed by the rational philosophy of Descartes and the biblical critique of Spinoza, further confronting Jewish and non-Jewish fundamental beliefs. For Anglo-Jewry the demands of this new intellectual discourse was immediate and unmediated. English Jews had access to these new concepts and to the philosophical works of Voltaire, Locke, Newton, Stillingfleet, Cudworth and Bolinsbroke. Previous values were also confronted through adaptations to older class systems, as new wealth generated by industrialisation and the urbanisation further loosened hierarchies. In response, governments reacted to both mediate these changes and ensure maintenance of control.

For the Jewish community, secularisation held special challenges. Judaism is expressed through a range of commandments and prohibitions affecting the behaviours and the religious practices which Jews are required to adhere to in all spheres of their lives. Here, there is no distinction between leisure and religious activity and thus a response to modernity was often perceived as a laxity of religious observance. As emancipatory processes defined new national and secular identities, there was a parallel reassessing of values, as Jewish communities questioned religious norms and the discipline of the rabbinic elite, in so doing developing a ‘scepticism and religious permissiveness’. Adaptations included modifications to the internal and external manifestations of Judaism and cultural identity, shaping the intellectual and social life of the community. These were expressed through the adoption of many of the outward manifestations of their compatriots. Increased prosperity encouraged a consumer culture, and urban dwellers enjoyed the entertainments offered in a city, from the theatre to galleries, coffee houses to brothels and in many cities Jews became prominent
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participants in cultural activity. As Hyman considers in her analysis of the Jews of Alsace, ‘Many Jews now discovered their individuality and embarked on a journey of self-definition freed from the constraints of a collective identity.’ Linguistic assimilation also provided specific opportunities for cultural change, creating a Judaism that was ‘religiously unified but culturally diverse’ whereby ‘each group displayed the markedly particular characteristics of its milieu.’ This was not an abandonment of Jewish identity; rather urbanisation encouraged new manifestations of Judaism, which was broadened to consider both secular and religious issues. For English Jews this process had begun earlier than on the continent, and derived from a response and adaptation to the contemporary social values of English society. So too are these external signs of acculturation evident in Melbourne, where the Jewish community also emulate many of the values and norms of their urban contemporaries.

Nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewry was not as orthodox as would have been considered by their Eastern European brethren, but they were more orthodox in their practices than were contemporary wealthy urban Jews in America or in other parts of Europe. In general they observed the major Jewish holidays, kept the Sabbath and adhered to the laws of kashrut. Whereas anti-Semitism in Germany led many to consider that social advancement could only be achieved by conversion to Christianity, this was a far rarer occurrence in England. In the eighteenth century some English Jews responded to the rather more relaxed attitude towards religion by simply abandoning religion, but they rarely chose the alternative—Christianity. Following emancipation, abandoning Judaism, particularly for the wealthier Jews, was reversed, instead sustaining a nominal connection to Judaism, ignoring elements which were considered obstacles to modernity, becoming ‘nonobservant


Orthodox Jews’ and persevering at least some association with Judaism and the Jewish community.  

The nineteenth century saw a sharp increase in the Jewish population of Europe, rising from two million at the beginning of the century to seven million eighty years later. The period also witnessed enormous internal and external immigration to urban centres. Of the many cities we now consider quintessentially ‘Jewish’, Odessa, Berlin, Vienna, Paris, London and New York only became major Jewish centres at this time. In all these cities debates arose surrounding the place of religion and the cultural frameworks of Judaism in a modern city. A consequence of this new wave of urbanism was an identification by Jews with their new place of residence. Jews began to equate themselves culturally with these cities, so much so that ‘Viennese Jews considered themselves politically Austrian, ethnically Jewish and more than ever, culturally Viennese.’

Communal structure

In understanding Melbourne Jewry’s adaptations within a new city, a number of areas of communal, personal and public expressions of Judaism require examination. The history of the Melbourne synagogues have been detailed in both general histories and in the specific congregational histories and therefore their details do not require elaboration here, but reading the extant records does reveal attempts at maintaining communal cohesion and perhaps financial pragmatism in their development.

In Victoria, England and across the New World, Judaism was a matter of personal choice, requiring members to develop a collective consensus for its maintenance. This chapter will consider how this consensus was developed in Melbourne. Religious life provided a focus for networking, offering not only spiritual support and comfort, but also social and cultural interaction. In Melbourne this is clearly seen in the rapid establishment of

---
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communal social infrastructure. In 1839, this tiny community, without sufficient numbers to formally constitute a minyan, held their first services.\(^3\) Immigration expanded their numbers and by Rosh Hashanah 1840 the first service with a minyan was held, conducted at the home of Solomon Benjamin (1818-1888) by Edward Hart (1818-1854) and assisted by Michael Cashmore (1815-1886), Samuel Henry Harris (1815-1867) and Isaac Lazarus Lincoln (-1850).\(^4\) Hart was ‘a welcome arrival and he was able to act as cantor and chant the prayers with grace and accuracy.’\(^5\) In 1841 formal congregational life in Melbourne was launched with the establishment of the ‘Jewish Congregational Society’, electing Michael Cashmore as its president, Solomon Benjamin vice president and a committee formed of Moses Lazarus (1808-1870), Isaac Lazarus Lincoln, Isaac Fonsaker and Henry Davis (1797-1843). That year, at the Port Philip Hotel, the Society held its first High Holidays services, attended by twenty-five coreligionists.\(^6\) Establishing a management committee they drew up organisational rules, which included a fine for nonattendance at committee meetings. In a society with voluntary communal allegiance, membership must have been problematic, as the committee initiated a weekly membership fee of six pence, while also decreeing a two guinea fine for any Jews resident in the district who had not become a member within six months of arrival. Maintenance of a minyan appears to have been challenging, and after the High Holidays 1846, Asher Hymen Hart (1813-1871) resigned as honorary reader. ‘I will not any longer (to be plain) submit to the insult of attending the Synagogue on Shabbats and Holydays without the means of celebrating public worship,’ he stated. In response seven members of the congregation promised to attend every Shabbat service on penalty of a five shillings fine, ensuring the minyan necessary for worship was guaranteed.\(^7\) In 1843 they renamed the congregation יישרל שאריה ל'פ, ‘The Holy Congregation of the Remanent of Israel’, a title popular with many New World synagogues and one which reveals the messianic hope of a dispersed population.\(^8\) The central symbol of Jewish religious life is the Torah Scroll and the committee passed a resolution stating ‘that the increasing population of the Jewish

\(^3\) Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora; Two Centuries of Jewish Settlement in Australia*, 38.
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community in Port Phillip and their apparent anxiety for the establishment of our Holy Religion on a sure and firm basis renders it incumbent on the Committee of the Congregation to provide, amongst other necessities, a “Sepher Torah” and authorised its procurement through Solomon Benjamin’s agents in London.395

A cemetery was the first structural element created by the community. For settler societies cemeteries are not only a necessity for the burial of the dead, but form an attachment and connection to a specific place for those who stay and for those who move on. For Jews, a cemetery is an imperative communal obligation and a number of religious teachings guide their location. Cemeteries must be situated beyond the outmost residences of a town and their size is defined by the minimum distances stipulated between graves.396 In new communities, the reality of the settlement experience obliged provisioning of a cemetery in precedence over the construction of a synagogue.397 The death of Henry Davis’s daughter in 1840 prompted the community to establish a place for her burial. They took an independent response, initially identifying land at Pentridge, which was purchased by Abraham Abrahams (1797-1865), but this proved unsuitable due to the rocky nature of the ground. By 1843, the tiny community estimated to number eighty to ninety had petitioned and gathered support from the Colonial Secretary, who surveyed and approved a site by May the same year.398 The burial of Davis’s daughter in a Jewish burial ground is interesting, as her mother Hannah Howell was not Jewish and had married Davis in Church. Hannah was the sister to Judah Solomon’s de facto wife Elizabeth Howell (see chapter 5). As a founder of the Melbourne community, Davis obviously maintained a close connection and identification with Judaism. Although two daughters converted to Judaism in Hobart Town in 1848, it would appear that the dead child had not, although this does not appear to have hindered her burial under Jewish rights.399

398 This was adjacent to the Melbourne Cemetery on land which now forms part of the Queen Victoria Market. Colonial Secretary’s Correspondence PROV VPRS 17.
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The issue of non-Jewish mothers continued throughout the development of the community. The construction of the synagogue in Bourke Street required identification of Melbourne’s Jews and thus those eligible for membership. At a meeting in February 1848, the committee defined two tiers of membership, creating the category of privileged members for all those who had paid their subscriptions and ‘were not married out or living openly in a state of concubinage’. Privileged membership entitled voting rights and the prerogative to nominate as office holders. Those not eligible to become privileged members could obtain a seat on payment of six months membership in advance and seats were allocated in a preferential order based on membership status (Figure 3.1).

Figure 3.1. Seating Plan Melbourne Hebrew Congregation
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Melbourne had a sizable British and West Indian Sephardi community. For twenty years from the mid 1850s, this community operated its own services according to their Minhag, in the school room of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation (Figure 3.2).401 Whereas the other synagogues in Melbourne were under the auspices of the Chief Rabbi, the Sephardi community’s loyalty was to Bevis Marks, the Sephardi synagogue of London. This community represented many of Melbourne’s earliest settlers and some of its very high profile members were actively involved in communal and wider social and political circles. But by the 1870s the Sephardi community were struggling to ensure a minyan, eventually merging with the main body of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. Interest in Sephardi liturgy was not confined to Melbourne, with the establishment of a synagogue in Ballarat, Charles Dyte (1819-1893) unsuccessfully attempted to introduce ‘Sephardi verses’ into the services in this regional congregation.402

![Figure 3.2. Advertisement for Sephardi Services](image)

Even with the small pre gold-rush population, agitation was expressed by those settlers in Geelong for their own synagogue. In September 1849, following a request from Geelong for assistance with the burial of a child, the synagogue committee passed a motion that ‘under present circumstances the committee were unanimous in their opinion of not sanctioning any thing in connection with a separate congregation at Geelong.’ The same resolution imposed a hefty financial burden on Mr Levy, the father of the late child, as a

---


penalty for not being a financial member of the Melbourne congregation; charging him £10 for burial, with the expectation that other Geelong residents would act as guarantor.\footnote{Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, "Minutes of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation," 16 September 1849.}

In 1857 following a number of disputes with the synagogue committee, its first minister, the Reverend Moses Rintel (1823-1880) resigned and established Melbourne’s second synagogue, the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. Described in his obituary as ‘the great leveller’ and ‘the pioneer of Judaism in this colony’, the obituary continued ‘not a movement in the history of Victorian Judaism from its foundation to the present day, but breathes of the wise and careful forethought of Reverend Moses Rintel in its triumphant achievement.’\footnote{\textit{Jewish Herald}, 21 May 1880, 6-7.} Rintel was Melbourne’s longest-serving nineteenth-century Rabbi, member of the \textit{Beth Din}, and deeply involved in a number of Jewish and wider charitable organisations. His concern for ensuring the maintenance of Judaism led to his establishment of a Jewish school in Melbourne. He was engaged with Jewish welfare and politics both at home and internationally, as a long standing committee member of the Jewish Philanthropic Society, and as one of the prime movers for the establishment of the Jewish Almshouse. His values of social welfare were wider than his immediate community and he was also involved in a number of Jewish and secular friendly societies including presidency of the United Friends’ Jewish Benefit Society, founder of the Order of Oddfellows, and a member of the committee of management for the Benevolent Asylum.\footnote{\textit{Jewish Herald}, 21 May 1880, 6-7; Thad. W.H. Leavitt, \textit{Australian Representative Men} (Melbourne: Wells and Leavitt, 1887), 176.}

Judaism for the general community held interest, and articles appeared regularly explaining issues of belief and ritual. The confidence of the community’s position within Melbourne society is exhibited in their use of the press for promotion of communal activities. More significantly, they were not averse to conducting internal political and religious battles in public. Following the establishment of the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, Edward Cohen (1824-1877), president of the Melbourne Congregation, published a letter in the \textit{Argus} notifying Melburnians that ‘only a small proportion’ of the community had joined the second synagogue and that ‘the principal members of the Jewish community—nearly the whole of the British Jews in Victoria—held their meetings in the
synagogue in Bourke-Street. Similarly, in 1869 papers around the country reported the ire of the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, when the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation claimed at a meeting with the Colonial Secretary that they were the recognised body for Jews in Melbourne. This followed similar indignation when Moses Rintel claimed seniority over his colleague in Bourke Street, a debate which reached such a level that it was referred to the Chief Rabbi for arbitration.

Acculturated Anglo-Jewry assumed that the wider society would accept the Jews as a religious community of faith, allowing for a ‘pride in being English and a pride in Jewishness’. Similar values were expressed in Germany, where emancipation had created urban and integrated communities engaged in business with the broader community. Moritz Michaelis spent some years in England before immigrating to Victoria and his attitudes and experiences of Judaism were moulded by the many encounters in his life. Michaelis, born in Lüdge near Pyrmont, came from an orthodox family, his father described as ‘a learned and enthusiastic Talmudic Scholar’ ‘most respected in the neighbourhood by Jews and Gentiles alike’. Educated in his hometown, he received training in Hebrew and Talmudic studies before being sent at the age of fifteen to study medicine at a gymnasium. He completed nearly two years of study, but financial difficulties following his father’s prolonged illness caused him to be removed from school and apprenticed to a wholesale and retail trading company. This position required Michaelis to travel, and he described the difficulties of keeping to the laws of kashrut in such circumstances:

During my two visits to Leipsig, I had taken my meals at a Jewish restaurant where everything was exceedingly nice and clean. I there met an old gentleman from Bonn … On my asking him the reason for his absence from our restaurant he cried in great excitement. ‘Have you been in there? That
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scoundrel! That scoundrel! I saw him buy the dressed geese and other poultry at the market.’

…The Snow had been falling for some time and it continued during our journey to Halle, When we arrived there all the passengers felt the cold and rushed into the dining room. I went in also but did not sit down at table. Some of them, co-religionists, whose acquaintance I had made, chaffed me for not doing so. Being only nineteen years of age and very sensitive to ridicule, I thereupon seated myself and ordered a plate of soup. Scarcely had I swallowed a spoonful when I felt very sick and had to go out into the fresh air. This was the first time in my life I had to my knowledge eaten other that (sic) Jewish cooking, but according to the gentleman’s statement I had already broken the law concerning food through unwittingly.

From Halle to Cassel was a good two day’s journey by coach…My religious scruples were such that rather than take another essay to eat non-Jewish cookery I lived on bread and butter and eggs, arriving at Cassel bitterly cold and literally famished.411

Michaelis relocated to Manchester to work with his brother for Samson and Leppoc, a firm of German commission agents. Arriving on the Day of Atonement, September 23 1843, he endeavoured to attend synagogue, but as a non-member, was refused admission, an action which so incensed him that he did not enter a synagogue for the ten years he spent in England. By the mid-nineteenth century, the Unitarian chapel was proving a draw card to the German Jewish community. Unlike in London, where the establishment were members of the Church of England, the industrial centres were the province of industrial-mercantile elite of Nonconformists. Unitarianism ‘was theologically relaxed, spiritually undemanding and politely rationalistic. Its ministers were frequently men of wide secular learning, intellectually sophisticated and tolerant of diverse opinions.’ Its denial of the trinity removed for Jews the most baffling aspect of Christianity.412 Men like Michaelis were drawn to experiment with the ideas of Unitarianism, to which he was introduced through a colleague. Never becoming a

411 Ibid., 21-22.
Unitarian himself, he was impressed by the preaching and rationality of the religion. Finding Unitarianism ‘less acceptable to reason’, he temporarily lost religious faith altogether, but maintained a study of Judaic works, including the Torah, Mendelsohn, Maimonides and Rashi in Hebrew, English and German:

thus I became a Jew by conviction as well as birth though I still continued to visit the Unitarian Chapel at Strangeway, the minister being a very clever preacher. Do not misunderstand me, I did not again become strictly orthodox, and though I was then and have even continued, a true believer in God and our teacher Moses, I have not observed many of the ceremonial laws considering them non essential, whilst I yet feel convinced that with few exceptions they are beneficial alike to mind and body. Under these circumstances I could without hesitation answer your grandfather in the affirmative when he asked me before my marriage if I were a true Jew.\footnote{Michaelis, \textit{Chapters from the Story of My Life}, 64-65.}

Although claiming that he was never again ‘strictly orthodox’, Michaelis subsequently became actively involved in Melbourne’s three synagogues, being respectively the treasurer for the Melbourne and East Melbourne Hebrew Congregations, a founder of the St Kilda Hebrew Congregation and committee member for the Melbourne Hebrew School, as well as a member of the Sabbath Observance and Jewish Aid Society Committees and a founder of the newspaper the \textit{Australian Israelite}.\footnote{J. Ann Hone, "Moritz Michaelis (1820-1902)," in \textit{Australian Dictionary of Biography}, ed. National Centre for Biography (Australian National University, 1974).}

The correspondents’ reports to the \textit{Jewish Chronicle} chart the communities’ disquiet at synagogue attendance and religious engagement. Concern for the maintenance of Judaism was not a conservative opinion, rather one that was expressed in reforming tones. From the 1880s a number of letters were written to the Australian Jewish press expressing unease over issues of decorum and non-attendance in synagogue. These associated current liturgical practices to outmoded rituals requiring modernisation if they were to be of relevance to the community.\footnote{\textit{Jewish Herald}, 12 March 1880, 3; 11 February 1881, 4 & 20 May 1881, 5.} Although Reform Judaism had been established in various forms in England, Germany and America, the majority of the Melbourne community remained staunchly loyal to the Chief Rabbi and Anglo-Orthodoxy. The first attempts to introduce Reform Judaism
to Melbourne were initiated in the 1880s, led by Abraham Michael Samuell (1829-1907) and Rabbi Dattner Jacobson. Samuell had been inspired by Reform Judaism after experiencing this confessional practice while in America. In 1882 he attempted to establish a Synagogue, with a ‘philosophy of modern Judaism’. A believer in observance to the Torah, his modifications were aimed not at dismissing the core elements of religion, but at re-evaluating blind adherence to the letter of the law. His proposal included holding services on Sunday, which initially appealed to a number of Melbourne’s Jewish shopkeepers and tradesmen who found it necessary to work on the Sabbath. Recognising a lack of Hebrew proficiently in the community, he proposed services predominantly in English, and in an attempt to appear modern, providing for mixed seating and a mixed choir, as well as affording full membership to men with non-Jewish wives. The holding of Sunday services was unthinkable to most in the community, and after the preliminary meeting the idea did not progress.416 He attempted again three years later, this time with the support of Dattner Jacobson, previously the Rabbi at the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, but who had proved too controversial for the committee and had been removed from his post. Together they briefly formed the Temple of Israel conducting a service at a Collins Street Church, at which Jacobson gave a sermon and a non-Jewish lady played the organ, but this again did not succeed and no further services were held.417

St Kilda Synagogue saw the next push for radical change. The architect Nahum Barnet, a prolific correspondent to the Australian papers, was a constant commentator on religious issues. While adamant in his belief in the importance of the connection with the Chief Rabbi, he was also critical of communal apathy and expressed a desire to adapt services to add meaning for his contemporaries, writing:

The younger members of our faith, the intellectual and the educated, are fast drifting into religious nihilism, and the institutions which generally bind and strengthen a community are drooping into decay…whose duty is it to revive the all but moribund religious zeal of the people?...I look, then, to our clergy.


It is their duty, nay- it is an obligation they owe the Divine Master whom they serve to rescue us from this mortal death.\textsuperscript{418}

Continuing the theme twenty years later, commenting on the Anglican Church’s attempts to adapt the \textit{Book of Common Prayer}, he wrote that ‘The pruning knife is sadly needed in the ritual of the Synagogue.’\textsuperscript{419}

Perhaps the most persistent agitator for change was Prussian-born, but English-educated Isaac Jacobs (1834-1914). Jacobs, a founder of the St Kilda Synagogue was a vocal campaigner, also spurred on by what he considered religious apathy engendered through outmoded forms of worship. Jacobs published two pamphlets on the issue. In \textit{Conservative Reform in Jewish Observance} he noted:

\begin{quote}
We may reasonably assume that no revision of the liturgy, or modernisation in the mode of rendering Divine Service, is likely to be effected here until some reformer of outstanding ability comes along, and arouses the majority of our people to bring about by communal action such changes in our synagogue services as would be calculated to attract more of our men and women, especially those of the better educated class, and get them to listen to, and take part in a service better calculated to bear good fruit than the present time in some of the orthodox Synagogues; and something that will reflect more of the spirit of the present enlightened age, and less of that of the horay past.\textsuperscript{420}
\end{quote}

This pamphlet is noteworthy for the depth of research Jacobs undertook, quoting and then critiquing a number of contemporary sources from Britain, America and Germany. In this battle he was pitched against a conservative opponent, another stalwart of the St Kilda congregation, Phillip Blashki, who would not countenance any changes to liturgical practices.\textsuperscript{421} The vision of Jacobs and Samuells was not fulfilled until 1930. Following a trip to England by Castlemaine-born Ada Phillips (nee Crawcour), (1863-1967) formal
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connections were established with one of the influential founders of British Liberal Judaism, Lily Montague, and a viable Reform Congregation was established.

Although commentators decried apathy, maintenance of Judaism was an important sign of merit for many in the community and individuals observance was worthy of comment in obituaries. Henriette Jacobs (nee Leishershonn) (1811-1899) (Figure 3.3), incidentally mother of Isaac Jacobs, is described in the Hebrew Standard as a woman who ‘strictly adhered to the orthodox practices of her faith and was a regular attendant at the services of the St Kilda Hebrew Congregation. As a mark of respect the synagogue doors were opened whilst the funeral cortège passed’.\textsuperscript{422} Similarly in the obituary for Rachel Michaelis (nee Gotthelp) (1829-1901), she is described as ‘a devout Jewess withal…carefully supervising the religious and moral education of her children’.\textsuperscript{423}

\textsuperscript{422} Hebrew Standard, November 17 1899, 5.

\textsuperscript{423} Jewish Herald, 15 February 1901, 6.
Without existing communal structures or the formal establishment of Jewish education and training, the community was required to take responsibility for important elements of ritual and practice. The first sanctioned *Mohel* in Melbourne, Isaac Lazarus Lincoln, undertook the role for the fledgling community, acquiring training from a non-Jewish doctor. Lincoln, born Isaac Lazarus, son of Polish-born Jonas Lazarus and his wife Rosa Nathan, took the name Lincoln from the city of his birth in Lincolnshire. First settling in NSW in 1834, Lincoln was an early investor in Victoria, purchasing land in Seymour in 1845. Economic prosperity seems to have eluded him, either from the economic conditions of Victoria in the 1840s or from his lack of business acumen. Initially establishing himself as a draper in Collins Street, he then tried his hand as an auctioneer and commission agent, prior to relocating to Seymour, where in 1846 he established the Lincolnshire Stores. Lincoln’s fortunes declined further, being declared insolvent in 1849, accused of bad book keeping and gambling. The family sailed for California, only to be drowned on the return voyage a year later. Lincoln was intimately involved with the establishment of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. Described as ‘zealous and pious’, he could not be formally accredited as *mohel*, as any authorisation would have required a personal examination by the Chief Rabbi. In lieu of this, the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation issued a certificate stating that ‘he had acted as *Mohel* for seven years to the entire satisfaction of the community.’ Interestingly, Lincoln appears pragmatic in his willingness on occasion to circumcise the children of non-Jewish mothers in variance with *Halachic* law. In other areas he proved to be a traditionalist. Where the Chief Rabbi Solomon Herschel, condoned modern medical practises, sanctioning the use of chloroform to anaesthetise an infant prior to circumcision, Lincoln would not.

425 *Argus* 6 February 1846, 3 & 2 August 1849, 2. Lincoln’s son Jonas being the sole survivor.
Lincoln was prepared to circumcise two sons of Nathaniel Nathan (1799-), although their mother was not Jewish. Nathan, convicted in 1830 for stealing clothing, was granted a Ticket of Leave in New South Wales in 1838, although this was revoked after he was found to have committed ‘highly disorderly and immoral conduct’ with Harriet Smith (who became pregnant), an assigned servant to Abraham Elias. After being released from goal, he was sent to Melbourne where he married Louisa Darcy, although as will be discussed below, this was likely to have been a bigamous marriage. Lincoln circumcised Nathan’s first son Samuel on the 3 August 1843, as the child was considered a ‘special case’. In 1848, Nathan wrote to the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation requesting a conversion for his family. The same letter also contained an application for the circumcision of a second son. The committee took a somewhat noncommittal approach, replying that ‘as the officers of the congregation had no control over Mr Lincoln the mohel they could not interfere in the matter’, but this view was revised by the time of the birth of his third son Chaim, and on this occasion permission was refused.

In 1850, the committee was still debating whether the children of non-Jewish mothers could be circumcised, and requesting clarification from their newly appointed Rabbi, Moses Rintel. His response was that ‘a child of a Jewish mother and Christian father can be circumcised, but there was nothing that would stop a Christian mother’s child being circumcised. Nothing in the laws to stop this’, stressing that there was no religious objection, but that he would only undertake the procedure if it was sanctioned by the committee. Two months later the committee had again hardened its stance, passing a resolution preventing Rintel from circumcising or burying anyone without their express permission.

Personal Expression

Communal identity requires the interlinked activities of personal and public participation. Without individuals exhibiting cultural connections to the decisions they make, no
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communal activity can take place. The remote setting of the Australian colonies and the realities of a new settler society created challenges for the practicalities of observance and religious maintenance.

Conversion

In modern societies, maintaining Jewish identity and communal behavioural norms are a challenge. For Jews, cultural survival and communal solidarity are grounded in the family unit and supported through communal organisations. Endogamy is important and reinforced by the orthodox Jewish law that children follow the religion of their mother. Maintaining this tradition and the hereditary line of Judaism was not only a major anxiety for the community of colonial Victoria, but a pattern repeated in the early settler society of America and as phenomena in the urbanising centres of Central and Western Europe. In Victoria, the makeup of society was a major contributing factor. The demographics of nineteenth-century Victoria resulted in a far greater proportion of men than women, inevitably resulting in significant rates of out-marriage by Jewish men, and thus the loss of their children from Judaism. Prior to the discovery of gold, the population of Victoria was very small and the Jewish population was minute, estimated to be sixty-seven men and fourteen women and a similar disproportion of men to women persisted. Although the gold rush greatly increased the number of Jews in Victoria, it did not solve this imbalance, so that by 1857 the total Jewish population had risen to 2,181 of which only 665 were women. Four years later, the proportion had improved, and the total Jewish population had risen to 2,903, the majority of this increase being female, bringing the number of Jewish women in the Colony to 1,046, but still only half the number of men. This increase did not alleviate the problem for Jewish men unable to find Jewish brides, continuing the inevitable response of men finding non-Jewish partners.

The Jewish community of England considered that under the agreement allowing their readmission, a prohibition existed on conversion. Amsterdam, with its more tolerant
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tradition and high numbers of *conversos*, had been a convenient and pragmatic destination for British conversions. Although Australian Jewry was under the auspices of the Chief Rabbi, due to the differing settlement patterns and diverging congregational structures, the issue of conversion was not handled uniformly. The New South Wales Court Act of 1787 ensured that ‘British law landed with the First Fleet’, and this was reiterated in 1828 with Imperial Act, 9 Geo IV c83, ensuring that all statutes and laws in force in England would apply to New South Wales and Van Diemen’s Land. These included the 1698 Blasphemy Act, which prohibited the conversion to Judaism of English Christians.437 The practicalities of establishing a Jewish community in an environment with a gender imbalance required some expediency. In Hobart the community took a pragmatic approach, creating a *Bet Din* of lay members and converting women when required. With the appointment of religious functionaries, the system was regularised. Melbourne had a more conservative approach, and in 1844 in the absence of a formally appointed *Bet Din*, the *Laws of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation* stated that ‘no application of conversation to the Jewish faith be received by this congregation or entertained in any shape’.438 In July 1845 Asher Hyman Hart put forward a proposition to the congregation that:

> All persons of the Jewish Faith wishing to have their wives and females that they may be cohabiting with up to this day 27 July 1845 be made ‘Geurists’, shall make application to the Honorary Secretary in writing within one month from this date and that the President shall write in the name of the Congregation to the ‘High Priest’ [sic] of London.439

The issue was further raised by Hart in a letter dated 27 June 1848 to the Chief Rabbi and which included a substantial list of procedural and *halachah* inquiries, the final of which was:

> the desire to know whether, under favourable circumstances, you would authorise the making of female proselytes, there being one or two cases that have very frequently been brought under our notice, but which we have

---
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invariably refused to entertain, not thinking it a matter for laymen (most of whom are young and inexperienced in such affairs) to legislate upon. This led to a situation where Jewish men chose not to marry, rather living unmarried with the mothers of their children, a situation which did nothing to resolve the religious identity of these offspring. In November 1851, the then President of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, Michael Cashmore, wrote again to the Chief Rabbi on this topic:

I must crave your particular indulgence for a little while, as the subject assumes a new feature by your reply than it ever has and is a matter itself most important to our community, because there are several members of our faith who have unfortunately been in the Colony for some years past; they arrived at a time when no Jewish females were to be found, and in consequence have become united with Christian women; they, however, do not wish to sever from the faith of their fathers, but on the contrary, are ready to support the same and are more desirous of initiating their children in the true faith of Israel.

The politics of *Ginr* delayed the introduction of a formal *Bet Din*, pending Victoria having sufficiently erudite clergymen able to pass judgement. In 1864 this was regularised somewhat by the appointment of Melbourne’s first *Beth Din*. Although the Chief Rabbi was supportive of conversion in specific circumstances, this issue remained contentious. Discussions within the press indicate that the East Melbourne Congregation acted independently, undertaking some conversions. Levi considers that conversion was considered to undermine the integrity of the community and was therefore not practised, but the records for the later-nineteenth century reveal that some conversions were taking place in Melbourne. The marriage records across all three synagogues show that at least twenty nine marriages (4.1 percent) were formalised in synagogue of relationships previously contracted under civil law, and at least three by couples who had already produced families out of wedlock. Using names as an indicator of cultural or religious background, twelve of
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the brides would appear not to have been born to Jewish parents, so it would seem that after some negotiations a conversion had taken place. Such was the example of the Hawker Samuel Marks (1832-), who in 1874 remarried Louisa Jane Cheetham (1842-1875), seventeen years after their first wedding. Another case was Samuel Levy, who first married Phoebe Richardson in Castlemaine in 1863, before remarrying her at the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation in 1878. The parents of Sarah Barnett (1836-)—John Barnett (1804-1887) and Sarah Francis—were married in Sydney in 1833. John was a dealer in second hand clothes, sentenced in 1827 to fourteen years transportation for the theft of two sovereigns from a drunken man in Whitechapel. Granted a Ticket of Leave in 1833, he married Sarah Frances in Australia’s second Jewish marriage. Sarah was the daughter of a Jewish man and a non-Jewish mother and was officially converted to Judaism on 18 January 1833. Barnett remained involved in Jewish affairs and his name appears on a petition in May 1833, requesting establishment of a Synagogue in Launceston.444

Other notable anomalies in the records raise questions other than conversion. Why did the marriage occur of Elias Barnett (1862-1942) and Elizabeth Nyman (1861-), who remarried at the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation on 29 November 1885, six months after being married by the Reverend Twiner in Fitzroy? Other couples appear to be married in a Synagogue some time after civil ceremonies. Couples living in mining towns or other areas without access to a synagogue would also sometimes marry civilly prior to the formalisation of their relationship in a metropolitan synagogue, although that would not explain why Melbourne residents Katie Raphael (1865-) and Leopold Lobascher (1865-) married in Carlton six weeks prior to their wedding at the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation in 1887.445

In 1880, the Jewish Herald reported the case of a circumcision of a twenty-six year old ‘Jewish gentleman from Western Australia…initiated into the Abrahamic Covenant in Melbourne’.446 This case also raised the question whether he had been born in a location where a mohel was unavailable, or whether he was perhaps halachically not Jewish, but had been through some conversion process. Without the name of the man involved, the answer to this cannot be determined.
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The difficulty of conversion in Victoria also led some who could afford it to seek assistance directly from London. Pfeffer has identified four cases in the London records. At least two of these cases were of Melbourne families, and indicate the importance of the correct and recognised conversion procedures. Nathaniel Nathan noted above, a married man with a daughter at the time of his transportation, did not obtain a Get from his first wife Edal, but left her for twenty-three years as an Agunah. Nathan was a founding member of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, although living with a non-Jewish common law wife. In 1845 he was one of the five members of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation who requested an ultimately unsuccessful meeting ‘to consider the priority of making converts’. Although two of his sons were circumcised by Lazarus Lincoln as ‘special cases,’ his request for conversion was refused contained within the same resolution which passed the ambiguous ruling on the circumcision of his second son.\footnote{Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, "Minutes of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation," 10 January 1848.} To remedy this position, Nathaniel and his family sailed to London and, although technically an adulterer, he was accepted by the Bet Din, where on 18 April 1853, he divorced his first wife. On 30 January 1854, Louisa Darcy and the five children were converted; she and Nathaniel were married a week later, with Nathaniel signing the marriage register as a ‘widow’.\footnote{Pfeffer, 'From One End of the Earth to the Other: The London Bet Din, 1805-1855, and the Jewish Convicts Transported to Australia, 318.}

Furore over conversion led to a sensational court case and the removal of the Reverend Dr Dattner Jacobson as minister to the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. In 1878 he preached a lecture advocating conversion in some circumstances. This led to a week of very public outcry and debate with daily letters to the Argus supporting or decrying his ideas. ‘I would like to ask those who are so anxious for the conversion of Christians to Judaism whether there is a single instance on record in which Judaism has been embraced from an honest conviction in the teaching of that faith.’ In the same edition Edward Asher wrote that ‘With all due respects to the Christian community at large, I should say that if a Christian becomes converted to the Jewish religion, and that having been educated in the Christian religion will not, and cannot ever have Jewish feelings with regard to the Jewish religion.’ The Reverend Blaubaum of the St Kilda Hebrew Congregation entered the public debate, arguing ‘Can a Gentile women who married a Jew, even if she be converted, be expected to acquire
in a short time all that religious knowledge which it takes a child seven of eight years to master? In defence of Jacobson’s position, ‘A Jew’ replied: ‘now it is another matter, and we young Jews are not treated as Jew, but as citizens. Our birth is ignored or remembered as a thing of credit…To marry thus is not to ignore Jewish life, but to extend its sphere, not to destroy our national traits, but to enrich them.’

Three years later, Jacobson, who had been in difficulties with his board, became embroiled in a legal dispute over his conversion of the son-in-law of a friend of Julius Mathews (1828-1900). It transpired that Jacobson converted the man for a fee, without the approval of the Bet Din. Mathews circulated a letter of condemnation on Dr Jacobson, who countered that the letter defamed him for ‘fraud and deceit’ and ‘that he had been guilty of conduct unfitting him to be the minister of the congregation.’ Jacobson then sued for libel in the Supreme Court, again igniting a very public argument, the salacious details reported daily, and in the process losing the support of the principal members of the congregation. He was awarded £300 of the £5,000 he had claimed, finally resigning and leaving the colony.

Wills

Ensuring offspring remained Jewish was a preoccupation of many families, even under the difficult demographics of the era. The examination of wills shows that many parents were willing to disinherit their children if they married outside their faith. London-born Elias Ellis (1796-1866) arrived in Melbourne from Sydney in November 1846, following a fire which destroyed his premises causing an estimated £2,000 damage and leaving him insolvent. Melbourne proved a more lucrative location, and on his death on 21 February 1866, his estate included seven properties in Carlton, contiguously situated on the corner of Cardigan Street and Queensberry Streets. Appointing Moses Rintel and his son Angel Ellis (1831-1916) as executors, he bequeathed property in trust for his wife’s lifetime. Following her death, all but one of his surviving children were to receive a portion of this property. The exception was his son, Maurice (1830-1887), who had married a Catholic and was raising his
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children in that faith. Ellis’s will stipulated that if his unmarried sons ‘marry persons not being Jewesses and professing the Hebrew faith’ then they were to forfeit their inheritance. He, like the majority of Jewish parents, left his property in equal shares to his sons and daughters. In this instance, as with many other Melbourne Jewish wills, Elias Ellis also protected the interest of his daughters, specifying individually for each daughter that their share of this property was to be ‘free from the debts and liabilities and control of any persons who may become her husband’. Twenty years later the will of Szymanski Leon (1811-1882), dated 11 December 1882, is even more prescriptive, defining his children’s obligations concerning their inheritance and the maintenance of their Jewish faith. In his will he leaves annuities to his sister, half siblings, niece and nephews, as well as property to his children. Willing his two daughters and son property in equal shares, he stipulates:

as long as they respectively shall profess and faithfully observe all the ordinances of the religion of the Jews and shall not intermarry with any person not of Jewish birth and religion…I declare that my mind and will to be that any child of mine renouncing the Jewish faith and ceasing to profess and observe the ordinances of the Jewish religion or marrying anyone not of the Jewish people and persuasion and professing the Jewish religion and observing the ordinances shall cease to be entitled to any interest in my estate and shall take no share thereof under this my Will … and the share of any child of mine so becoming disinherited shall be disposed of in like manner as if such a child had died leaving no issue.453

Personal Names

As Jews in the western world achieved levels of acceptance and emancipation, they self-consciously transformed some of the outward symbols of Judaism, including adapting the names of their children and creating names for their religious and cultural institutions which reflected their new political circumstances.454 Jews have been relatively fluid with their surnames which often reveal the political, social and economic history of their acquisition. Traditionally Jews used a patriarchal form, linking individuals to their fathers through the
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term Ben (son of) or Bat/Bas (daughter of), a practice which placed the emphasis on the individual within the family. The development of larger urban centres required more specific forms of individual identity and by the tenth and eleventh centuries it was common for Jews living in larger urban environments to have acquired family names, but the practice waxed and waned with fluctuating economic circumstance. Following the imposition of the Napoleonic Code, European Jewry acquired surnames. As they were required or enforced, names were selected based on a variety of place names, occupations or through acronyms. In order to protect individuals from legal restrictions such as limitations on marriage, or in an attempt to avoid compulsory army conscription, Jewish families sometimes consciously gave children different family names or their mother’s surname. The family of Alfred (1855-1932) and Ernest Kornblum (1860-1942) born in Tost, Silesia, described the origins of their family name from the Napoleonic edict of 1806, when their grandfather Abraham (c.1780-1854) was walking in a field near his home in Gleiwitz, Silesia with several of his brothers discussing the name they would take. As no agreement could be reached each took a different name. One, indicating a tree, decided to call himself after that and became Baum, while a second brother called Solomon, determined this as a surname, while Abraham, who was admiring the blue flowers in the field, resolved on Kornblum.

Although many studies have considered the acculturation of immigrant communities through the transformation of names, Jews arriving in England appear to have generally taken a limited range of surnames, most of which clearly define them as Jewish. Many of those arriving in England before the mid-nineteenth century may not have had surnames or they changed them on arrival to more obviously Anglo-Jewish names, favouring English versions of Biblical names, both for their personal and family names. Thus the Rypinskis
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arriving in Manchester in the 1840s immediately became Jacobs, while at the same time in Sheffield, Michael son of Levi became Levinson. This biblo-centric focus led to names such as Abraham, Aaron, Isaac, Jacob and Solomon as favoured alternatives for both family and male personal names. Other Jewish names reflect the tribal ancestry of the bearer such as Cohen, (Khan, Cohn, Katz) or Levi (Levien, Levitt, Levy). German Jews devised Germanic versions of these names such as that of the Melbourne merchant Joseph Katzenstein (1825-1901). First names can be diminutives of biblical names, so that Eliezer could be Lesser, Leser or Lesyser; Isaac, Itig; Jacob, Kopel, Kofman, Kopleman and Solomon, Salaman, Salmon or Zalman. Jews had historically sometimes taken names from their place of origin. As they moved around Europe these names were either retained indicating a place of origin, or changed to reflect the new location. A number of families in Melbourne retain place names including Horowitz, Englander and Hollander.

The Sephardi community historically had family names adopted from their Arab or Christian neighbours and these were generally retained, a sign of the importance of Sephardi identity. The origins of these names can reveal their history of hidden Judaism, reflecting names which were common Spanish first names or surnames. Names such as Mendez and Henriques were borrowed from their Christian neighbours, while Lopez originates as a common Spanish first name. Amongst those migrating to Melbourne were many Londoners with distinctly Sephardi surnames, such as Fonseca, Mendoza, Mendes, Mocatta, and Montefiore. These were joined by a number of Jamaican Sephardi families such as the Belinfante, de Leon, de Pinto, Henriques, Lopez, Lindo, and Mosquita families. Identifying other Sephardi residents of Melbourne without obviously Spanish derived names requires additional information, so that the Sephardi origins of Edward Cohen and Jamaican born Hyman Joseph (1831-1875) are concealed.

Analysis of the personal names of Jews in Melbourne shows a combination of fashionable and biblical names. For men, the top four names were Joseph (9%), Henry (7%),
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Louis/Lewis (5.8%), Abraham (5.4%) and Samuel (4.3%). These were followed by Isaac (4%), Solomon, (3.4%), Morris/ Maurice (3.3%), and Jacob (2.5%). For women biblical names were slightly more pronounced after Elizabeth and its diminutives, Betsy, Lizzie, Eliza (7.2%), Sarah (6.7%), Rachel (5.8%), Rose/Rosetta (5.7%), followed by Rebecca (5.3%), Esther (5.1%) and Hannah/Anna (5.1%). Whether individuals arriving from Central or Eastern Europe anglicised their names on arrival in either Victoria or England is hard to determine. There are some names which were obviously not changed, so that there are seven women named Semelia, four Tamars, but only a single Zipporah, Reyna, Sidonie or Zillah. Six men retain Judah and Bernhardt, and only two Ephraims. As European Jewry emancipated, they borrowed names from their non-Jewish neighbours and some of these became so ubiquitous that they became synonymous with Jews and were rarely used by others; of those found in Melbourne we particularly find Hymen (17), Isidor (10), Moritz (4) and Sigismund/Siegfried (3). Some English-born individuals clearly have Hebrew or Yiddish names that they interchange with similar English ones: Julia/Gittle Cashmore (1780-1855), Alice/Alsey Hart (1826-1873) or Flora/Bloomer Symons, (1832-1894). Whether the Normans are really Nahum and the Mark/Markus are really Mordecai is hard to establish. Some names appear to have been corrupted entirely through the process of immigration. Saicob Silberberg’s (c.1815-1903) first name points to a form of miss-transliteration from Yaakov (Jacob). Saicob is differently spelt on a number of his documents, while his shipping record lists him as Jacques, a name with at least some phonetic linkage to Yaakov. Jews used both religious and secular names, sometimes using one for their community affairs and the other for their civic and business activities. Thus Henrietta Salomons (1783-1862), was the daughter of Yehiel Prager, known in business as Israel Levien Salomons.

The first names chosen for children reflect the class and ethnic identification of a parent. As the acculturation process changes over time, some names become more fashionable, so that by the 1870s we witness the appearance of contemporary secular names, such as Joan, May or Gladys for women, while men acquired names such as Clarence, Harold or Frank, although biblical names retain a parallel vogue. A few families showed great
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patriotism to their new land, providing first and second names with significant Australian connections; consequently we have the first Jewish child born in Victoria and grandson of Henrietta Salomons (Prager), Jonas Felix Australia Levien (1815-1877) or Eureka Isabel Sicree, (1873-1906), daughter of Moroccan-born Lazarus Sicree (c.1838-1888).

A few of the Jews had unexpected names: Noel Syron Lopez de Leon (c.1841-1931), son of Jamaican born Rebecca Lopez (1805-1881) and David de Leon (c.1803-1871) and Dutch-born Christina Van Eyl (1809-1879), while there remains a popularity in the Jewish community for Isobel/Isabella (thirty individuals) a name associated with the expulsion of Jews from Spain. The fluidity of names is also reflected by individuals who adapt their names for class reasons such as the interchangeability of Lewis and Louis. Until the outbreak of the First World War and the hostility to Germanic names, few Jews anglicised their names further, although during the course of the nineteenth century the Ottolangai family became Langley. The anti-German feeling of World War One led the Littens to transform their name to the less Germanic Raphael, while the British army insisted that the son of Alfred Kornblum lose his German surname, anglicised to Kaye.

Ashkenazi Jews traditionally name children after deceased relatives, while the Sephardi allow for the naming of a child after a relative who is still alive; thus naming patterns can reflect cultural backgrounds. In examining families in Melbourne, there are instances of fathers and sons sharing first names. This could be an indication of Sephardi origin, or a sign of acculturation forming fashionable family linkages. London-born photographer Alexander Fox (1830-) named a son born in Fitzroy in 1865, Alexander after himself. One can only assume that Fox is an Ashkenazi name, from the German Fuchs.⁴⁶⁵ London-born Abraham Benjamin Isaacs (1828-1902) was also named after his father, Benjamin, although this is a family with at least a Sephardi connection through his mother Rachel Rodrigues. Other families carry names through generations: draper Michael Cashmore, son of Joseph Cashmore (-1824) and Alice Nathan (1796-1873), produced nine children born in New South Wales and Victoria. Of these Joseph Michael (1843-1886), shares both this father and grandfather’s names, while his eldest daughter Alice, (1842-1932) is named after her still living grandmother.

Public Manifestation

In the nineteenth-century, associational activities were a vital component in the delineation of the middle class. The way the community chose to position itself within the wider community not only illustrated their attempts at communal maintenance but also the public positioning of themselves as equal members within mainstream society.

Kashrut

Without suitable structures, the initial tiny Melbourne Jewish community was unable to maintain the strict rules of *kashrut*. It was not until the appointment of Moses Rintel as Reader, *Shochet* and *Mohel* in January 1849, that *kosher* meat could be slaughtered. As with other aspects of Jewish ritual and practice, *kosher* food appears to have fascinated the wider Melbourne community, with many articles on the subject appearing in the press. In 1851 the *Argus* published a long opinion piece on the morality of the *kosher* killing of animals, favourably comparing their treatment to non-Jewish butchering. Local and regional papers also explained the practices of *kosher* killing with both the *South Bourke Standard* and the *Wallaroo Times and Mining Journal* of South Australia quoting the Hebrew and English Almanack (sic), published in London by Vallentine, while the *Colac Herald* particularly focused on the *kosher* killing and eating of birds. The issue of *kosher* meat in Melbourne reached the attention of the Chief Rabbi in London, who wrote to the Wardens of the Hebrew Congregation in 1853:

I hereby beg to inform you that several complaints have been made to me relative to the insufficient supply of lawful meat at Melbourne. I deeply regret that a Congregation which had given repeated proof of religious zeal by the costly enlargement of their synagogue and by other similar accomplishments should neglect a matter which is of such vital importance to the preservation of our faith. The difficulty of obtaining Kosher meat tempts many young men to eat forbidden foods; having once commenced it is very difficult for them to cease, and a habit is thus formed which not only endures throughout life but
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even descends to further generations. Such a growing evil must be crushed at
the root, and energetic measures should at once be taken to provide an ample
supply of kosher Meat’

The quantity of advertisements promoting kosher food and the commentary
surrounding kashrut, place the issue in the public eye. Local shops ran competitive
advertisements throughout the Melbourne and Ballarat papers, particularly prominent in the
lead up to Passover, where advertisements marketed a range of kosher cakes, matzos and
wines.

Figure 3.4. Advertisement, Argus, 9 February 1856, 7

From 1850 Isaac Pulver (1803-1873) had somewhat of a monopoly position on the
supply of kosher food, as member of the Beth Din overseeing Jewish religious laws, Shochet and
manufacturer of kosher products. Pulver’s multi-continent career had commenced as minister
to the Jewish community of Cheltenham, England, prior to sailing for Cape Town in 1849
where he was appointed the community’s first minister and Shochet and in these roles,
participating in the consecration of the new Synagogue. Apparently finding the ‘ideas of

470 Berger Solly, ”The Pre- History of the Great Synagogue, the Cape Town Hebrew Congregation, 1841 – 1905,”
the congregants difficult to comprehend’, he resigned from the post and arrived in Melbourne hoping to seek wider commercial opportunities. Pulver was appointed to the Beth Din, where he exercised considerable intellectual authority. His three year contact as Shochet brought with it an annual salary of £250, which was supplemented by an additional £100 from the purveying butchers Easton and Bennet of Stephen Street. Until the 1850s there was no matzos manufacturing in Victoria and all had to be to be imported from Sydney at great cost. By 1856 several members of the community vied for the honour of becoming Melbourne’s first matzos baker, with the privilege falling to the partnership of Isaac Pulver and S. Mendel. A large advertisement appeared in the Argus in February 1856, authorising Messers Pulver and Mendal for the manufacturer of Matzos and Passover cakes under the auspices of Rabbi Rintel and an especially appointed subcommittee of the Melbourne Synagogue. Interestingly this sizeable advertisement starts with large Hebrew characters spelling out the word Matzot (מazo), requiring the publishers of the Argus to have acquired Hebrew type, perhaps in expectation of more advertisements of this sort (Figure 3.4). Pulver’s Passover advertisement for 1861 describes his matzos and cakes as ‘clean, pure and kosher’ his monopoly however, was challenged directly by the Polish born ‘French’ pastry chef Saicob Silberberg, whose advertisement in the Argus explicitly states ‘No Monopoly...authorised by the officers of the Mickva Yisrael Melbourne Synagogue, will SUPPLY the finest KOSHER PASSOVER CAKES…120 Bourke St.’ The rift between the congregations seems to have been healed somewhat by 1874, where Leon Josephson (1855-), who had purchased Pulver’s business, advertised matzos under the authority of both Melbourne congregations. In the 1850s and 1860s several firms were advertising other Passover produce. These included Pirani of 9 Queen Street, who were offering kosher wines and cordials, the hotelier Barnett Isaacs (c.1820-1884), who advertised Passover accommodation complete with kosher rum at the Duke of Kent Hotel and later ran similar advertisements for the London Tavern again advertising kosher rum at Passover (Figure
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While in larger regional areas, shops such as those of Louis Vince (c.1827-1899) in Ballarat were placing sizable advertisements in their local paper advertising kosher groceries.\(^{477}\)

**Figure 3.5. Advertisements for kosher goods and services**

**Philanthropy**

The accumulation of wealth and education served both personal and communal interests; Jews were able to speak publically as Jews, to represent the community, and to refashion Jewish society through philanthropic actions. A scholar of this new emancipatory outlook has suggested that “The Jewish public sphere was a discursive network mediating between the twin realms of Jewish economic life-capitalist production and philanthropic distribution.”\(^{478}\) This maintenance of Jewish identity provided practical support, facilitated personal networks and provided intellectual outlets through participation in benevolent associations, and Jewish social and cultural organisations such as debating and literary societies.\(^{479}\) *Tsedakah* is a powerful feature of Jewish communal life and formal provision for charity was made almost as soon as a Jewish presence was established in Melbourne. In 1841 the Jewish community formed a Poor Society, although not all the community considered it necessary. Asher Hyman Hart argued that the community was so small that each knew the circumstances of the others and that ‘the natural tie of Jew and Jew was strong enough
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without requiring any formal pledge to assist another. The 1840s was a time of financial instability in Victoria as elsewhere and the communal records paint a somewhat harsh reality. In 1849 Lewis Davis (1806-1875) requested assistance in waiving the £4 charged for burial of his child, to which the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation replied that ‘they did not want to make a precedent.’ This unsympathetic attitude was soon replaced by a communal responsibility in the form of the Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society (Melbourne’s first ‘philanthropic’ organisation) whose first meeting at the Rainbow Tavern on 19 November 1849 defined its objective:

> to assist the poor and distressed in cases of sickness and medical aid and a weekly stipend to maintain themselves while unable to attend to their usual avocations, and secondly to afford temporary and to deserving objects who may require in such a form and at such times as shall be found expedient by the committee.

The Philanthropic Society was followed in 1857 by the Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society, initially to assist ladies in their confinement, but later the remit was extended to provide financial assistance to distressed ladies of the Jewish faith during their confinement, a responsibility which was extended two years later to ‘sick women and children of the Jewish faith, providing financial assistance and also providing funds to ensure a brit.’ Although many settled as a part of an extended family migration, others within this new society had no extended family network to call upon in times of need and both societies provided financial and medical assistance. On 5 September 1858 the Philanthropic Society received a request for assistance for six-year-old Rachel Nathan (1852-) orphaned daughter of Michael Nathan, who had been taken in by Mr Simmons of Stephen St. Simmons applied
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for assistance for her support and the committee resolved to investigate and establish if Rachel had any other family who could be responsible for her welfare.\footnote{Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society Minute Books SLV Box 4252/1 MS 15380, 5 September 1858.}

Both organisations received applications from individuals and families for support to relocate to another colony or to return to Britain. Two of the children of the pugilist Daniel Mendoza (1764-1836) had been separately transported to Tasmania for theft. At a meeting on 12 August 1854, a request was received from Isaac Mendoza (1809-) for help to travel to Launceston, where he said that his sister Sophia (1792-) was willing to take care of him. He was provided with £3. In a few instances, the application was to remove from Victoria either to another Australian colony or to another part of the English-speaking world. At the same meeting an appeal was received from a Mr Beck for a passage to Sydney or the United States. The committee possibly took an economic view and provided him with £4 for a fare to Sydney.\footnote{Ibid., 12 August 1854.} The most distressing appears to be that of Dr Dattner Jacobson. The Philanthropic Society and Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society raised funds to assist the family of Dr Jacobson to leave for America. Initially they were provided with £5, but the president of the Benevolent Society noted during a visit the ‘starving condition of the family’ and she had left a discretionary sum of £2 for the purpose of providing food.\footnote{Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society Minute Books, AJHS MS 9352A, 21 December 1885.} Eventually Jacobson sailed to America to take up a post in New Orleans, while his wife stayed in Melbourne where she again sought financial assistance from the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, eventually receiving a Get (although no civil divorce appears to have been sought). Their daughter opened a kindergarten in the Oddfellows Hall, catering for both Jewish and non-Jewish children, before attempting to establish the first Jewish boarding school in Australia one ‘intended to meet a long felt want.’ It does not appear that this was achieved and she too eventually emigrated to America.\footnote{Argus, 22 Dec 1887, 4; Jewish Herald, 6 July 1880, 4.}

Those immigrating could also come without resources. At a meeting of the Philanthropic Society on 14 September 1857, relief was granted to two immigrants who had just arrived on the White Star, £6 to fourteen year-old Solomon Cohen (listed on the shipping
manifest as Samuel aged 11) and £3 to Isaac Greenfield (1837-), a passenger on the same ship.\footnote{PROV: Victoria, Australia, Assisted and Unassisted Passenger Lists, 1839–1923 and Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society Minute Books SLV Box 4252/1 MS 15380, 14 September 1853.}

With a growing Jewish population, in 1862 the Philanthropic Society applied for a grant of land on which to build an Almshouse. Reporting the laying of the foundation stone in 1870, the \textit{Illustrated Australian News for Home Readers} commented:

The Jews are everywhere remarkable for their kind consideration and treatment of the poor brethren amongst them, and the proposed erection by the Jewish community in Melbourne of almshouses for their aged and decayed people is in accordance with the charity which is characteristic of the race.\footnote{Illustrated Australian News for Home Readers, 24 January 1870, 30.}

Designed by George Johnson (Figure 5.6), each almshouse contained a parlour, kitchen and bedroom, and included a veranda to assist with ventilation. Their location on St Kilda Road placed this institution amongst a number of other charitable organisations co-located and catering to Melbourne’s needy residents. In 1885 the almshouses were extended and renamed in commemoration and honour of the century of the birth of the philanthropist Sir Moses Montefiore.\footnote{Jewish Herald, 11 December 1885, 6.} The minutes, fundraising and high profile events such as subscription balls were widely advertised and reported in the Melbourne papers as integral elements of Melbourne’s social and charitable life.
Philanthropic interests were not confined to Jewish causes; Jews were actively involved in hospitals and benevolent charities throughout the colony, transferring interest as they moved from the goldfields to Melbourne. Particularly as the twentieth century dawned a number of locally-born Jewish women became associated with wider charitable roles. Jane Benjamin (1858-1909) as President of the House Committee of the Jewish Almshouses; Annie Cohen (1861-1939) was a committee member for both the Foundling Hospital for the Unmarried Mother and Her Child, Berry Street, and the Melbourne District Nursing Service as well as a number of Jewish charities. An advocate for free kindergarten education, Ray Ellis (1872-1942) used her professional capacity as an author to campaign for her chosen cause, publishing articles across the Victorian press. Interested in the wider medical interests of her female cousins, she was secretary to the Queen Victoria Hospital, while her society connections led her to be a long standing and founding member of the management committee of the Lyceum Club. These individuals were recognised for their charitable activities, energy and social connections, rather than for their religious affiliations, although the two could be bound together. Perhaps the most overt example is a memorial to Edward
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Cohen in the Royal Melbourne Hospital (Figure 5.7), complete with iconography presenting
the Priestly Blessing bestowed by Cohenim through the raising of the hands.

Figure 5.7. Memorial to Edward Cohen, Royal Melbourne Hospital
‘The narrow confines of nationality opened themselves to give way to the judging and
crowning of the world.’ So argued Dr Bernard Lilienfeld, in a speech aimed at raising funds
for the erection of a statue in Melbourne in honour of Shakespeare by the German
community. Jews formed part of a complex multicultural society of Germans, Italians,
African-Americans, Swiss and Chinese willing to chance the unpredictability of the Victorian
goldfields. Many German Jews retained a dual identity as Germans and Jews, expressed in
their participation in the German Association, founded in 1850. The Association’s initial aim
was to support German immigrants, particularly those seeking employment, but hindered by
their lack of English. It later lobbied on a range of political issues including proposed
changes to the Naturalisation Act and arguing for equal representation for equal taxation. At
the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War the Association became a political and
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consciousness raising organisation, arguing the German cause. The 1867 visit by the Duke of Edinburgh (himself the son of a German father) provided an opportunity for the community to show its loyalty to the British crown by staging a major procession, which included a German band assisted by the band of the 14th Regiment, and that of the Collingwood Rifles. The German Association’s committee included a number of high profile Victorian Germans including the artist Eugen von Guerard (1812-1901) and the botanist Ferdinand von Mueller (1825-1896). A number of its committee members were German Jews, including Dr Bernard Lilienfeld, Honorary Physician to the Melbourne Hospital, the Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital, Honorary Secretary to the Medical Society and Medical Officer for the Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society. Other active Jewish participants included Louis Monash (1831-1894), the father of Sir John Monash, secretary to the Association in the 1850s. Isaac Katzenstein was also active as a public face of the organisation during the few years he resided in Melbourne. Katzenstein appears to have been a highly cultured individual acknowledged ‘in literary and artistic circles’ amassing a significant art collection, which was sold at public auction on his emigration to Egypt in 1868. This collection was described with possibly some hyperbole as ‘the largest and most valuable private art collection in the Australias’ and included furniture, watercolours, drawings, engravings, sculpture and a large collection of framed and bound photographs. Reflecting Katzenstein’s world view, the collection was international in scope and utilised the new technology of photography, reproducing one hundred and twenty images of art work from international collections held in museums in Germany, London and Rome. His brother Joseph shared his interest in art, although Joseph’s collection was far more modest, it
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revealed his complex identity in an English colony, as amongst a number of English landscapes were four busts of members of the German royal family.\textsuperscript{501}

**Shop Hours**

For minority groups such as the Jews of Melbourne, maintaining religious practices in a diverse city required a negotiated interface with the wider community, raising questions irrelevant in small self-contained communities with a Jewish majority.\textsuperscript{502} Melbourne’s economy created issues requiring innovative responses in order to maintain traditional religious practices. Just as the maintenance of Jewish institutions required a new conceptualisation of space and identity, so too did engagement with civil society. In 1841 the opening hours of shops confronted Jewish values of social justice and challenged Jewish ritual practices for the proprietors and shop assistants alike. Twenty-five of the forty-seven drapery stores in Melbourne were operated by Jews, particularly clustered around the north side of Collins and Elizabeth Streets, and these shops operated until well into the night. In February 1841 the drapers attempted to restrict trading hours, by agreeing to close at 8pm, thereby improving the conditions of their employees and maintaining the Sabbath. Of the fourteen who signed the advertisement in the *Port Phillip Gazette* proclaiming these new hours, at least half were Jewish including the businesses of Michael Cashmore, Isaac Lazarus Lincoln, E. & I. Hart, D. & S. Benjamin, M. Lazarus, I. Simeon and Harris and Marks (Figure 3.8).\textsuperscript{503} While three years later, Moses Benjamin (1805-1885) advertised that he ‘did not conduct business between 6 p.m. on Friday and 6 p.m. on Saturday’.\textsuperscript{504} Their initial initiative was supported the following week, when a group of fifteen grocers also announced that they would close their premises at 8pm.\textsuperscript{505} These schemes did not go entirely smoothly. The same edition that hosted the grocers advertisement contained a letter signed ‘Studeo’, expressing concern that young men, usually employed in shops, but now with greater leisure time, would not have adequate diversions for their new hours of relaxation and could be led

\textsuperscript{501} Will of Joseph Katzenstein, PROV Index to Wills, Probate and Administration Records 1841-2009, VPRS 28 P01 1045.

\textsuperscript{502} McLeod, Secularisation in Western Europe, 1848-1914, 141.

\textsuperscript{503} *Port Phillip Gazette*, 20 February 1841, 2.

\textsuperscript{504} *Port Phillip Patriot and Melbourne Advertiser*, 29 January 1844, 3.

\textsuperscript{505} *Port Phillip Gazette*, 27 February 1841, 2.
into ill pursuits; further suggesting this provided an opportunity for education and self-improvement. Obviously not all who had committed to these trading hours fulfilled their promise, perhaps seeing a competitive advantage, as within a month the following letter was published in the paper:

Sir,—I presume to draw your attention to the circumstances of a certain Draper in this town Mr _, who having signed the declaration against keeping business open after 8 o’clock, is still in the habit of admitting customers after that hour clandestinely—such a breach of honor (sic) and common honesty towards fellow tradesmen should not be allowed to pass with impunity, and such conduct should be held up to the public reprehension by the exposure of the party to that odium which he justly merits.

I am your’s obediently

LANARIUS

Figure 3.8. Cheapside House
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The problems of religious observance and commerce continued. In 1864, the *Jewish Chronicle* reported that the Jewish shopkeepers in Melbourne were closing their premises for the High Holidays, while the issue of Sunday trading by Jewish traders was championed in the Jewish and wider papers. After the prosecution of a Mr Bukh in Ballarat for operating his business on a Sunday, the *Argus* took a broad view, arguing that:

> We are fond of boasting of our religious liberty, and point to the removal of disabilities, the imposition of which can only be defended on political grounds, as an evidence of our trust in the validity of Christian principles and the ultimate triumph of Protestant truth…During fifty-four days of every year…we forbid our Jewish fellow subjects to carry on their lawful callings—in other words, we handicap industry with over seven weeks and a half of enforced idleness…We are not discussing the question now as to whether a nation, the great majority of which is Christian, is justified or not in insisting on the general observance of its weekly holy day by all the people that are within its gates; but we simply point out the fact, in order to show that the edifice of religious freedom is still awaiting completion.\(^509\)

\[\text{\begin{center} */ * * * */ \end{center}}\]

Judaism had been challenged by the scientific and philosophical concepts of the European enlightenment, while the growth and attraction of cities brought new challenges. Urban life has been conceived as a duality of influence: places to which small communities could seek guidance, while simultaneously places of assimilation and loss of Jewish identity pressing communities to respond to the freedoms that social and political emancipation brought to them.\(^510\) Bringing the experiences gained in London, Germany, Eastern Europe and the Sephardi world, to merge in a developing urban context, the Melbourne Jewish community—children of these intellectual and social challenges—did not lose their identification with, or their practice of Judaism. In an isolated environment such as Melbourne, they sought to structure their lives around Jewish ritual and practice, self-
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consciously proclaiming their identity and recognising this as a part of a dispersed diasporic experience. In Melbourne and in other centres, issues of Jewish interest, explanations of Jewish practices and reprinting of articles from the Jewish press appeared in the Australian papers, exhibiting a high level of acceptance and integration into the wider community.
Chapter 4 Family Identity

In 1896, many Australian city and regional papers reported on the generosity and philanthropic activities of wealthy Jewish New Yorker, Lazarus Morgenthau. He had ‘found a new and romantic way of distributing some part of his wealth’, through a fund set up to support the provision of dowries for poor but ‘healthy’ brides, of ‘all religions’.\textsuperscript{511} Marriage for Jews, as with others, was not always so generous or romantic: in 1865 the Geelong Advertiser carried an advertisement from Ludwig Hyman stating that he would ‘not be responsible for Mrs Hyman’s debts from this date.’\textsuperscript{512}

In analysing the complexity of family relationships and family history, Lawrence Stone outlines a six-pronged methodological and historiographical approach considering demographic, legal, economic, social, psychological and behavioural issues.\textsuperscript{513} Using material available in this prosopographical study, I have applied these concepts to examine the distinctive nature of the family relationships of Victorian Jewry, illustrated by case studies the research has brought to light. Through analysis of the three Melbourne synagogues, a more detailed understanding of the community’s demographic structure has been uncovered, one which challenges previous preconceptions. Melbourne’s expansion resulted from international immigration and analysis of the place of birth has revealed the cosmopolitan composition of the community.

Whilst the traditions of Judaism are transferred generationally, they are reinterpreted by the legal and social frameworks of their time and place, subtly altering the values and actions disseminated to following generations. For settler societies the relationship between marriage and colonisation is inseparable, structuring and defining a new society, one based on multiple identities and divided families.\textsuperscript{514} For Jews, this heterogeneity is compounded by a duality of identity expressed through the legal judicial codes in which they operate (that of Jewish law represented by the Bet Din and that of civil authorities). In contrast to Central and
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Eastern Europe, in Britain and Australia, Jews were included within a civil legal framework which recognised Jews as citizens. Civil law is based on the rituals and moralities of the dominant society and in England and Australia the precepts of Christianity at times conflicted with the traditions that framed Jewish law. On occasions the differences provided a pragmatic alternative for individuals, enabling them to resort to either secular or religious courts to find the most advantageous determinations for personal matters such as dowries, inheritance rights and divorce. In Victoria, as family law developed, an observable shift from religious practices to civil jurisdiction can be detected. Although Melbourne Jewry placed itself under the authority of the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, the difficulty of communications, the unrestricted nature of citizenship and the circumstances arising from a new and isolated society brought a shift in attitudes. Until the sanctioning of a Bet Din in 1864, theological issues and their practical outcomes required communication with London, the only religious alternative being an unauthorised local response. Unfortunately the Bet Din records have not survived so any knowledge of how the dual system operated has to be pieced together from other records. Nevertheless, the evidence from the civil records suggests that Jewish couples took advantage of colonial legislation, while maintaining traditional practices when they suited their requirements.

The literature on family history, particularly in England, stresses the importance of religion and the various forces of evangelicalism and non-conformism in shaping the values and preconceptions of families in the early modern and modern period. For Jews, the models and influences differed. Religious and traditional adaptions were influenced by patterns of acculturation and alterations in the legal status and legal practice of Jewish communities, rather than by religious reforms. Family life holds a central position in Judaism, and the literature on the subject has concentrated on exemplars of the Jewish experience: Medieval Jewry; the golden age of Jewish Spain; Jews under Islam; nineteenth-century Germany, with further attention to Eastern Europe in the early modern period and


immigrants to America. Jews are absent from more general historical studies of family structures. This omission provides an opportunity to study Jewish family patterns through what Hyman considers ‘deviant case’ analysis, isolating the characteristics of Jewish family patterns that have enabled communities to maintain their distinctive traditions. The *Mishna* clearly creates mechanisms for the formal organisation of family and societal relationships, including permitted and expected consanguineous relationships, the status of minors, *ketubah* (marriage agreements), betrothal, divorce, adultery, and vows. Although this religious legal framework is central, the negotiation of these issues within the diaspora has varied. Social, cultural and class expectations of families shape the educational, economic and demographic experiences of individuals, and these are rarely static. This sculpting of the legal framework created an ‘inward acculturation’, one that transforms and creates new customs adapted through the intersection of religious and secular laws.

Jewish traditions are characterised by strong family ties, a consequence of the focus of Jewish life and observance in the home. These Jewish values were promoted by middle-class Jews seeking to acculturate into wider society, understood as a sign of Judaism’s adherence to ideals of bourgeois domesticity. In contrast to a women’s peripheral role in the synagogue, her remit within the home was to actively diffuse Judaism within the family. This responsibility within the domestic setting could be a double-edged sword, whereby women’s failure to impart Judaism adequately was considered the cause of assimilation and the breakdown of ‘traditional’ strengths.
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Research can establish a number of extended kinship relationships within the Melbourne Jewish community at a business and personal level. A number of widows immigrated to be with children already settled in the colony; widows can be seen living with children, nieces and nephews; bequests were left to male and female family members; financial support was provided to children and in-laws; business partnerships were developed between extended family members; while long patterns of chain migration sometimes over several decades, indicate transnational connections, communication and support.

Marriage

Although linked to the divine mitzvah of procreation, for Jews marriage is not a sacrament; rather it is a legal transaction, defined as such by the ketubah which outlines the contractual arrangements of both parties (Figure 4.1). These specify the husband’s obligations to provide for his wife, her contribution by way of a dowry, and the potential financial obligations of the groom in the event of a divorce.

Figure 4.1. Ketubah, for marriage between Aaron ben Zarach, and Freidah Lea bat Nathan, 1891
As states promulgated civil marriage legislation, the autonomy of Jewish legal frameworks was challenged. In Britain, where no statuary legislation defined the legal status of Jewish institutions, marriage customs acquired a de facto legal status. This status was formalised as Britain attempted to regulate marriage through the passage and amendment of marriage acts. Recognition was given to the specific requirements of the community, as within these acts Jews (and Quakers) were granted specific exemptions, privileging their respective marriage traditions. From the mid-eighteenth century, in an attempt to prevent clandestine marriages, to regulate marriage and to bring it under the auspices of the Established Church, England instigated and subsequently amended legislation regulating and codifying matrimony. The first of these, the 1753 Hardwick Act, formalised the process, requiring all marriages to be preceded by the publishing of banns announcing the couple’s intention to marry, constraining the solemnisation of the wedding to a Church or Chapel scheduled between specified hours, and introducing official registration of these unions. The act specifically excluded marriages by Jews and Quakers:

Provided likewise that nothing in the Act contained shall extend to...nor to any marriages amongst the people called Quakers, or amongst the persons professing the Jewish religion, where both the parties to any such marriage shall be of the people called Quakers or persons professing the Jewish religion respectively.

This exemption and similar exclusions in further legislation were deemed to denote the validity of Jewish and Quaker marriages, although the lack of a specific and explicit legal framework caused some confusion for both individuals and the courts. This exception was still ambiguous ninety years later when a further amendment was introduced


524 Clandestine marriages were legally binding marriages conducted ostensibly by a clergyman but outside of cannon law and irregular in format. As clandestine marriages lacked the formalities of regular marriages they were also much less expensive for those involved. See Stone, Road to Divorce: England 1530-1987, Chapter IV and 126.

to remove doubts as to Quakers’ and Jews’ marriages solemnized before certain periods (10 and 11 Vict., c.58).

Whereas doubts have been entertained as to the validity of marriages amongst the people called Quakers and amongst persons professing the Jewish religion, solemnized in England before the first day of July one thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven...according to the usages of those denominations respectively; and whereas it is expedient to put an end to such doubts; be it therefore declared and enacted...That all marriages so solemnized as aforesaid were and are good in law that the parties to such marriages were both Quakers or both persons professing the Jewish religion respectively.\(^{526}\)

With the British settlement of Australia, these exemptions were transferred to the colonies. In New South Wales as early as 1836, the ‘Act to prevent Clandestine Marriages and to provide for the issuing of Licences’, again exempted marriages by Jews and Quakers, reiterating the wording of the original British acts:

> Provided always and be it further enacted That nothing in this Act contained shall extend to any marriages amongst the people called Quakers or among persons professing the Jewish religion when both the parties to any such marriage shall be of the people called Quakers or persons professing the Jewish religion respectively.\(^{527}\)

These clauses were followed in Victoria in 1859 in an ‘Act to amend and consolidate the Laws affecting the Solemnization of Marriage’, which, as with the Hardwick Act a century before, endeavoured to regularise marriage within Victoria by defining those authorised to officiate at a wedding, when and where weddings could be performed and delineating the administrative procedures. Again specifically excluding Jews and Quakes from the provisions, the Act stated:

> shall nevertheless within three months next following be transmitted to the registrar of the district within which it was celebrated by the person

\(^{526}\) As quoted in ibid., 24.

celebrating or witnessing the marriage or by one of the parties thereto stating the date and place of such marriage and the name designation and usual residence of each of these parties.\textsuperscript{528}

Consanguinity

Judaism is transferred matriarchally and communities are maintained through endogamous marriages, with reluctant provision for conversion. Within the colonial context, endogamous marriages were characterised by the small numbers of interrelated families and constrained by the disproportionate numbers of Jewish men to women. Jewish patterns of consanguinity can be contrary to English and Christian practices and thus the legal standing of these unions was ambiguous. Marriages between cousins were common and, unlike in Britain, where they were illegal, marriages between an uncle and niece, and those of a man to his brother’s widow, are not only acceptable but in the case of the levirate marriage, biblically sanctioned.\textsuperscript{529} Although Henriques argues these could not be undertaken in England, they do on occasion appear in the records. These patterns of consanguinity were clearly exhibited in 1870s Prussia, where 23 out of 1,000 Jewish marriages were between relatives (compared to ten for Catholics and fourteen for Protestants).\textsuperscript{530} Within the Melbourne community a number of discernible forms of endogamy appear with a prevalence of families marrying amongst themselves; repeat marriage between particular families; ‘occupation endogamy’; and only occasionally ‘geographical endogamy’ to spouses born in the same location.\textsuperscript{531} Historically, family marriages were used to support the retention of property, identity, occupation or class and undertaken especially when the number of eligible partners was limited.\textsuperscript{532} Although widely practised by Anglo-Jewry, the legality of consanguineous marriages was unclear and in June 1837 a Bill was passed in the House of Commons ‘For

\textsuperscript{528} Parliament of Victoria, "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws Affecting the Solemnization of Marriage," (Parliament of Victoria1859).

\textsuperscript{529} Henriques, Jewish Marriage and English Law, 49.

\textsuperscript{530} Kaplan, The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family, and Identity in Imperial Germany, 115.

\textsuperscript{531} For those unions of European partners, the data is unclear if these fall into occupational or familial relationships as well.

\textsuperscript{532} ChaRan Y. Freeze, "Making and Unmaking the Jewish Family: Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia 1850-1914" (Brandeis University, 1997), 46-47.
removing Doubts respecting the Validity of certain Marriages amongst Persons professing
the Jewish Religion’. This legislation aimed to define the issue of consanguinity for Jews:

THAT no Marriage already or hereafter to be celebrated between any two
persons professing the Jewish Religion shall be impeached or rendered void or
voidable by reason of consanguinity or affinity unless the same be within the
degrees of consanguinity or affinity prohibited by Mosasic Law, according to
its interpretation as received by person’s of the said Religion. 533

Although the Bill passed through the House of Commons, it appears not have been passed
through the House of Lords, and the Jewish community and the London Bet Din continued
to maintain its historic cultural practices. 534

Many families intermarried over several generations. The descendants of Livorno-
born Israel Ottolangui (1774-1825) and his London-born wife Miriam Amelia HaLevy
(c.1773-1842) settled in Australia over a fifty year period, following the 1830 transportation
of their nineteen-year-old son known as David Langley (1812-1882), sentenced to life for
stealing 12 shillings worth of cheese. 535 Amongst those who settled in Melbourne, two other
sons, Moses (1808-1885) and Aaron (1811-1874) married sisters Emma (c.1811-1898) and
Reny a Bensabat (1814-1874), the daughters of Jacob Bensabat (-1827) and Rachel Rodrigues
(1785-1863). Moses and Emma’s son Ben Joshua Ottolangui (1848-1909) subsequently
married his double cousin Sarah (1858-1882), daughter of Aaron and Renya. A third
Bensabat daughter, Sarah (1828-1854) married George Mendes (1823-1901), on Sarah’s
death, George married for a second time, to his wife’s niece, Amelia Ottolangui (1832-1910),
the daughter of Moses and Emma (Figure 4.2). Although cross-generational family marriages
were outside British law, large families such as the Bensabat’s produced lineages where age
and generations merge. The Sephardi habit of naming family members after those who are
living as well as those who are deceased leads to an even more complex interconnecting of
this family, with names reappearing over generations and amongst family members.

533 "Jewish Marriages. A Bill for Removing Doubts Respecting the Validity of Certain Marriages among Persons

534 The House of Commons, Journals of the House of Commons, vol. 92 (London: By Order of the House of Commons,
(1837), 573-574. Finstein contends that the Bill was terminated in the prorogation of parliament Finstein, Jewish Society in
Victorian England: Collected Essays, 64.

535 Old Bailey Trails Online, Trail of David Langley 14th January 1830, t18300114-135.
Marrying one’s uncle was a particular Sephardi tradition, but a pattern which can also appear in Ashkenazi families. German-born Isadore Gross (c.1838-1886) migrated to England where, in 1857, he married Polish-born but English-educated Jane Jacobs (1839-1908). Their daughter Adeline (c.1858-1951) married her father’s brother William Gross (c.1840-), before both families migrated to Melbourne. In 1908 in St Kilda, Adeline and William’s daughter Truda (1879-1975), married her mother’s first cousin, the lawyer Bertram Levinson (1877-1961) (Figures 4.3 and 4.4).

---

536 Dubin, “Jewish Women, Marriage Law and Emancipation: A Civil Divorce in Late-Eighteenth-Century Trieste,” 68
Figure 4.3. Wedding Portrait of Truda Gross

Figure 4.4. Simplified Jacobs/ Gross Family Tree
Dowries

Although lineage, family wealth, learning and commercial talents were the four factors customarily favoured in the selection of Jewish marriage partners, individual families prioritised these according to their specific aspirations.\(^{537}\) Jewish families considered identifying potential marriage partners and undertaking financial negotiations on behalf of the bridal couple as a *mitzvot*. Although a good name and religious observance were important, dowries could also be a defining element in the marriageability of women. While marriages provided opportunities for judicious political, professional, friendship and business alliances, the transfer of property through the mechanism of a dowry enabled the consolidation of wealth. According to Jewish law, dowries are assets which a wife contributes to the marriage and entrusts to the charge of her husband. These can include ‘cash, real estate, jewels, stocks or other transferrable wealth’.\(^{538}\) If the marriage was dissolved by either death or divorce, the dowry was returned to the wife.\(^{539}\) Dowries were not a unique Jewish practice, but one which reflected the prevailing practices of the wider society. In a European context, dowries doubled as insurance for political and economic insecurity, often forming a critical fund for the residential permits in urban centres, as well as leverage capital for the establishment and support of business for a mercantile community.\(^{540}\) As a predominantly middle-class, urban and mercantile society, Melbourne Jewry could utilise the transfer and acquisition of wealth to create social and economic alliances. With tight endogamous marriages, Judaism and Jewish traditions were maintained. Although access to the dowry details contained in *katubah* is limited, some hints at financial provisions are available in wills. Isaac Levi (c.1822-1888) died leaving four daughters and a son. His will divided his estate into equal shares, stipulating that upon marriage the daughters were to receive £500 each as a ‘marriage portion’, this sum to be deduced from their total share. As with many others, his will further specified that if any child was not to marry within the Jewish faith, their total

\(^{537}\) Freeze, "Making and Unmaking the Jewish Family: Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia 1850-1914," 47.


\(^{539}\) Freeze, "Making and Unmaking the Jewish Family: Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia 1850-1914," 53.

\(^{540}\) Kaplan, "For Love or Money: The Marriage Strategies of Jews in Imperial Germany," 126; *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family, and Identity in Imperial Germany*, 88.
distribution would be reduced to £200. A wife’s dowry could be leveraged for business ventures. The dowry of Rosetta Levinson (1865-1835) was invested by her husband Alfred Kornblum in the establishment of a new business with his brother-in-law in Ballarat, a firm which subsequently become Kornblums and Co with premises in Flinders Lane, Melbourne and London.

Age at Marriage

‘At eighteen a man marries’ is a much quoted statement from the Mishna, and traditionally seen as representing the ideal upper age for marriage. In Eastern European communities marriage marked a transition from childhood to adulthood, and for wealthy or scholarly families, unions of young teenage couples were contracted swiftly following a boy’s Bar Mitzvah. These adolescent couples did not set up independent households of their own; rather, they began married life within the confines of the bride’s family, supported under a period known as kest. At the other extreme, civil authorities in the German territories attempted to restrict the growth of Jewish communities through the control and constraint of Jewish fertility by the imposition of various repressive marriage regulations. This resulted in high instances of late marriage or non-marriage. Following the Second Partition of Poland in 1793, Southern Prussia (the Province of Posen) imposed a minimum age for marriage of twenty five, levied high fees for marriage certificates and enacted a property valuation of one thousand talers (greater than most families could afford), resulting in many couples forgoing a wedding and merely cohabiting. The autonomous and semi-autonomous nature of many of these communities occasionally sanctioned approaches of non-compliance through the strategic use of poor record keeping and by communal provision of dowries for the poor. In other areas where these restrictive quotas were imposed, many couples failed to register their

---

541 Will of Isaac Levi, PROV Index to Wills, Probate and Administration Records 1841-2009, VPRS 28 P02 250. Later documentations show that his daughter Rose married a non-Jewish husband Frederick James Field, and upon her death the surviving siblings applied to have a portion of the estate distributed to her daughter. Public Records Office VPRS 7591 P02 141.


545 Jehle, "Relocations" in South Prussia and New East Prussia: Prussia’s Demographic Policy Towards the Jews in Occupied Poland 1772-1806," 38.
unions with the civil authorities. As Jews acculturated within the developing cities of Western Europe without these restrictive constraints, so they adopted later marriage patterns, as is reflected in the marriage patterns of Melbourne Jewry.

In examining the seven hundred extant marriage records of fourteen hundred individuals for the three Melbourne congregations (Table 4.1), not all marriages were those of previously unmarried individuals. The records include weddings of widows (69), divorcées (7), those who had previously been married by Registration (29 couples) and those who had children prior to marriage (5 couples). The following analysis identifies total marriages and first marriages separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MHC</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no of extant records</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1. Total extant marriage records with age data by synagogue 1835-1890*

546 There is some overlap in these individuals and their circumstances.

547 The data is further complicated by knowledge of the specific date of wedding, but generally only a year of birth can be calculated from available information and sometimes this may be ± 1 or 2 years.
Table 4.2 Average Age of Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MHC</th>
<th>EHC</th>
<th>St KHC</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals first marriages</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ages</th>
<th>MHC</th>
<th>EMHC</th>
<th>St KHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>First Marriage</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MHC</th>
<th>EMHC</th>
<th>St KHC</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals first marriages</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Ages</th>
<th>MHC</th>
<th>EMHC</th>
<th>St KHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>First Marriage</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870s</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880s</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In examining Table 4.2 we see that women were marrying at 22.1 years, while men were on average marrying at 29.1 years, older than their British contemporaries. Not only were the grooms older but the age disparity between husband and wife was also greater. The average deviation in Britain was five years whereas in Victoria it was seven. This pattern compares more closely to American Jews of German descent, where men waited until they were financially established after immigration, marrying in their late twenties or early thirties. In Melbourne a paucity of women resulted in much younger brides, marrying in their late teens and early twenties. In Melbourne, the oldest cohort of Jewish grooms appears in the 1860s, coinciding with the end of the gold rush and the consolidation of the Victorian economy in its wake. Marriage requires the expense of establishing a household and consequently some occupational stability. The postponement of marriage by this male cohort would appear to be attributed to the disruption that the social and economic conditions of the gold rush created.

Few marriages of adolescents occurred in Melbourne, although a number of minors were married with parental consent. In Melbourne, the youngest bride identified was fourteen-year-old Port Macquarie born Annie (Agnes) Cohen (1849-1902), niece of politician and businessman Edward Cohen, married to London-born Simeon Frankel (1840-1928), the acting minister for the Launceston Jewish community. The Frankel family’s immigration and settlement followed a pattern reminiscent of many, Simeon’s father Jacob (1814-1899), born in Breslau, Prussia, had migrated to England, where he studied with the chief Rabbi,

---


549 Between the late-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth century British grooms were on average 4.3 years older than their wives. The middle class expanded this differential. Davidoff and Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850*, 323. Analysis of census data of American Jewish families in 1880 shows large regional variations ranging from four to ten years age difference. Weissbach, *Jewish Life in Small-Town America: A History*, 142. Variations were also widespread in Germany: Steven M Lowenstein, "Ashkenazic Jewry and the European Marriage Pattern: A Preliminary Survey of Jewish Marriage Age," *Jewish History* 8, no. 1/2 (1994): 157-158.


552 *Launceston Examiner*, 19 March 1868, 3.
Solomon Herschell before employment as a Cantor in Kent.\textsuperscript{553} Migrating with his family to Hobart when Simeon was two, Jacob was a founder of the Hobart Synagogue and assisted with services. In 1849, following the death of his wife Sarah Moses (1815-1847), he moved to San Francisco, while his children went with their aunt and uncle to Sydney. Returning to Melbourne in 1857, the forty-four year old Jacob married twenty-four year old Mary Marks (1833-). Four years later he relocated again, this time to New Zealand, where he stayed until his death aged eighty eight.\textsuperscript{554} While Simeon’s peripatetic life took him from London to Hobart, Sydney, Launceston and Melbourne before finally returning to settle in Sydney, where for forty years he was Secretary to the Great Synagogue.\textsuperscript{555}

In total 179 brides (or 26.4 percent) were married under the age of twenty, compared to one groom, Dunedin born Louis Jacques Levy (1869-) to eighteen-year-old Melbourne-born Leah Marks (1870-). In 1874, the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation performed a marriage for the oldest bride in the cohort, that of forty-seven-year old Dorset-born Sarah Clara Johnson (c.1827-1891). Sarah Clara had married Welsh-born dentist Barris Meir in a civil ceremony in London twenty-five years previously. Johnson is an unusual Jewish surname and Sarah is often the name taken by converts, so it could be inferred that Sarah Clara was a convert and perhaps this delay in a synagogue wedding reflected the complexity of the conversion process.

\textsuperscript{553} Ava F Kahn, "Roaming the Rim, How Rabbis, Convicts and Fortune Seekers Shaped Pacific Coast Jewry," in Transnational Traditions, New Perspectives on American Jewish History, ed. Ava F Kahn and Adam Mendelsohn (Detroit: Wayne State University, 2014), 50.


\textsuperscript{555} Hebrew Standard of Australasia, 5 July 1945, 4.
Table 4.3 Average age of marriage by place of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brides</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No of first marriages</th>
<th>Age at first marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Poland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grooms</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>No of first marriages</td>
<td>Age at first marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Poland</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brides were more likely to have been born in an English-speaking country (Table 4.4) and were less likely to have been independent immigrants; rather, they settled either as a part of a family group, or as a result of chain migration. This would indicate the potential for
greater support networks and a less dislocated experience than for those who travelled independently. Whether accurate or not, the records indicate very few women were engaged in paid employment prior to marriage; marriage may have offered an opportunity for families to shift the financial burden of extra members.556

Small but consistent variations in the age of brides occur within the three synagogues. The 1860s saw the marriages of the youngest cohort of brides, those of the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation marrying at 20.9, a year and a half before those of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. The East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation consistently had the youngest brides, while these women were slightly less likely to have been born in an English-speaking country than their sisters at the other synagogues. Place of birth appears to have significantly affected age at marriage (Table 4.3). While those from Victoria, South Australia and New South Wales married between 20 and 21, an age comparable to those of Prussia and Russia Poland, those from Tasmania married later, in line with their German counterparts. With the exception of thirty-year-old Amelia Benjamin (1844-) from Australind, West Australia, the oldest group were from America, who married on average at 25.1 years. This pattern is largely reflected in their partners, with Central and Eastern European men and many from the colonies marrying prior to turning thirty, with late marriage characteristic of those born in Denmark, Germany, Holland and Britain.

A strategy often utilised by poorer European women unable to afford a dowry was to migrate to the New World or marry older widowers. Although the socio-economic position of European wives is not visible in the data, this does not appear to be the case in Victoria. It could be assumed that the expense and difficulty of travel outweighed the cost of a dowry. Melbourne had twice as many Jewish widowers as widows; what is perhaps unexpected is that equal proportions of men and women were remarrying younger spouses. Women remarrying younger partners had an average age difference of less than ten years; widowed men who married tended to be considerably older than their partners. The marriage in March 1860 at the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation between thirty-eight year old

556 The records likely do not reflect actual work practices by women. Only 8% state an occupation, almost all either in the clothing industry or teachers, Fanny Solomons states on her 1882 marriage certificate that she is a ‘lady’, but in her divorce testimony she says that she had been a paid employee both in her father’s shop and as a housekeeper to her brothers. Lobascher vs Lobascher 1894, PROV VPRS 283 P0000 80.
Bavarian widow Sophia Newman nee Hecht (1822-) and twenty-five year old Prussian born George Victor (1835-), both storekeepers of Golden Point (Ballarat), may have been facilitated by a common German background or be a reflection of the paucity of women on the gold fields.

Combining a number of records from various sources indicates that poverty could well have been a facilitating factor in the marriage on 3 February 1883 of twenty-three-year old Melbourne-born Sarah Emden (1857-1888), listed as a servant living at the Jewish Almshouse, to Ludwig Hyman (1833-1913), a Geelong-based but Vilna-born tailor, twenty-seven years her senior and the husband responsible for the advertisement repudiating responsibility for his first wife’s debts in the Geelong Advertiser of 1865. The Emden family had settled in Victoria in 1855, where Sarah’s father Elias (c.1810-1888), a slipper maker by trade, had been employed as the beadle to the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, a position which included onsite accommodation.557 The family was compelled to move when, in an attempt to reduce synagogue costs, Elias’ position was amalgamated with two others.558 Even as an employee of the Synagogue, the family could not make ends meet. On at least three occasions in 1855 and 1856, Elias applied to the Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society for relief; his income was supplemented through the late 1850s through small gratuities earned as a messenger and meetings assistant for the Society. In February 1860 he resigned, stating that ‘he did not wish to have anything further to do with this Society on any capacity’.559 Notices placed in the Argus announcing family marriages proudly list the Emden family as ‘late of London’, but their fortunes had slipped by the time of Sarah’s marriage and the family were living in the Jewish Almshouse, where Elias was employed as caretaker.560

Family alliances could also spread over generations and through shared life experiences. On 7 July 1877, twenty-nine-year old Dinah Levy (1858-) married her sixty-two-year old widowed uncle George Gershon Harris (1825-) at the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. Dinah Levy was the daughter of emancipist Lazarus Levy (1817-1884) and his

557 Argus, 23 November 1863, 6.
559 Minutes of the Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society, Manuscript Collection, State Library of Victoria, Box4252/1 MS 15380, 6 February 1860.
wife Rebecca Harris (1817-1882) a former servant. This was a family intermarried with several others who arrived in Australia due to criminal conviction. Lazarus’s older brother Phillip (1801-1888), also a convict, married Mary Moses (1828-1904), the daughter of ‘Money Moses’ (1780-1841), convicted with Lewin (1812-1842) and Ellis Casper (1784-1862) for the 1839 Great Gold Dust Robbery. While in 1846 in Hobart his younger brother Samuel (1821-1870), married Ellis Casper’s daughter Sarah (1826-1907) (See Chapter 7 Figure 10).  

Place of Birth

To further investigate the demography of the Melbourne Jewish community requires a more nuanced understanding of the place of birth. Anecdotally, it has been considered that the three synagogues had differing constituencies, with the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation the most ‘Anglo’, East Melbourne for the ‘foreign Jews’ and St Kilda defined by its long standing and high profile Rabbi Danglow (1880-1962), who arrived in Melbourne to take up his post in 1905.  

The German territories (21.71 percent) followed by the bordering areas of Russia Poland (20.88 percent) provided the highest number of non-English speaking marriage partners (Table 4.4). It is difficult to determine the motivating factors for immigration, but concentrations of immigrants from this area would imply that the restrictions placed on these communities were decisive push factors. Throughout the nineteenth-century, Germany, like Britain, witnessed enormous mass emigration. The cost of travel from Europe was significant, restricting emigration to those with at least some means. Research indicates that mid-century emigration was unlikely to occur from the highest levels of profession or skilled occupations or the lowest occupations. American research has also noted that many European immigrants earned more than those who remained in Europe, perhaps because the brightest (or more courageous) were likely to emigrate.  

---

561 Levi, These Are the Names: Jewish Lives in Australia, 1788-1850, 470, 476, 482.

562 This definition has been based on the comment made by Goldman concerning the establishment of the East Melbourne Congregation ‘it attracted about 30 members of the old Synagogue and the foreign element who always looked with suspicion upon their reserved English brethren.’ Goldman, The Jews in Victoria in the Nineteenth Century, 133; Levi, Rabbi Jacob Danglow: The Uncrowned Monarch of Australian Jews, 7, 27.

By far the majority of marriage partners in this study came from English-speaking
countries (77.23 percent)—88.05 percent of brides and 69.91 percent of grooms—with
marriages conducted between individuals born in Britain, the Australian colonies, New
Zealand, The United States of America, Jamaica, Gibraltar and South Africa. Concentrated in
these figures are the large numbers from Britain, who constituted 44.4 percent of brides
(28.6 percent from London) and 43 percent of grooms (32.4 percent from London). Using
this data as a guide to immigration patterns, we can observe that women were more likely to
have come from an English-speaking country. Ravenstein asserted that women tended to
form the majority of short-distance immigrants, (partly explained by the fact that they often
travelled to nearby centres to undertake domestic service). Although the incidence of
Jewish women undertaking domestic service appears low, women arrived in Melbourne from
New Zealand at twice the rate as men, with Dunedin as the primary location of birth. While
39.08 percent of brides were Australian born, only 17.22 percent of grooms were from the
Australian colonies. This raises the question, what happened to the other Australian-born
sons?

Unsurprisingly, considering the population spread of European Jewry, those from the
German territories and Russia Poland made up the majority of the non-English speaking
immigrants (Table 4.5). The German territories provided 16.67 percent of grooms and 5.45
percent of brides, while the proportions are reversed for brides with 16.59 percent from
Russian Poland and 5.45 percent from Germany. These places of birth can be somewhat
misleading, as many of those born outside either Britain or Australia had migrated to Britain
as children or young adults prior to secondary migration to Australia, or directly to the
colonies as young children. The experience and expectations of this sub-group may have
differed from their immigrant peers, educated in Europe, the Middle East and the Americas.

564 This is similar to the population as a whole, which dropped from 52% in 1861 to 18% by 1911. Marjory Harper and
University Press, 2010), 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brides</th>
<th>Total Marriages</th>
<th>First Marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>44.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>27.73%</td>
<td>28.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Poland</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Australia</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the greatest concentrations of Jews in Central Europe resided in historic Poland, the majority were concentrated in the east, particularly in three areas: Ruthenia-Ukraine (south east 44 percent), Lithuania-Belarus (north east 27 percent) and Malopolska (central 17 percent). Those in Melbourne came from what had been in the eighteenth century Great Poland, home to only 12 percent of the Jewish community and subsequently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grooms</th>
<th>Total Marriages</th>
<th>First Marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>43.02%</td>
<td>42.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Poland</td>
<td>16.59%</td>
<td>15.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>13.51%</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
divided between Prussia and the Russian Empire. Due to economic and political conditions, the Jewish population in this area was highly urbanised with only an estimated 2-5 percent residing in villages. Within Great Poland, the Prussian Province of Posen provided the largest concentration of Jews in the German territories and this was one of the four principal German territories from which international immigration occurred in the nineteenth century. Within this province five towns had communities over two thousand (Posen, Lissa, Kempden, Krotoschin and Inowrazlaw), a distribution not reflected in the Melbourne marriage records, with only Posen and Krotoschin providing any significant numbers (and then it cannot be clear if Posen refers to the city or the province), with nine individuals identifying Posen itself and twelve from Krotoschin, two from Melbourne, nine from East Melbourne and one from the St Kilda records. Also within the Prussian controlled area, Chodziesen/Kolmar (now Chodziez, Poland), a city north of Posen, provided thirteen marriage partners (seven from the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation and two from the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation and four from St Kilda). In the Russian-controlled territories of the former Great Poland, the Province of Plock provided significant numbers to Victoria, with at least twelve individuals from East Melbourne listing Plock as their place of birth, while Kutno (Kutney) in the same province was home to another nine, eight from East Melbourne and one from the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. Warsaw also produced a significant population in Melbourne, with eleven marriage partners, eight married in the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, two in the Melbourne and only one in St Kilda.

---

568 Ravenstein, ”The Laws of Migration,” 248.
569 Sariel, ”"In the East Lie My Roots; My Branches in the West". The Distinctiveness of the Jews of Posen in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century,” 184.
Table 4.5 Place of birth by synagogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total brides, identified place of birth</th>
<th>MHC</th>
<th>MHC %</th>
<th>EMHC</th>
<th>EMHC %</th>
<th>St Kilda</th>
<th>St Kilda %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>36.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other England</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Poland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>31.19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Total grooms, identified place of birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>MHC</th>
<th>MHC %</th>
<th>EMHC</th>
<th>EMHC %</th>
<th>St Kilda</th>
<th>St Kilda %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other England</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prussia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia Poland</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The demographics of the various synagogues are represented in their marriage patterns (Table 4.6). For the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, 93.56 percent of brides came from an English-speaking background compared to 75.75 percent of grooms. Reflecting the later establishment of the St Kilda Hebrew Congregation with its dominance by Anglo-German Jewry, 91.11 percent of brides came from an English-speaking background while Australia was the birthplace of only 59.58 percent of their spouses; 33.93 percent came from Germany, including 27.7 percent from Prussia. The East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation had the least number of English-speaking partners, with 74.56 percent of brides and 39.55 percent of grooms.

For those from a non-English speaking place of birth, geographic endogamy does not appear to play a large part in determining marriage partners, with only 45.8 percent of those born outside an English speaking country marrying others from a non-English speaking background. Occasionally marriages occurred between couples from the same town or village in Europe, whether these were a result of arranged marriages (of either relatives or acquaintances) or coincidence cannot be determined. Such was the 1854 marriage of Hamburg-born couple Herman Heynemann to Helen Cohen (1836-) and the 1874 marriage of Hyman Cohen (1849-1906) from Ozorków, Russia to Eva Harris (1851-1934) of the same town. Others such as that of Aaron Joseph (1845-) from Constantinople, Turkey to Fanny Morelle (1850-) from Horan, Holland show the diversity of the unions within the community.

As with the lack of geographic endogamy in the marriage partners, the Eastern European Jews do not appear to have developed an identity separate from others within Jewish Melbourne. Although the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation has been considered the home for Eastern European Jews, this is somewhat simplistic. This congregation certainly had a higher proportion of Prussia and Russia/Polish grooms (52.45 percent), but only 19.74 percent of their wives were from Prussia or Russia/Poland. In the absence of marriage in geographically endogamous patterns, historic ties to place of birth may have been

---

570 This is very different to the Irish community, where evaluation of marriage records for 1886 indicate that seventy-five percent of Irish women married Irish men. Chris McConville, "Emigrant Irish and Suburban Catholics: Faith and Nation in Melbourne and Sydney 1851-1933" (Thesis (Ph.D.), University of Melbourne, 1984), 286.

harder to maintain. While family connections were certainly sustained by letter, and through the circulation of communal publications, newsletters, minutes and newspapers, geographic or ethno-specific organisations were not established, while, as will be considered in the following chapter, many were eager to take out nationalisation. The identity of those Jews from Great Poland is also difficult to determine; academic debate has focused on whether the population considered themselves German Jews or Polish Jews (with a more traditional outlook). Throughout the long nineteenth century, political allegiances shifted rapidly as territory was subsumed by advancing armies and Great Poland shifted from Polish to Prussian, French, back to Prussian and subsequently German, before being reabsorbed into Poland at the end of World War One. These geopolitical shifts, coupled with the restrictive laws imposed until full emancipation was achieved in 1871, fostered a Jewish identity ahead of a national consciousness. Prior to 1871, the pressure exerted by the Prussian state towards the Jewish community, opposing its traditional autonomy whilst withholding equal rights, was a probable facilitating factor in emigration to the Australian colonies. Furthermore, Posen was not a centre of religious conservatism, rather one that took up Reform Judaism at an early date. In 1847, 89 percent of those participating in a vote in Krotoschin believed that Rabbis should have an academic education, while in nearby Inowraclaw one hundred members of the community were also members of the Progressive Party, supporters of Reform Judaism. While in Posen a large Reform synagogue capable of seating nine hundred was built in the 1850s. Those settling in Australia may or may not have been directly involved in any of these modernising tendencies, but their choice to come to Australia, with its predominate Anglo-Judaism, may reflect these enlightenment tendencies.

Occupational endogamy provided an opportunity to consolidate personal relationships and financial resources; on occasion this could be reinforced by a shared migration experience. Jewellery, watchmaking and pawnbroking were traditional Jewish occupations; all are skills easily portable in times of economic or political unrest. At a

572 In comparison Kobrin considers the strong ties and identity that Jews from Bialystok maintained in Kobrin, Jewish Bialystok and Its Diaspora.

573 Sariel argues for a separate Posen identity, distinct from German or Polish. Sariel, "'In the East Lie My Roots; My Branches in the West'. The Distinctiveness of the Jews of Posen in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century," 178. While Khan argues that Posen Jews were culturally different from Germans, but perceived a German identity as cultural prestigious. Rosenbaum, Jewish Voices of the California Gold Rush: A Documentary History, 1849-1880, 38.
rudimentary level this can be little more than hawking, but with skill it becomes a highly valued trade. The associated occupation of pawnbroking derives from the historic insistence on Jews to engage in money lending, releasing Christian merchants from the Church’s injunctions against usury. Pawnbrokers in Victoria often developed into ‘financiers’ or gold buyers supporting a number of commercial and personal financial investments. The Levinson family migrated from Posen to Sheffield in the 1840s and although the 1847 Jewish population of Sheffield was assessed at fifty-six, two generations of the family found Sheffield-born partners in Ballarat. These families had much in common: all three were families of jewellers and children of parents who migrated from Prussia in the 1840s, while Hyman Levinson (1833-1905), Louis Lazarus Meanowski (1821-1895) and Simon Cohen (c.1825-1890) were simultaneously committee members of the Ballarat Synagogue, and were at various times business partners. In Ballarat in 1876 the marriage took place between the thirty-year old jeweller Mark Levinson (1846-1913) and eighteen-year old Amelia Meanowski (1846-1942), the daughter of the jeweller and pawnbroker Louis Lazarus Meanowski. The 1851 census for Sheffield lists Prussian jeweller Simon Cohen as one of three ‘visitors’ to the Levinson home in Pond Hill, Sheffield. As the Jewish community moved from the goldfields to Melbourne, these connections were maintained and the subsequent generation saw the marriage of forty-one year old Michael Maurice Levinson (1863-1918), to twenty-nine year old Daisy Cohen (1873-1924) daughter of Simon Cohen, now both resident in St Kilda.

Most mid-century settlers to Melbourne were lured by the prospects that the gold rush offered. Although they are not matched samples, the 1857 Victorian census provides a comparison with the composition of the Jewish community (Table 4.7). The patterns vary considerably, the Jewish community was slightly less likely to have been born in Australia, England or the other British colonies than other Victorians (67.72 percent compared to 72.03 percent). While the concentration of Jewish communities in Central and Eastern Europe and the political upheavals in those areas through the struggle for emancipations resulted in eight times as many Jews from the European categories of Germany and ‘Other European’ (24.64 percent compared to 3.16 percent) than the general population.


Table 4.6 Comparison to 1857 census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marriage Data</th>
<th>1857 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Australian Colonies</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>36.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Colonies not Australia</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Divorce

As marriage is a contractual arrangement, the conditions of this can be severed under particular circumstances, although interpretations of these vary through Talmudic and other philosophical discussions. Divorce is effected by the husband, who provides a writ of repudiation in the form of a get which formally severs the union, and with this the Ketubah and any dowry is returned to the wife. Although men instigate divorce and formalise the process through the get, wives have the right to apply for a divorce on seven grounds:

1. If he becomes afflicted with a repugnant disease after marriage, of the existence of this disease was unknown to her prior to marriage.
2. If he is impotent or sterile.

---


577 Although under Jewish law men hold the prerogative to initiate divorce against the will of the wife, this practice has generally been frowned upon. Rachel Biale, Women and Jewish Law: An Exploration of Women's Issues in Halakhic Sources (New York: Schocken Books, 1984), 6.
3. If he refuses to provide for her, or refuses to engage in sexual relations with her.
4. If he subjects her to physical or verbal abuse and for misconduct.
5. If he engages in a malodorous occupation.
6. If he leaves her to move to another country or place, and she refuses to accompany him.
7. If he becomes an apostate.⁵⁷⁸

Although a framework for Jewish divorce was provided through biblical and Talmudic teachings, attitudes to divorce and its moral and legal frameworks were shaped by the social norms of the surrounding society. Its application was restricted by changes to the jurisdiction provided to Jewish courts and the availability of Jews to seek legal action in civil courts. European Christian societies considered marriage a sanctified and indissoluble contract manifesting God’s will and requiring wifely submission.⁵⁷⁹ In Europe, the gradual shift from absolutism to a concept of a civil society ‘transformed the standard of the moral good from a conflation of Christian principles with the public good…to a secularized concept of the public good’, and this became the primary driver for moral and political decision making in the nineteenth century.⁵⁸⁰ These were not uniform changes in attitude; rather, they reflected the nascent changes in political and social attitudes occurring throughout Europe, particularly following Napoleon’s introduction of the Civil Code. The nexus between Jewish legal frameworks and those of the political state were particularly complex and underscored in the divergent concepts of divorce. The Russian Civil Code considered matrimonial matters the responsibility of individual confessional groups, thus providing for autonomous decision-making by Jewish communities; the Hapsburg Empire took a centralist approach, divesting authority for marriage to religious bodies while simultaneously subjecting them to civil conditions; in post-revolutionary nineteenth-century France, Rabbis attempted to reform Jewish practice to conform with civic norms.⁵⁸¹ The special status accorded Jewish matrimonial practices in Britain does not appear to have provided clarity for the thorny issue

of divorce. Henriques argues that although there were statutory regulations providing for Jewish marriages, Jewish divorce remained outside religious jurisdiction, subject to civil law. The evidence, as we will consider below, would seem to somewhat contradict this argument. It would appear that by formally distinguishing Jewish marriages as a separate category Jews were afforded the opportunity to maintain a parallel system of family law.

The issue of transportation to the colonies for Jewish convicts raised some uniquely Jewish challenges. The English courts could grant a divorce after a ‘desertion’ of seven years, a procedure which could be employed by the wives of non-Jewish convicts to resolve the issue of their permanent separation, but this is not the case in Jewish law. Desertion by a husband is in itself not a ground for divorce and such women are considered to be *Agunah*, prohibited to remarry until her husband has provided a *get*. It would appear that the English *Bet Din* facilitated divorce for women who might be left in this predicament due to the transportation of their husbands. What is unclear is whether after seven years these women could also apply to the civil courts and obtain a civil divorce, avoiding any civil legal impediments to remarriage. While in many instances wives and children followed their convict husbands, or families came *en masse* with a convicted loved-one, divorce was an option taken in some circumstances. Several emancipists who settled in Victoria had divorced wives prior to embarkation. The most dramatic was Samuel Lazarus Levy (1765-1849), sentenced for life in 1808, whose wife’s predicament warranted the arrival in Sydney in 1830 of Rabbi Aaron Levy, the first Rabbi to visit the Australian colonies, apparently to organise a *get* for Levy’s long-suffering wife. Perhaps the most illustrative example is that of the Solomon family, who as partners in the Port Phillip Association were the first Jews associated with Victoria, and represent clearly the complexity of experiences of conversion, divorce and out-marriage of the Anglo and Australian Jewish communities.

Following the conviction in 1830 of the brothers Judah (1781-1856) and Joseph (1780-1851) Solomon for inciting the theft of goods from the pawnbrokers Abraham Abrahams

---

582 Henriques, *Jewish Marriage and English Law*, 58; Endelman agrees suggesting that perhaps Jews were following Jewish law, regardless of English Law email correspondence, 17 November 2014.

and Wolf Myers in Sheerness, their death sentences were commuted and both were transported for life to Van Diemen’s Land.\textsuperscript{584} Although believed to be brothers, Joseph Solomon’s wedding certificate of 8 May 1806 lists his father as Isaac Stakenman, with the Hebrew name as ‘Abraham our Father’, implying he was a convert.\textsuperscript{585} Prior to leaving England, Joseph divorced his first wife Judith Lazarus in a dramatic ceremony, reported by \textit{The Times}:

Their feelings were sensibly affected at leaving their native country, particularly Judah, who had long resided in Sheerness. On Thursday last, the ceremony of divorcement, according to the Jewish custom, took place at the Fountain-inn, Sheerness between Joseph Solomons (sic) and his wife. It was performed by the High-Priest and Chief Rabbi, who arrived for the purpose in a coach and four. The husband was permitted to come on shore, under an escort, and in irons; and after the ceremony, he returned on board, to suffer that expatriation his guilt had brought upon him.\textsuperscript{586}

The openness of this divorce would imply either that the Jewish communities’ practices were outside and alien to those of civil society, or that they were accepted within Britain. The complications of this family did not end here. The story of the financial success of the Solomon brothers has been well documented, facilitated by the £60 investment brought with them from England, enabling the establishment a mercantile empire while still ostensibly under conviction.\textsuperscript{587} But it is their family relationships that concern us here. Both Solomon brothers joined the Hobart Hebrew Congregation on its formation in 1842, although a year later, upon his marriage by special licence to Mrs Eliza Backhouse at St John’s Church, Joseph left. Joseph’s four children by his first wife subsequently joined him in Van Diemen’s

\textsuperscript{584} Abraham Abrahams also convicted with them was not so lucky, being executed the day after sentencing. \textit{The Times} (quoting \textit{Maidstone Gazette}), 26 August 1819, 3 issue 10708.
\textsuperscript{586} \textit{The Times}, Thursday October 21, 1819, 3, issue 10756.
Land, all marrying non-Jews, and he and his children were all buried as Christians. In 1838 Frances married Anthony Cotterall, who with Judah’s son Michael (1815-1899) established extensive property holdings in Port Phillip.

At the time of his transportation, Judah had eight children and a pregnant wife, Esther Abrahams (nee Levy, Russell) (1775-1861), believed to be the widowed daughter-in-law of the Abraham Abrahams, victim of their theft. In 1825 Judah had acquired sufficient wealth to build a £500 mansion complex in Hobart, which included a storehouse, residence and business premises which he named Temple House. Judah’s choice of appellation for his house reflected its use as the premises for the first Jewish services in Tasmania and was a public display of Judah’s identity. He was the financial benefactor and Treasurer for the fledgling community, donating land for the site of the Hobart Synagogue, as well as donating £200 and lending the community a further £250 for the synagogue’s construction. This financial support was undertaken while simultaneously cohabiting with his non-Jewish housekeeper Elizabeth Howell, by whom he had a son Joseph (1826-). It was this son who eventually inherited his father’s properties on the Saltwater River (Maribyrnong River) in Port Phillip. Unfortunately for Judah, in December 1832 his wife Esther arrived with three of their daughters, to reclaim her marriage and half his fortune. Judah attempted to renounce Esther, declaring that under Jewish and English law his absence of over twelve years entitled him to remarry. The couple battled and lobbied publically for a number of years and it is believed that this impeded Judah’s attempts at a free pardon. Three of Judah’s daughters married Jewish husbands and settled in Melbourne, while his daughter Sarah, who married her cousin Joseph (1819-1890), son of another brother Samuel (1776-1864) in a Christian ceremony, also settled in Port Phillip where the couple purchased land in Melbourne’s second land sale. Judah’s son Michael not only followed him to invest in Port Phillip but also to crime and divorce (Figure 4.4).

Michael Solomon had landed in Tasmania in 1829 with another uncle, Henry Solomon (1801-1843) and his wife Elizabeth. In 1835 he settled in the Port Phillip District at Moode

588 These Are the Names: Jewish Lives in Australia, 1788-1830, 797-798.
590 Samuel also settled early in Melbourne Levi, These Are the Names: Jewish Lives in Australia, 1788-1830, 824 and Solomon, "From Convict to Colonist-Joseph Solomon of Evandale (C.1780-1851)," 70.
Yalla, Yarra Yarra, also holding licences for land in Keilor and Carrum, and working in partnership with his brother-in-law at Solomon’s Ford on the Saltwater River. In 1840 he married a cousin also called Sarah Solomon in Tasmania’s first Jewish wedding. After being declared insolvent, Michael Solomon, like his father before him, attempted a brazen robbery of his mother-in-law’s second husband, Simeon Benjamin (1817-1859). The motivation for this audacious theft was apparently the reneging of a condition imposed by the Hobart congregation on Elizabeth Solomon in her attempt to marry Simeon Benjamin. The congregation’s stipulation was that prior to her marriage she settle £1000 from her late husband’s estate on her children and donate £25 to the synagogue, compliance of which would have significantly eased her son-in-law Michael Solomon’s financial position. ‘After a long trial…by a highly respectable and intelligent jury,’ he was found guilty and sentenced to ‘transportation beyond the seas for fifteen years’. Although Michael Solomon received a ticket of leave in 1852, a get was issued on 29 January 1859 dissolving his marriage to Sarah under Jewish law, making this couple both the first Jewish marriage and divorce in Tasmania. Later that year he married a second time, in a Presbyterian ceremony to Elizabeth Salmon.

---

593 *Courier*, 21 September 1844, 2.
594 Pfeffer, ‘From One End of the Earth to the Other’: The London Bet Din, 1805-1855, and the Jewish Convicts Transported to Australia, 298.
595 *Courier*, 6 January 1847, 2.
Divorce also reflects the changing attitudes of personal autonomy, particularly the willingness of women to accept unacceptable or unpleasant personal relations. In Victoria, the fluidity of society allowed husbands to desert wives through going ‘upcountry’ or removing themselves from the colony altogether. In Victoria civil divorce was introduced three years prior to the establishment of a Bet Din, providing a process for applications to be assessed. It would appear that as civil society grappled with the concept of divorce, the Jewish community acquiesced to civil law. Articles appeared in the papers stating the Jewish Law was no longer binding in England, while by 1895 the subject is of interest afar a field as the Riverina, where it is reported that the Jewish Chronicle has been calling for divorce reform in the plight of deserted wives, praising the advanced arguments put forward.

the most conservative people in existence are the Jews…Therefore we regard it with triumph to our cause that the “Jewish Chronicle” this month endorses marriage reform in a leading article…All honour to the Rabbis! As the Irish
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598 Finlay, To Have but Not to Hold: A History of Attitudes to Marriage and Divorce in Australia 1858-1975, 29, 51.
would say more power to them! The heads of the Jewish Church are in advance of our own.599

Other than for convicts sent to the colonies, only two religious divorces in either England or Australia have been identified (although a number of those immigrating from Europe indicate previous divorces on the marriage records). Julius Mathews was divorced for adultery in England, sometime before his c.1853 immigration to Victoria, while his legal adversary Dr Dattner Jacobson provided a get to his wife prior to leaving for the United States.

Prior to 1890, when more lenient divorce laws were enacted, only about thirteen cases per year were heard.600 The records indicate that a few Jewish women took advantage of the new civil legal framework to end abusive relationships and formalise their status after desertion by their husbands. This would indicate that the community had moved away from an autonomous religious legal framework to engagement with civil law. No records survive of the Bet Din, so it is unclear if any couples approached it to end their marriage. What is clear from the records is that no Australian divorcees appear to have applied to be remarried in any of the Melbourne synagogues. The 1861 Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act provided for judicial separation on the grounds of ‘adultery or cruelty or of desertion without cause for a period of two years’. Divorce proceedings could be brought against wives on the grounds of adultery, while wives could only apply for a divorce if they could prove adultery and another matrimonial offence such as rape, incest, bigamy, sodomy and cruelty.601 These civil laws were relaxed through an 1883 amendment which provided custody to mothers, maintenance payments to wives who had fled abusive husbands and allowed for remarriage after the finalisation of the proceedings.602 Whereas Freeze identified seven categories for divorce within Russia – ‘domestic strife, primarily over monetary matters and in-laws; physical and psychological abuse; adultery; licentiousness; childlessness; insanity and religious
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599 Riverine Herald, 25 March 1895, 2.

168
—they appear to be far more limited in Victoria (both in number and reason), responding directly to the legal framework as outlined in the Act. Not all couples with marital difficulties took the far-reaching step of instigating a divorce, as we can see by Herman’s 1865 advertisement quoted above, but some did. Not all couples could afford the associated costs. Only four Jewish divorces have been identified for the period 1861-1895, each instigated by the wife on the grounds of desertion and cruelty, and all were from poor families with significant financial strains. That of Krakow-born Eva Silberfeld (1867-) and Dunedin-born Louis Levy (1863-) of 1895 perhaps raised the most issues. The couple was married in 1889, when Louis refers to himself as a ‘commission agent’. His wife claimed almost immediately he began drinking; refusing to work and leaving the family with no income. Louis had been employed by the jewellers P. Falk and Co, and to assist the couple, both his mother Mathilda Seba (1838-1917) and father in law Bernard Silberfeld (c.1837-1923) provided money to purchase more stock, which he chose instead to gamble and drink away. By August 1890, with one small son, Eva was forced to sell the household furniture to pay their debts. Her father Bernard brought the family to Coleraine, where he was living, and provided them with a home and furniture, again setting Louis up in business. In March 1891, Louis threatened to kill his pregnant wife and after the birth of her second child again threatened her life, the police were called and he was committed to the Lunatic Asylum. By February 1892, the couple were again cohabiting, this time in St Kilda. Eva’s father had supplied £50 to establish Louis in business and credit had also been supplied by her uncle, John Silberfeld (1857-). Again, Louis took the money, his stock, her watch and jewellery and pawned it all for drink. By the time his father-in-law arrived, Louis was so drunk he could not stand. He again asked Bernard for money, when he refused, Louis asked him to take Eva and the children to Coleraine as he was going to commit suicide. She fled to Coleraine and gave birth to a third son. Louis moved to his mother’s home in Bendigo, where he was arrested for drunkenness, again sent to the Lunatic Asylum, released, rearrested and reincarcerated, before apparently fleeing to Sydney. In her attempt to partition for divorce, Eva

---

603 Freeze, ”Making and Unmaking the Jewish Family: Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia 1850-1914,” 224.

604 Of these only three from the 1890s are available to read. Unfortunately the case of Howroitz vs Howowitz heard in the 1861-1884 is unavailable due to damage to the document.
tried to contact her husband over several months.\textsuperscript{605} The Act stated that a reversal of a divorce can be granted ‘on the grounds that it was obtained in his or her absence’. In two of the three divorce cases examined the wives had attempted to communicate with their deserting husbands. In both cases the husband’s families refused to assist, either declining to provide an address or refusing to forward correspondence, as a result of which the cases dragged on for considerable periods of time. In the Lobascher case of 1894, the plaintiff Fanny Solomons (1858-1929) was explicitly informed by her husband’s sister that she would not provide Fanny with the address of the husband (he was believed to have fled to London) as the divorce was ‘washing dirty linen before the public’.\textsuperscript{606} The greater ease by which central and eastern European communities were able to manage divorce in the mid-nineteenth century is reflected in the records, with two women and five men remarrying after religious divorces in Prussia and Russia Poland.

\textit{\textsuperscript{*} \textsuperscript{*} \textsuperscript{*}}

The Melbourne Jewish community was formed by settlers from urban centres of England, the New World and Europe. Predominantly Anglo-Jewish in background, many more had also spent time in Britain prior to relocating to Victoria. This was not a community that maintained strong allegiances to their countries of birth; rather, they experienced the Jewish world in its diversity. They rarely married people from their home towns and did not form organisations which were culturally specific to their place of birth. Lured by the opportunities of a new settlement and free of religious restrictions, they married and began families utilising the dual legal frameworks in which they operated. They brought the experiences of negotiating Judaism and Jewish practices through a variety of civil and judicial processes, while maintaining Jewish traditions of consanguinity and divorce. Not shy of expressing their opinions of themselves and their place in Melbourne, they created space through their organisations and public debates. Lacking significant numbers of potential Jewish marriage partners, and although outwardly opposed to conversion, the records indicate that this was undertaken, although it could engender a hostile public communal reaction.

\textsuperscript{605} Divorce Levy vs Levy 1895, PROV VPRS 283 P0000 92.

\textsuperscript{606} Divorce Lobascher vs Lobascher 1894, PROV VPRS 283 P0000 80.
Chapter 5 Networks

The French barque Alexandrine cleared out on Saturday for the Auckland Isles, with the German expedition for the observation of the transit of Venus on board. The German Consul General, Mr Brahe with some of his friends, and Mr S De Beer, as agent for the vessel, went on board during the afternoon to wish the party farewell and success in their undertaking.

_Australasian_, 10 October 1874, 19

As a shipping agent, Emden-born Solomon de Beer (1841-1917) published a monthly Shipping Report and Freight Report for the _Argus_ newspaper, connecting the merchants and agents of Melbourne to their markets and the wider world, thus providing current information vital to their business while running his agency for routes between Melbourne, New Zealand, Asia, Africa and America (Figure 5.1). Married in New Zealand to an English-born wife, and living between the ports of New Zealand and Melbourne, active in philanthropy in the Jewish and wider community, de Beer forged a business and personal life based on a complex web of connections.

*Figure 5.1. Solomon de Beer*
Post-colonialism has led contemporary scholars to re-evaluate the impacts of the British Empire. However this scholarship has moved from an isolationist model focused on the nation state, to envisage a transnational perspective considering ‘networks’ and ‘webs’ of the empire, developing these as analytical tools to a structure connecting ideas and places. Primarily, this research has focused on two interconnected strands: relationships between the colonisers and the colonised; and the mobility of people, ideas and goods that enabled this exchange. In developing these themes, scholars have been particularly attentive to a number of core strands which enabled these connections: communications, intellectual and business transactions, and the transfer of technologies, identities and attitudes between Britain and its Dominions. The networks which these encounters created not only flowed to and from the metropole, but also involved a complex reciprocation of interchanges between the colonies allowing for the cross-pollination of new ideas.

Although much of the literature on empire uses a single image of Britain as a Protestant (Evangelical and Dissenter) nation, with a Catholic (particularly Irish) minority, this is a simplification of the rich complexity that created the empire. Two important barriers for understanding the impact of the empire on Britain are elaborated by Thomson as ‘failure to recognise how diverse and pluralistic the empire was…and failure to recognise how diverse and pluralistic Britain was’. Australian history is similarly characterised by Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Celtic settlement, but the term ‘Anglo’ can also exclude the Welsh,
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608 Bickers acknowledges ‘colonial “auxiliaries”—such as the ‘Lebanese and Sephardic Jews from India’; Bickers, *Settlers and Expatriates: Britons over the Seas*, 14; Ballantyne, *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand’s Colonial Past*, 139 and Thompson, *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, 4, acknowledge Protestantism as a central concern of empire studies.
Cornish, Irish and Scots. The diversity of Australian immigration has recognised the Chinese and the repressive response which culminated in the White Australia Policy, while the subtle diversity of other elements within the settler population is often unacknowledged. Whereas much has been written on race and gender, predominantly concentrated on relationships between the coloniser and the colonised, this again has often been at the exclusion of a more nuanced perception of the multiplicity and diversity of racial and cultural experience within settler societies. Thus within Catherine Hall’s *Civilising Subjects*, the Jewish community of Jamaica which represented a significant proportion of the free population, receives but two passing references, of which one is a quote with a disparaging tone. From an Anglo-Jewish perspective, emancipation created a framework which allowed space for participation in the politics of empire, ‘The British Empire provided a field of activity in which Jews were able to justify their emancipation.’ Since there were few Jewish soldiers, missionaries, civil servants or squatters, Jews are not apparent at the forefront of the Australian colonial experience, and can appear invisible within the imperial discourse. But as early settlers, they shared in the settlement experience and brought to the enterprise their own networks, which were connected in distinctive patterns, both overlapping and diverging from those of their counterparts.

The complexity of the networks connecting Jews in the empire and beyond puts them outside of the national focus of much of the current scholarship. Jews have been typified as ‘nationlessness’, belonging to a diaspora rather than to a specific political or geographic locality. British identity could have multiple identities, and for the Jewish community it allowed for both Englishness and Jewishness and with Jewishness came a connection to a diaspora. Fedorowich and Thompson elaborate this concept of multiple identities, envisaging the British world as a conceptualisation based on the three themes of diaspora,
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culture and identity. This premise is made more intricate by the ‘hidden phenomenon’ of emigration, ‘whose relationship to empire was considerably complicated by the fact that diasporas, of whatever ethnicity or nationality, rarely mapped neatly on to the formal boundaries of colonial rule’. Although not expressly writing about Jewish migration, this concept neatly encapsulates the complexity of Jewish settlers within the British Empire, who not only identified with their place of birth and their new society, but conceived of themselves as being connected within the wider Jewish diaspora.

The concept of a diaspora is further refined by Kalra, Kaur and Hutnyk: ‘Diasporic subjects are carriers of a consciousness which provides an awareness of difference… This sense of difference emerges against dominant cultural forces, which challenged the diasporic subject’s sense of identity’ and shifted their consciousness outside the realm of the nation. This chapter will examine the ‘bundle of relationships’ and connections accessed via diasporic connections by Melbourne Jewry to create a new society within the British Empire. As with other settlers, the Jewish community did not sever ties with family, community and business on settlement; rather, these were maintained through the expanded opportunities available in the colonies. The distinctive hierarchies and culture produced in Victoria permitted a level of acceptance for the Jewish community, with greater tolerance than in Europe or the Caribbean where many had originated. This was a community influential as makers of public policy, as politicians, and as community and local government leaders. Their international connections expedited trade and encouraged the flow of intellectual ideas connecting the community to world events.

Although Bickers argues that the British Empire could be considered a British ‘diaspora’ or ‘dispersal’, this is outside the classic understanding of concept of a diaspora, one
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which is commonly associated with the historic experience of Jews.\textsuperscript{618} The Jewish diaspora is considered disconnected from a homeland, and with a self-consciousness centred on ‘exile’ both as a physical and a geopolitical identity. The notion of the ‘Wandering Jew’ anthropomorphised this sense of exile, envisaged as a profound displacement, but one in which Jewry strove to create identity and memory.\textsuperscript{619} Historically, Jewish history was integrated within Jewish identity, an identity shaped and fixed by the Bible. Lacking a physical connection to place, Jews envisaged the Bible as the ‘portable homeland’, conceived as the repository of history and the revelation of history as a whole.\textsuperscript{620} As ‘people of the book’, Jews defined a unique experience of this history, with historical self-consciousness derived from both memory and narrative.\textsuperscript{621} Jewish memory was evoked and transmitted through ritualised practices of prayers, cultural observances and literary genres.\textsuperscript{622} This narrative was not one of political events, chronicles or historical studies; rather, it was a record of religious law, assigned to a specific time and place.\textsuperscript{623} The effect was to de-emphasise the importance of specific location, creating ‘non-spatial or trans-spatial’ perceptions of the past.\textsuperscript{624}

I would argue that the experience of many Jewish communities is more complex and nuanced than this, and that Jewish self-perception is one of many overlapping and intersecting diasporas, containing multiple interconnectivities across international boundaries, and based on a complex ethnic identity both of historic ‘placelessness’ and multiplicity of place.\textsuperscript{625} Diasporas are not necessarily immigrant communities. They do not come from ‘elsewhere’; rather, the members share a collective memory, different from the
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This is exemplified by Sephardi Jews recalling the golden age of Spain while living dispersed across Europe and the Atlantic. Other communities reflect even more complex diasporas and affiliations: such as that of Anglo-German Jews in Australia or Russians in contemporary Israel. These are communities able to maintain relationships transnationally as well as locally, through familial, business, religious and travel networks. This lack of connectedness to place and multiple identities has often caused distrust, leading to a perception that the community lacked loyalty to the specific state or empire. This was acutely so for the Sephardim, who not only shifted with repeated regularity throughout Europe and the New World, but also fluctuated in their religious observances between Judaism and Christianity. The distrust was often political. A German Encyclopaedia of the mid nineteenth-century quoted a Prussian minister of justice who claimed that the Jewish proclivity for frequent moving was a sign of a degraded morality.

Outside nation states, Jews used language and a shared cultural experience to define identity, even as they moved within an increasingly globalised world. Thus in many societies Jewish groups maintained religious and communal organisations that reflected these origins. In Jamaica there were ‘Portuguese’ synagogues for the Sephardi community and ‘English’ ones for the predominantly German and English Ashkenazi community. In Salonika congregations were named after the place of origin, Sicilia, Puglia, Calabria, Majorca, Lisbona, Provenza, Castiglia, Catalonia, Aragona, and Seviglia, a memorial to loss and a connection to a complex cultural identity.

Anderson explores the importance of language for cultural identity and nation building, but for Jews, the transnational languages of Ladino and Yiddish facilitated communication across national and empire boundaries, and in so doing, created a new intellectual community broader than any one nation.
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also had the advantage of privacy, excluding ‘outsiders’ unable to read the Hebrew letters. Conversely, I would argue that Anglo-Jewry’s complete adoption of English was an element in some scholars’ repudiation of this group as a unique and viable Jewish cultural alternative. On the other hand, English afforded this community a wider world-view, enabling interconnectedness with a new diaspora linked through the political and economic connections of the British Empire and the New World. This interconnectedness was facilitated through the spread of ideas and the experiences of individuals. High levels of literacy assisted this process, and of the 1,400 brides and grooms married in Melbourne synagogues until 1890, only thirteen could not sign their names in English, while a significant number were literate in several languages.

Immigration

As the economies of the new world colonies developed in the nineteenth century, improved communications and transport encouraged fifty million Europeans to migrate, seeking a new life. Within Australia, these advances, particularly the demand for labour, were motivating factors for the estimated 1.6 million who came from Britain. Within these figures lie the several thousand Jews who relocated to Victoria, arriving as single men, families, sibling groups and occasionally as single women.

In 1960 the sociologist and social worker Eugene Litwak penned a paper for the American Sociological Review entitled ‘Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion’. Here he argued that extended family connection can be maintained in contemporary industrialised societies through the financial support that extended families can offer to their members, particularly in the migration process. Through improved communications, extended families undergoing a process of chain migration could offer knowledge about the
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place of immigration while sustaining connections to the place of birth. Litwak coined the term ‘modified extended families’, defining a family group where the extended family no longer lived together but proffered support by other means. These concepts were expanded by Masey who showed that family migration enabled maximisation of earnings and importantly a minimisation of risk. Litwak’s observations hold true for the Melbourne Jewish community a century earlier, with complex connections aiding immigration, marriage, business arrangements and settlement more generally. Without clear census data the knowledge of household structure for Melbourne is limited, but family connections can be observed through a range of other indicators from immigration patterns, to the selection of a spouse, business partnerships and obituaries.

Similarly, feminist and colonial theoreticians have examined the family as a means of exploring political, racial and imperial networks and power within the British Empire. Much of the literature examining family relationships has focused on ‘boundaries of racial difference’. Grimshaw argues that for British families settling in Australia, urbanisation and industrialisation had altered previous patterns of family life. Families were vital in societies that gave little state assistance, for they contributed fundamental social welfare support unavailable elsewhere. For Anglo-Jewry, the waves of post-readmission immigration witnessed modifications in family ties, reforming and creating new connections without necessarily severing previous relationships. Grimshaw elaborates, explaining how the expanding middle class of nineteenth-century England utilised kinship ties to assert and maintain their position. Correspondingly, the Jewish community fashioned and replicated social welfare organisations to ensure individual wellbeing and communal survival. Although by the mid-nineteenth century the London Jewish community was leaving its confines in the

east of the city, census data reveals that the majority of those Londoners settling in Melbourne originated in the small area around Houndsditch, bound by tight endogamy and business networks. The family of the convict Ellis Casper hailed from an extended family of watchmakers, including Ellis himself, at least two of his brothers and a nephew. Prior to their 1841 transportation, the family’s connectivity appears strong, with several generations of brothers, nephews and nieces living in the small thoroughfare, Bury Street, St Mary Axe, beside the Bevis Marks Synagogue. The family seems not only to have lived in close proximity to each other, but married within a small circle, with several members over two generations marrying into the family of the distinguished Rabbi Solomon (Zalman) Ansell, one of the first members of the English Beth Din. Two of Ellis’s sisters, Rebecca and Hannah, married the same husband, Jacob Wolffson. Rebecca died shortly after their 1823 marriage and within two years of his first marriage he remarried her sister Hannah (Figure 5.2). On moving to Melbourne in 1852, family ties were maintained. Ellis not only lived with his daughter Grace (1828-1881) and her husband Henry Wolff (1823-1859), but the two men were partners in a business exporting small quantities of gold and importing groceries which they sold through their store in Geelong.641

![Simplified family tree, showing relationships within the Casper family](image)

The cost of immigration to Australia was always high, rising and falling with demand. This was particularly so during the gold rush when steerage rates rose from £10 in 1851 to

641 Argus, 22 September 1852, 4, 22 August 1856, 2 and Geelong Advertiser, 23 March 1852, 1.
For those able to afford such technologically advanced ships as the ‘Great Britain’, fares in 1853 varied between £70 for salon class to £32 for the lower cabin. It has been estimated that one quarter of those leaving Britain in the nineteenth century were beneficiaries of some sort of assistance, either in the form of a subsidised passage or a land grant. Subsidised schemes were operated by the British government and religious and philanthropic organisations, but Australia continued to be an expensive destination. Even for beneficiaries of assisted immigration, direct and indirect costs could be significant. A financial outlay was required to meet the cost of internal transportation to the port of embarkation, as well as for outfitting for the voyage or contributions to the cost of bedding and utensils, and these expenses could exceed the cost of a passage to America. The indirect costs involved risk: initially the perils associated with long-distance ocean voyages, the loss of income on the voyage. Then establishment costs within a new location. Research has shown that European immigrants were often better educated than those left at home, perhaps affording them greater means and skills to resettle in a new location. With assisted schemes concentrating on domestic servants and agricultural labourers, Jews appear mostly not to have fulfilled the requirements for assisted immigration, suggesting that most were self-funded immigrants.

English newspapers supplied information for prospective immigrants to Victoria, with the Jewish Chronicle facilitating Jewish emigration to the goldfields through a number of high-profile articles on emigration to the Australian colonies. In August 1852 the paper cautioned young men about expecting to make a speedy fortune on the gold fields:

The recent discoveries of gold have tempted many young men to leave the land of their birth and depart in pursuit of fortune. Among their ranks the young Hebrew has gone also to seek an independence by frugal habits, industrious pursuits, and the
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sweat of his brow; but especially since the discovery of gold in Australia, numbers of our active young men have been drawn to the golden shores by the glowing accounts they have heard, and have started full of anticipatory hopes reaping a speedily self-sufficiency. Now, we are not of that number who are lead away with the idea that a fortune may be realised there in a few months, for if some have indeed, been enriched in a short time, we believe them exceptions, not the rule.\textsuperscript{648}

Recognising that few women were tempted by the prospects of gold, and the difficulties this meant for Jewish men of a marriageable age, the paper urged Rabbis to encourage female migration from their communities:

yet by reason of the fast increasing population of the gold colonies, he will see that the acquisition of gain must of necessity become the work of time…He will want to settle down…because yearning for companionship, and, finding no damsels of his creed near, he became friendly with the stranger…To allay this evil the clergy must strain every nerve, and we doubt not that when pointed out, they will use every endeavour within their power. The best remedy will be to preach from their pulpit the necessity of ‘female emigration’, for through a large number of men have left us, scarcely one female has followed, although there is here such a preponderance of Hebrew females over male.\textsuperscript{649}

The paper also reflected the prevailing notions of loyalty expected of the community. Five months later, when the paper again raised the issue, it stressed the virtues of Australia in comparison to the Californian gold rush:

There gold is not a blessing but a curse … crime of the darkest form is rampant; neither property nor life is safe. Australia is a British colony, and that speaks its praise, the sovereignty of the crown is there acknowledged by the loyal community…in Australia the population have attained a high social and commercial position under a constitutional legislature; and beyond all these distinctions in its favour, the most

\textsuperscript{648} \textit{Jewish Chronicle}, 27 August 1852, 359.\textsuperscript{649} \textit{Ibid.},
important is, that whilst California has no wealth besides her gold, that Australia, independently of gold, is unlimited.  

Although a combination of immigration and natural increase fuelled the expansion of Melbourne’s Jewish community, consistently more men immigrated, resulting in a community with a disproportionate number of men to women. This issue was not unique to the Jewish community, but the matriarchal nature of Judaism and the reluctance to convert, resulted in two choices for many men: marrying outside of their faith or remaining single. Settlement by families was an iterative process, linked to the evolution of communal organisations creating an environment conducive to family life.

Emigration afforded an opportunity to reduce the financial burden of Jewish relief, but it was recognised that to facilitate this required assistance. In 1853 the Jewish Ladies Benevolent Loan and Visiting Society expanded its scope to consider assistance towards immigration to both America and the Australian colonies, establishing an auxiliary Emigration Committee chaired by Nathaniel Montefiore. In recognition of the opportunities that Australia offered, the committee established a loan scheme to assist single women and families to the colonies, financed through subscriptions. These were widely promoted, and this publicity allowed the Committee to give credence to its endeavours through the financial endorsement and participation of high-profile individuals.

The article of 14 January 1853 quoted above continued by describing the advantages for Jewish women in emigrating:

Young women who contemplate emigrating; should, however remember that the settlers require industrious domesticated wives; and that they are sufficiently acute not to take any other…for the introduction of industrious, unpretending girls, whether as wives or servants, there is scarcely any limit…Female emigrants of the Jewish persuasion would have all the advantages and few of the disadvantages of other people. There is a bond of union among them so strong, that although some threads may be unravelled; its main strength remains unimpaired. As soon as a new emigrant arrives among them, they sally forth to welcome her, give a hospitable reception,
emulate each other in the desire of making her comfortable and seek employment for her that may prove ultimately advantageous.\footnote{Jewish Chronicle, 14 January 1853, 113.} Much has been written about the fears for emigrant women, fears for her place in society and fears of the depravity and experiences she might find, both on the journey and in the new home, and this was no different for the Jewish community. Kranidis argues that ‘the concept of ‘danger’ permeates the discourse on emigrant women, ‘becoming a metaphor for women’s hegemonic place within and without the confines of the nation and serves to comment on their relation to the dominant ideologies’.\footnote{Rita S. Kranidis, The Victorian Spinster and Colonial Emigration: Contested Subjects (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 8.} In reality, care was taken for female protection, with the Colonial Office overseeing strict segregation, so strict that Hamberton considered it a form of control over the women under sail.\footnote{Thompson, The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century, 163.} In 1853 the Emigration Committee launched a high-profile scheme to assist female immigration to Australia. Almost immediately, concern was voiced as to the suitability of sending single women to the colonies. Fear was expressed about the dangers for the women and for the impact that marriage would have on the economic prospects of the male settlers. Initially the Committee sought to utilise Government ships, which led to ‘Lily’ penning the following in alarm:

Your correspondent N shews his good taste and feeling when he advises those noble ladies who have taken up the cause of emigration to ponder well—before they consign the fair daughters of Judah to a fate worse than that of poverty and privation at home. Government ships are the very worst kind for Jewesses, who…are generally nurtured and brought up in a modest privacy unknown among Christian females.\footnote{Jewish Chronicle, 10 June 1853, 285.}

A letter from the son of Abraham Harris to his father was even more strident:

Respectable Jewish single girls, I should think, could get better situations as cooks or servants in England, without coming out here; and to come out on spec of marrying is, I fear, a very bad spec, as one-half of the Jewish young...
men are not getting more than a living for themselves much less for a wife, and the old standards can very well get married…without waiting for an importation from home; and to send young girls to this colony where the house-rent is not to be had, and where the necessities of life are so exceedingly dear, ought to be argued by right minded persons, as, instead of doing a great good, they may do a great evil.\textsuperscript{655}

An editorial continued in this vein:

we have reason to fear that if indiscriminate emigration prevails, as at present, its effect on the moral and intellectual progress of Australia will be deplorable…discourage the idea of unmarried females venturing out for the present…Australia is yet drunken with success, and the civilising influence of women is not yet felt…Women unprotected is not yet safe in the gold regions of Australia.\textsuperscript{656}

For Jewish women, fear was compounded by cultural practices, particularly the lack of kosher food on the voyage, which further limited Jewish participation in immigration schemes. In an attempt to assist as many immigrants as possible, the Emigration Committee endeavoured to negotiate with the Government over the provision of kosher meat on voyages. This was a hindrance the government seemed unwilling to navigate. It placed various economic obstacles in the way, although conceding to allow for the provision of kosher meat at the individual’s own expense, without any equivalent reduction in the fare.\textsuperscript{657}

As the Emigration Committee advanced its activities throughout 1853, it sought the advice and services of Caroline Chisholm (1808-1877), the champion of female immigration. To allay fears of the suitability of the venture, a reader from the Bristol Synagogue, Mr Benjamin and his wife were initially contracted to escort the group, but the couple apparently withdrew due to ill health. In order to protect ‘vulnerable’ women, the Committee allowed the immigration of only those who had friends in the Australian Colonies and who could
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contribute towards the cost of their outfitting and passage.\textsuperscript{658} Three months later the Committee reported that it had selected only ‘persons whose characters and trades or occupations would enable them by industry and perseverance, to gain an honest livelihood in Australia’.\textsuperscript{659} The venture culminated in 1854 with the landing of the ‘Ballarat’ in Melbourne and disembarkation of eighteen single Jewish women and fifteen Jewish families assisted by the Committee.

The concern expressed for female immigration was significant, although the numbers of single Jewish women immigrating was small. Analysis of the immigration patterns indicate that most immigrants settled in family groups, although a significant number appear to be families headed by women. The surviving evidence does not illustrate the plight of individual female immigrants who had negative settlement experiences. By 1858 the Emigration Society was compelled to publicly report on its work, claiming that it ‘refutes all calumnies, and scatters to the winds all the innuendos which for some time floated about in the atmosphere of the communal public option, and establishes beyond doubt the usefulness of the charity’. It added that ‘The cases of individual misconduct of some female emigrants, so severely and so justly animadverted upon by our Australian co-religionists, were those of persons who found their way into the colonies of their own accord, sometimes against the advice of the society-at all times without assistance.’\textsuperscript{660}

The Emigration Committee’s report of February 1858 stated that 388 individuals had been assisted, of whom 210 had gone to the United States and 108 to Melbourne. In outlining the objectives for assistance, the committee stated that it hoped immigration would secure livelihoods for those who had previously depended on the community for charity. Their objectives for single women included furnishing suitable marriage partners for men in the colony. The success of this program provided an additional and unexpected benefit: a number of recipients secured sufficient resources to contribute to remittances for others to fund their journey to the colonies. The issue of single female immigration was so contentious that the committee felt compelled to report the circumstances of those who had come with Caroline Chisolm. Other than these eighteen women, the report does not name the
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beneficiaries. As these were essentially privately funded ventures, the beneficiaries who arrived in family groups do not appear in the assisted immigration listing, and so are difficult to identify. The Committee reported that it funded greater numbers of married women than married men. By implication these women were either travelling to accompany husbands who had previously left for the colonies, or were widows (or divorcees) starting a new life away from Britain. Those identified through this research were rarely single women travelling alone; rather single women generally accompanied other extended family groups or married siblings. The Crownson family is an exception to this pattern, with sisters, Rachel (c.1841-), Elizabeth (1848-1935) and Phoebe (1852-1890) migrating separately from London between 1864 and 1872.661

Chain Migration

The strong sense of family and extensive familial intermarriage is illustrated in the immigration patterns of the Melbourne Jewish community. Not only did families afford financial and practical support in the migration process, but family connections in the colonies provided paths for immigrants to follow. These are not characterised as migrations from a single place such as a village.662 Rather, these could be transnational, with several branches of a family or interconnected families from various locations settling in Melbourne. In Sydney in 1848 a group of gentlemen convened a meeting to ‘Promote Emigration to Australia’.663 Amongst these were members of the Henriques and Montefiore families both families with transnational immigration patterns and a tantalising link to a large chain migration from Jamaica to Melbourne in the following few years.664

These were Sephardi families who maintained their connections to the West Indies through marriages to other Sephardi families from the Caribbean. The largest of these migrations to Melbourne is that of the interconnected Henriques, Lopez, De Leon and Belinfante families. The first of this family to arrive was Joseph Henriques (-1872), who
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migrated initially to Adelaide, where he married Judith Georgina Barrow Montefiore (1828-), while Judith’s sister Emily Barrow Montefiore (1830-1917) also married in Adelaide the widowed Moses Benjamin Henriques (1808-1860) assumed to be Joseph’s brother. Joseph established the firm A Q Henriques & Co, in Melbourne with another brother, Abraham Quixano Henriques (-1890). Their parents, Benjamin Henriques (1787-1860) and Abigail Mosquita (1793-1857) and several siblings followed them to Victoria, arriving from 1853. Another sister, Rachel (1816-1874) also initially settled in Adelaide with her husband Dr Solomon Iffla, arriving in Melbourne in 1853. Another Henrique’s cousin, Joseph Augustus (1823-) and his wife Louisa Lopez (1821-1900), left Jamaica, successfully establishing themselves as merchants in New York, where the 1870 census listed the valuation of their personal and real estate at $105,000. They too later immigrated to Melbourne and here they eventually died. Louisa’s sister, Rebecca Lopez (1805-1881) migrated to Victoria with her husband David de Leon (c.1803-1871), and five of their children in 1858. Included in this extended family grouping was a married daughter Ada de Leon (1833-1917) and her husband Solomon Belinfante (1813-1884), whose occupation is listed variously as a merchant and an accountant. In Melbourne this couple produced a family of at least twelve children.

The extent to which the economic conditions of post-slavery Jamaica influenced the decision of these families is unknown. Some information can be gleaned from the compensation payments made to slave owners, providing an indication of the individual families’ previous position and the financial compensation that they received. Families such as the Montefiores had significant enterprises in Barbados, and Joseph and Jacob Montefiore received compensation for twenty slaves each, while almost all of the other families arriving from the Caribbean can be found to have held slaves. These range from a single slave to the thirteen slaves owned by Isaac Lopez, the father of Rebecca and Louisa Lopez, and thirty one slaves by Abigail de Leon, the mother of Joseph Augustus Henriques.

The settlement patterns of other families reflect different social and economic circumstances. Clara Isaacs (c.1828-1877) arrived in Victoria in 1848, apparently as an
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independent female traveller. In 1856 her brother Barnet Isaacs immigrated on the Moorcroft with his wife Alice (Alsey) Hart, son Woolf Barnett Isaacs (1844-1905) and unmarried sister-in-law Agnes Hart (1836-1878), establishing himself in Melbourne as a successful publican. His sister-in-law Agnes subsequently married Jacob Andrade Isaacs (1831-1876), also a publican but no relation to Barnett. In 1877, upon the unfortunate death of both their spouses, Agnes and Barnett married, again replicating the Jewish tradition outside of English law, but allowable under changes to Victorian law enacted in 1873. Clara Isaacs’ only child Caroline (c.1848-1925) was a new-born baby when her mother left for Melbourne, and was left in London to live with relatives. In the 1860s she was sent to Hokitika, where she had extended family networks, prior to moving to Melbourne and marrying in 1872. Her marriage certificate lists her address as that of her uncle, Barnett Isaacs in Burlington Terrace, East Melbourne. Although both Isaacs’s siblings settled in Melbourne, little trace can be found of Clara. Family notices published by Barnett, such as those in 1869 to notify the death in London of his mother Elizabeth Barnett (c.1785-1869) and brother-in-law Michael Myers (c.1814-1869), make no mention of his sister, but it would appear that Barnett provided a home for his niece on her arrival in Melbourne.

Onward Immigration

Of the millions who left Europe in the nineteenth century for the Americas, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, an estimated forty percent returned to their country of birth. Many others ‘tried their luck’ in a variety of destinations. ‘No two British communities were entirely alike, although all offered opportunities for transformation, if not advancement, and all offered too, the routine dangers of over-reach, failure or quiet mediocrity.’ For Jews, their diasporic outlook extended opportunities: Europe, England and the various Australia colonies afforded triangular routes of communication, residence and return, while for others

---


670 Bickers, Settlers and Expatriates: Britons over the Seas, 5.
the Caribbean, America and South Africa were also available. For many families New Zealand became a ‘horizontal connection’, providing spouses for those looking for marriage partners and linking families and business across the Tasman. Jews were unlikely to send their children ‘home’ to be educated, while business and family connections resulted in some spending a peripatetic life between several continents or, for those with a sufficient fortune, retiring to London. Some, like the family of Moss Davis (1846-1933), amassed sufficient capital through breweries in the colonies to retire to Park Lane and marry his children into the English establishment, while two of his sons received titles for their business and political life in New Zealand.

Moss Davis’s in-laws, the Jacobs family, exhibit the availability of chain migration and onward migration. Prussian-born Elias Rypinski Jacobs (c.1809-1874) and his wife Henriette Leishershonn were married in Manchester in c.1834, before moving back to Graudenz, Prussia, where their first five children were born (Figure 5.3). The family returned to England, prior to 1847, when a daughter, Leah (1847-1941) was born in Liverpool. They moved again, this time to Manchester, where their last two children were born. Here Elias found work as a glazier, a classic itinerant immigrant job, requiring only a rough diamond and a few panes of glass. His economic fortunes temporarily improved and in 1861 he is listed in the census as a Picture and Picture Frame Maker, unfortunately being declared bankrupt the following year. He subsequently managed to establish himself as one of a new breed of Jewish entrepreneurs, opening a small factory, coating vulcanised rubber on cloth, in a process previously developed by Charles McIntosh. Elias returned to Poland sometime after the 1861 census where he died in 1874. Notification was sent to his sons Isaac and Lesser (1852-1911) in Melbourne from their brother-in-law Isidore Gross, then in Graudenz. The first member of the family to migrate to Victoria was the eldest son Isaac, who arrived in 1852 as a representative of the Manchester firm Falk and Company. By 1878, all but one of the siblings as well as their widowed mother had made their way to Victoria.
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although only Isaac and his sisters Jane and Augusta (1842-1923) settled permanently in Victoria. The others moved between Victoria, Sydney, New Zealand, America, Canada and London. The only sibling not to come to Australia was the eldest sister Betsy (1837-1908) who married in Manchester in 1856 and migrated with her husband to Baltimore. In 1862 Rebecca Jacobs (1844-) married Isaac Herman (c.1835-) in Melbourne, prior to moving to Christchurch New Zealand, where they had eleven children. Isaac Herman was declared bankrupt in December 1887 and sentenced to one month’s prison for bad account keeping, and the families’ possessions were sold at public auction.676 The family then migrated to Vancouver, Canada before Rebecca relocated to California (her sixth country of residence) and all trace of her vanishes.677 The younger brother Lesser, was employed by a Prussian-born wholesale jeweller operating as Feldheim and Co. Lesser married in Sydney and eventually returned to London with his family. While the youngest sister Sophia (1850-1921), married the shipping agent Solomon de Beer in New Zealand before she too finally settled in Melbourne.

Figure 5.3. Jacobs Family Manchester c.1852, Augusta holding a photograph of her brother Isaac, already in Victoria.

676 Otago Daily Times, 31 March 1887; Ashburton Guardian 31 March 1887; Wanganui Chronicle 31 March 1887 and The Press, 17 December 1886, 4.
Female Employment

In Britain, emigration was seen as a solution to the plight of ‘superfluous’ women unable to find a husband, and an answer for women in need of improved financial status. The selection was undertaken with care, ensuring those chosen had a level of education, processed suitable skills and were considered respectable. Industrialisation expanded female employment opportunities, providing work in factories, but domestic service remained the dominant female employment. Female migration was aimed primarily at providing domestic servants for Australia, an occupation which local women were disinclined to undertake. Although the Jewish community recognised the financial benefits of immigration, the defining factor in attempts at organised female immigration was that of community preservation.

It would appear that whereas many of the non-Jewish female immigrants were travelling in anticipation of a position in domestic service, this was not the case for their Jewish sisters. Of the 105 women for whom an occupation can be established, nine can be identified as servants and two as housekeepers (for family members). The majority of working women were employed in clothing manufacturing, as tailoresses, dressmakers, cap makers, feather dressers, milliners and furriers. A further eleven were employed in various retail industries, in positions such as storekeepers, pawnbrokers and general dealers; six in education as teachers or governesses, and three publicans, while the remaining included a hawker and a machinist.

Hammerton argues that immigration often stemmed from an individual’s downward social mobility, but the Victorian goldfields and the economy of nineteenth-century
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Melbourne provided opportunities for enterprising men and women.\textsuperscript{681} At a time when education of Jewish girls in England was limited and the middle class was unable to find suitable Jewish governesses, at least five teachers migrated to Victoria.\textsuperscript{682} A Jewish education was important, even to families living in isolated rural communities. Although not an immigrant, the experience of Fitzroy-born Louisa Fredman (1862-1946) is indicative of others who sought employment in this field. Louisa was a gifted student, winning prizes for Hebrew and General Achievement at the Melbourne Hebrew School.\textsuperscript{683} With few opportunities for employment as a middle-class woman with some education, she obtained work in the isolated community of Branxholme in Victoria’s Western District, as governess to the Silberberg family. Her achievements did not go unnoticed and were extolled in the description of Montefiore Silberberg’s (1882-1959) Bar Mitzvah at the Ballarat Synagogue in 1895. The \textit{Jewish Herald} reported: ‘In the course of an excellent address to the Bar Mitzvah the Reverend I.M. Goldreich paid a graceful compliment to Miss Louisa Fredman, of St. Kilda (governess in Cr. Silberberg's family), for the able and correct manner she had prepared the young gentleman for his confirmation’. After complimenting the boy’s achievement, the paper noted: ‘Much sympathy was felt for the talented young lady when Mr. Goldreich explained that, owing to the recent bereavement she had sustained by the death of her father, she was unable to be present and enjoy the practical result of her labour.’\textsuperscript{684}

A woman’s working life often ended upon her marriage, but her skills could prove beneficial in establishing opportunities to support a family during the uncertainties of life.\textsuperscript{685} Leah Fonseca (1828-1902) is listed in the 1851 English Census as a furrier, living with her parents in Goulston Street, London. In June the same year she married Danish-born Henry (Samuel Isaac) Cohn (1826-1874), also employed in the fur trade. The couple migrated to Bendigo, where Cohn joined his brothers, who had previously established a successful


\textsuperscript{682} Pollins, \textit{Economic History of the Jews in England}, 89.

\textsuperscript{683} \textit{Argus}, 13 March 1876, 7 & 1 February 1875, 6.

\textsuperscript{684} \textit{Jewish Herald}, 16 September 1895, 6.

brewery. Returning to Melbourne, Henry entered the hospitality sector, running hotels and the refreshment rooms at railway stations before being declared insolvent in 1870, citing ‘falling off of business, loss of trade, high rents and heavy expenses’ as the cause of his commercial failure. He returned to his initial occupation, as a furrier in West Melbourne, but this also appears to have been unsuccessful. In 1874 Cohn committed suicide, leaving debts of over £374 to suppliers and individuals. Following Henry’s death, his widow Leah re-established herself in Melbourne, opening as a wholesale furrier on the corner of Collins and Queen St, Melbourne. The advice pages of the *Australasian* frequently quoted Mrs Cohn as an expert and directed inquiries to her, referring to her as ‘the best furrier I know’. On her death in 1902 she had not only weathered the depression but left an estate valued for probate at £780.

**Communications**

Advances in technology and communications were vital to Empire, and they were an instrument for the dissemination of ideas and knowledge through the English speaking and wider Jewish world. Newspapers, letters, pamphlets and circulars became a means by which Jewish communities connected to local issues and those affecting their brethren around the globe. This enabled reciprocity of information, as Melbourne-based correspondents reported for the British and European press, and British and European papers were reported locally, while papers were imported into the colony attached to correspondence from home and through subscription. None more so than during the gold rush when published
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accounts, guides and articles, aimed at middle-class audiences, were widely circulated.\textsuperscript{693} Newspapers also helped Jews explore their place within the wider Christian and secular societies, defining their place within a dominant culture.\textsuperscript{694} The Jewish press played a unifying and consolidating role for Jewish solidarity and identity, ‘embracing the imperatives of emancipation, which required the loyalty of Jews to the countries in which they lived’, while maintaining interest in international Jewish affairs.\textsuperscript{695} A Jewish press was developed during the nineteenth century and widely circulated; papers included the \textit{Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums} in Leipzig, first published in 1837, the \textit{Archives Israélites} founded in Paris in 1840, the London-based \textit{Jewish Chronicle}, begun in 1841, and \textit{The Voice of Jacob} of 1841-1848. This paper endeavoured to produce an Australian edition in Sydney, running to only three editions, entitled the \textit{Voice of Jacob or the Hebrew Monthly Miscellany}. The lag in communications necessitated English, European and Australian papers reporting information that was weeks or months old and this was the case for the Australian edition of the \textit{Voice of Jacob}, which was largely culled from the home paper.\textsuperscript{696} The \textit{Voice of Jacob} was especially directed at promoting Jewish education and scholarship, comprising both opinion pieces encouraging Anglo-Jewish intellectual advance and reports on the newly developing English Jewish schools, as well as carrying international news of interest to readers.

The \textit{Australian Israelite} was the first regular Jewish newspaper in Australia, produced from 1871 by Solomon Joseph (1834-1900), Chairman of the Melbourne Jewish Literary and Debating Society. This was followed in 1879 by the \textit{Jewish Herald}, edited by Reverend Blaubaum (1848-1904) of the St Kilda Hebrew Congregation, assisted by the architect Nahum Barnet and the solicitor Maurice Benjamin (1848-). The \textit{Jewish Herald} carried reports of Jewish political and cultural life across Europe, the Middle East, the Americas as well as Australia. The locally edited and imported publications supplied Melbourne Jewry with a wider appreciation and a sense of connectedness to issues affecting the Jewish diaspora.

\textsuperscript{695} Ibid., 31.
They connected readers to political, religious and social changes, resulting in a transformation from an ‘intangible conceptions of the ‘community of Israel’ (Knesset Yisrael) into the tangible reality of international Jewish organization.”

The Jewish press was not the only source of information concerning Jewish affairs. The general press carried articles on local and international Jewish political issues, as well reporting on Jewish philanthropy both at home and abroad, reprinting the minutes of a variety of Jewish philanthropic organisations. Wider Jewish philanthropic activities were promoted through the publication of lists of subscribers to local and international charitable activities.

Knowledge of colonial society was promoted In England, with the Jewish Chronicle reporting on the Melbourne community as early as December 1844 at a time when only eleven Jewish families had settled in the town, and later encouraging immigration to the colonies. The British Jewish press marketed itself as spanning the empire, listing subscribers from across the British provinces and the colonies. Australian contributions to the Jewish Chronicle were interspersed with those of local English communities, often giving greater detail to community activities and communal politics than for the English regional counterparts. The paper also contained articles culled from the colonial papers as well as commenting on articles from the colonial non-Jewish press. The Jewish Chronicle was widely circulated in Australia. In 1864 a letter was published from a non-Jewish reader described how he often read this ‘valuable and intelligent paper’ at his local Mechanics Institute. The same correspondent reported on the case of a non-Jewish child undergoing a medical circumcision performed by Reverend Rintel, who had been recommended to undertake the procedure, due to his proficiency, in contrast to the local doctors. The Melbourne Hebrew Congregation utilised the international Jewish press to assist with the recruitment of its rabbinical leaders, advertising internationally through the Jewish Chronicle, the Prussian HaMagid, the New York Jewish Messenger and the French Archives Israelites. Communication was not one way. Ballarat-based Newman Friedal Spielvogel (c.1830-1891), a scholar with an
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international reputation in Jewish learning and philosophy, was a frequent contributor, not only to the Australian Jewish press, but also to the East Prussian Hebrew language weekly, *HaMagid*. Through its readership and wide ranging articles, *HaMagid* produced reports and information on political and mercantile themes that fostered connections at a local and international level and between the Jewish and non-Jewish worlds.

Vibert describes how personal letters from the colonies sought to diminish geographical space and to reduce imagined difference. For many in Melbourne, this space was more complex. Victoria was a secondary destination for those who came from Europe via England, so that maintenance of these transnational connections was important for family and business. Letters could thus be written from many ‘homes’ and in more than one language; even for English-born children, they were sometimes composed in their parents’ mother tongue. The letters from the Posen-born, but Sheffield-based Michael Levinson (1812-1862) to his family in Victoria 1860-1861, written almost entirely in English, included many references to newspapers in the correspondence. The return letters went on to Posen and the family there. In a letter dated 24 October 1861, Michael wrote:

> Not to you Dear Hyman complain of not getting letters from Posen after you know they never are so punctual in writing to us. I enclose the letters I received from there. You will find it is a וַעֲדָה (Mazel Tov) and that they are much pleased to hear good news from you.

For those who had settled in Victoria from Britain and further afield, connection to family and place of origin was maintained through the improved communications offered by the efficient mail services and railways. From 1852 voyage times were reduced with the introduction of steam propelled ships. With the opening of the Suez Canal in 1862 a more direct route became possible, further reducing time at sea. Settlers such as Nathaniel Levi kept scrap books, recording not only his own achievements, but also those of his family in
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Liverpool and Coventry as well as issues pertaining to wider Anglo-Jewry. The books contain Annual Reports for the Coventry Philanthropic Institution, of which the Coventry-born but Liverpool-resident father Joseph (c.1796-1874) was a founder. Also contained in the scrapbooks are cuttings relating to the New Synagogue, Liverpool, for which his brother Godfrey (1824-1883) was a secretary, as well as material relating to its sister congregation, the Liverpool Old Hebrew Congregation, an 1879 Obituary for the Reverend Professor D M Isaacs, Minister of the Old Synagogue, Manchester and a pamphlet supporting the cause of Jewish political emancipation.  

The family notice section of the London-based *Jewish Chronicle* and the Victorian papers regularly listed lifecycle events captioned ‘Australian papers please copy’ or ‘home papers please copy’. Australian notices were published in the *Jewish Chronicle*. Such was the case on the death of Alice Hart, wife of Barnett Isaacs in 1856. In a similar vein, the death of parents in England was formalised in Melbourne through the posting of death notices and the holding of commemorative *minyanim*. Following their deaths in Lambeth, England of husband and wife Sarah Green (c.1827-1890) and John Nathan (1819-1906), the *Argus* carried numerous notices over several days, posted by their four Victorian-based sons, Abraham (1858-1928), David (1867-1940), Benjamin (1869-1952) and Samuel Nathan (1850-1928), noting that the information had been received via cable and listing their *minyan* at Wavetree, Lonsdale St, Melbourne.  

**International Business Connections**

In his polemic of 1911, German economist and sociologist Werner Sombart argued that Jews had been the founders of modern capitalism through the methods developed for trade and the specialisations in goods traded. He drew attention to ‘new commodities’ particularly cotton and the items required in cotton manufacture. Hertzberg, in critiquing Sombart’s thesis, argued that Jews neither created new economies nor predominated in them; rather, they utilised their skills to become beneficiaries of new trends. The significance of Jewish  
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traders and transnational Jewish industry has not been systematically investigated, and Jewish trade is rarely seen in general economic histories, lost in a gap between economic and cultural historical research.\(^{711}\) Hertberg’s thesis could be applied to the experience of the Nathan family and their innovative adaptation of colonial agriculture.

The New Zealand-based firm Glaxo’s origins lie in the partnership established between Joseph Edward Nathan (1835-1912) and his partner and brother-in-law Jacob Joseph (-1903). Following his mother’s death, Joseph Nathan was lured by the opportunities of the Victorian goldfields. In 1853, on his way to the goldfields, Nathan met a police warden who warned him that his chances of making his fortune by prospecting were very slim, but that supplies for the miners were in demand.\(^{712}\) Like many Jewish settlers, Nathan followed this advice and established a store. Returning to Melbourne in 1857, Nathan married a cousin, Dinah Marks (1838-1893). Two years earlier, Nathan’s sister Katherine had married another cousin Jacob Joseph, a London-born but New Zealand-based merchant. Although blind as a result of an accident as a child, Jacob Joseph had established a successful warehouses business in New Zealand. In 1857 Joseph wished to make a return visit to England and asked his brother-in-law to assist in the management in his absence. This led to the formation of a partnership, as Jacob Joseph & Co, exporting wool and importing groceries, stationery, medical supplies, ironmongery and drapery.\(^{713}\) In 1873 Nathan established the independent trading business Joseph Nathan and Co., erecting Wellington’s largest building, a warehouse measuring 42ft by 64ft and 52ft high, complete with a hydraulic lift.\(^{714}\) The 1890s saw improved transport from Britain reducing the need for the style of warehousing offered by Nathan. This coincided with the growth in mass consumption, providing a market for foodstuffs and products that could be produced in the temperate regions of Australia and New Zealand and distributed back to Britain and across the Empire.\(^{715}\) With his sons, Nathan diversified into one of New Zealand’s chief agricultural


\(^{713}\) Magee and Thompson, _Empire and Globalisation: Networks of People, Goods and Capital in the British World, C.1850-1914_, 135.


\(^{715}\) Hobsbawn, _The Age of Empire 1875-1914_, 64.
products, butter. In 1903 on a visit to England, Nathan saw the potential for expansion of his dairy-based business into powdered milk. He formed a partnership with Debenham’s, London to exploit the recently developed American ‘Just-Hatmaker’ processing, which he registered in 1907 under the name Glaxo, a euphemism for ‘Lacto’. On Joseph Nathan’s retirement to London, his sons managed the business from bases both there and in New Zealand.

![Figure 5.3. Simplified Nathan/Joseph Family Tree](image)

This is not the only side of the Nathan family’s interconnected business enterprise. Their roots in Australia begin with Nathan Lyon Nathan (1754-1850), transported on the Third Fleet as a sixteen year old, for the crime of stealing a bundle of clothing. Nathan completed his sentence and returned to England, where on 11 November 1807 he married his cousin Sarah Nathan (1785-1837). This marriage produced nine children, all of whom migrated to the Australian and New Zealand colonies (Figure 5.3). The first was their daughter Rosetta (c.1810-1859) who arrived in Sydney in 1831 in order to marry her cousin Moses Joseph (1803-1889). Theirs was to be Australia’s first Jewish wedding, conducted under a *chuppah*, performed by P.J. Cohen ‘by authority of the Reverend Solomon Hershell
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Chief Rabbi of the Jews in London’.718 Moses Joseph had been transported for theft in 1826, but upon arrival had been assigned to the firm of Cooper & Levey, where he was able to develop his business skills. He received a ticket of leave and in 1848 the Governor granted him an absolute pardon, allowing him to rapidly become involved in communal and business affairs in Sydney. He initially invested in a tobacco shop, but this quickly gave way to warehousing and the provision of ships, before the construction of his own fleet of fourteen vessels.719 His wealth enabled him to purchase ‘Mahratta’, a pastoral run in the Monaro district of New South Wales, and 100,000 acres of freehold land in New England, as well as land in New Zealand’s first land sale in 1841, before he turned his attention to the opportunities offered by the discovery of gold. By 1855 Moses Joseph was the largest licensed gold buyer in New South Wales, and in a single year transferred 1,000 ounces of the precious metal to London.720 Moses Joseph died in London in 1889, leaving an estate valued at £300,000 in England, £185,499 in Australia, despite having lost another £250,000 investing in the Confederate States of America.721

The Nathan family illustrates the advantages and support that significant chain migration can bring. It also shows how fortunes could be developed through familial sharing of financial resources. As the children of Nathan and Sarah Nathan settled in the various colonies of Australia, they were helped by their benefactor and uncle, Henry Moses, proprietor of a wholesale clothing warehouse, and married to Esther Nathan, Sarah’s sister. It appears that Henry Moses provided £100 capital for many of the Nathan family to emigrate. The first was Rosetta’s brother, Louis Nathan (1811-1886), married to Henry Moses’s daughter Harriette (1818-1834), who settled in Hobart and established a firm trading in China and the South Seas, as well as an extensive fleet of whaling boats. They were followed by Harriette’s brother, Samuel Moses (1807-1873), a trained mohel who arrived with an ‘Order of Service for Circumcision’ inscribed in vellum. Samuel Moses and Louis Nathan established Nathan and Moses, one of Tasmania’s largest importing and exporting business.
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Moses was also President of the Hobart Hebrew Congregation before all three retired to England.\(^{722}\) Other Nathan siblings sponsored by Uncle Henry settled in Launceston, Adelaide and Sydney. Two sisters also migrated; Miriam (c.1825-1882) to Melbourne, where she married the early settler and successful businessman Solomon Benjamin before also retiring to London; and Rachel (1813-1893) to Sydney, where she married the businessman and politician Samuel Cohen (1812-1861). Establishing themselves as traders in the port towns of the Australian colonies, the interconnected Nathan and Joseph families could utilise the merchant fleet built up by Moses and Rosetta Joseph to service their businesses.

Perhaps the most successful and longest surviving companies were those of the extended Michaelis Hallenstein family, benefiting from the experiences of various family members in Germany and Manchester, honed through skills learned importing in Melbourne and culminating in their international tannery business. They expanded their business across the Australian colonies to New Zealand, London and Hong Kong, eventually returning to their place of birth with branches in Germany itself. The business commenced with the goldfields partnership between Hermann Buttner, Bendix (1835-1905) and Isaac Hallenstein (1830-1911), who jointly operated a store in Daylesford. Isaac Hallenstein had come to Victoria from Germany via California, where he had learned skills in tanning as well as being tempted to try his luck on the goldfields. On his marriage in 1863, Bendix left Daylesford and migrated to New Zealand, where he built an empire in the clothing industry, leather, drugs and insurance as well as establishing a public profile through his involvement in local and provincial politics.\(^{723}\) In 1864, still in partnership with Buttner, Isaac Hallenstein purchased a small tanning business in Footscray, trading as Isaac Hallenstein & Co, shortly after including his brother Moritz Hallenstein (1831-1904) in the business. Buttner subsequently sold his share of the business to Isaac’s uncle Moritz Michaelis. Moritz Michaelis had arrived in Melbourne as a representative of his Manchester employer Sampson & Leppoc, with Adolphus Boyd as his business partner. Later the two established an independent partnership as importers and auctioneers, at one stage turning over £25,000 in a single auction.\(^{724}\) Despite embezzlement by an employee, the business thrived until the

\(^{722}\) Ibid., 571.


\(^{724}\) Michaelis, Chapters from the Story of My Life, 82.
importation of faulty elastic-sided boots from America caused its insolvency. Agreeing to pay his creditors an initial amount of 14 shillings in the pound, he too bought into the partnership with his nephew and in 1883 was able to pay off his remaining creditors. As Michaelis Hallenstein, the business thrived, increasing production from 120-150 hides per week to 480. The business model was complex, with various family members as partners within each other’s enterprises, proffering advice as required. Michaelis Hallenstein expanded first to Sydney in 1875 as Farleigh, Nettheim & Co., bringing Cosman Nettheim (1851-1907) from Germany to train and manage this end of the business; Bendix had input in New Zealand as Hallenstein & Farquhar from 1879; and Moritz Hallenstein was sent to London to negotiate the European markets, while two of Moritz Michaelis’s sons returned to Germany where they too opened branches of the family business.

Prior to the advent of refrigerated cargos, several Australian companies endeavoured to preserve and export Australian meat using a variety of new technologies. One of Moses Joseph’s many enterprises was the Patent Preserved Meat Manufactory at Camperdown, NSW, established in 1846 to manufacture and export canned meat. While in Victoria, two enterprising brothers not only exported meat back to Britain, but attempted to do so for the Jewish poor by producing low cost kosher preserved meats. The brothers Daniel (c.1832-) and Samuel David Tallerman (c.1827-1895) had settled in gold rush Victoria. The younger brother, Daniel, first tried his hand in California before becoming a successful storekeeper, hotelier and provider of entertainments in rural Victoria. His business model was to open ventures in new areas following the discovery of gold in the vicinity. He made and lost a fortune before settling in Ararat and subsequently Melbourne. By 1870 the brothers, as partners in the Victorian Meat Preservation Company, were exporting canned and preserved meats to England and France. They specialised in an innovative preserving process, packing rolled meat in tallow for transportation. This was more popular with British housewives than canned meat, as it more closely resembled fresh butcher’s meat. The brothers returned to Britain, where they established Tallerman’s Australian Meats, importing a range of preserved
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meats and profiling their business through regular public dinners which served their produce.\textsuperscript{728} Further developing international markets, they provided meat to the French army and represented Australia at the London International Exhibition of 1873.\textsuperscript{729}

Recognising the prohibitive cost of \textit{kosher} meat for the English poor, the brothers tried to export this from Australia, but the success of this enterprise was hampered by the refusal of the Chief Rabbi to certify the meat \textit{kosher}.\textsuperscript{730} This issue seemed to intrigue not only the Jewish press but the Australian regional papers, many of which carried commentary on the issue:

If there be any enactment in the Judaic code which forbids such beneficial innovation as Mr Tellerman purposes, surely it would be easy to cite book, chapter and verse in justification of the judgement. Until such be done one cannot help having a lingering belief that caprice rather than law dictate the veto.\textsuperscript{731}

In 1880, when refrigeration further improved the ability to export meat, the \textit{Jewish Herald} reprinted an angry comment from the \textit{Jewish Chronicle}:

Will our Jewish working men be allowed to profit by this new achievement in science? We are afraid not. Medieval Rabbis…have, in their anxiety to protect Israel from the heinous transgressions of the law…unwittingly placed an obstacle in the way, which we are afraid, orthodox rabbis of our days will not have the moral courage to remove.\textsuperscript{732}

\textsuperscript{728} \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, 19 January 1875, 7.
\textsuperscript{729} \textit{Maitland Mercury and Hunter River General Advertiser}, 19 May 1874, 4.
\textsuperscript{730} \textit{Jewish Chronicle}, 21 January 1876 and 21 July 1876, 246.
\textsuperscript{731} \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} 15 January 1876, 7 and regional papers such as \textit{Capricornian}, 5 May 1876, 95 and \textit{Rockhampton Bulletin}, 31 January 1876, 3.
\textsuperscript{732} \textit{Jewish Herald}, 13 February 1880, 8.
The Jewish World

Constantine describes how the British Empire fashioned a ‘Greater Britain’, whereby a familiarity of business, products, newspapers and religious observances resulted in a sense of dispersed Britishness, rather than a distinctively new community.\(^{733}\) In establishing formal communal structures, the Melbourne Jewish community did not do so independently; rather it followed the pattern of Ashkenazi England, placing themselves under the auspices of the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire and perpetuating their connections to Anglo-Judaism.\(^{734}\)

Without any formal necessity for religious affiliation or communal representation, there was no requirement for an overarching structure covering the Ashkenazi communities of either England or Victoria. The role of the Chief Rabbi was a particularly European post-emancipation development in an otherwise un-hierarchical and independent religion. During the nineteenth century, a number of congregations in the English provinces and in London voluntarily accepted the religious and religo-legal pre-eminence of the Great Synagogue’s rabbi. The role of Chief Rabbi was formally created with the 1842 election by twenty-six congregations of Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler to the post.\(^{735}\) Adler oversaw all religious questions of the Ashkenazi community within the British Empire, with local religious leaders and communities requesting his authority and seeking his guidance on a range of matters, including the appointment of Rabbis, the vexed issues of conversion and the recognition of children’s Jewish identity, and detailed matters such as the repair of \textit{Siphrei Torah}.\(^{736}\) Other congregations in the British Empire were not legally bound by the Chief Rabbi’s jurisdiction, yet many, particularly those in Australia, willingly recognised his authority and supported it financially as a tie to the ‘mother country’.\(^{737}\) In 1848 the Melbourne community accepted the rules and regulations circulated by the Chief Rabbi for the guidance of all the communities under his jurisdiction.\(^{738}\) The difficulty that distance created for colonial Jewry’s
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negotiations with the Office of the Chief Rabbi resulted in the ultimate independence of local Jewry, a position with greater autonomy than that of similar congregations in Britain.

Whereas for Christians, ministers and priests could receive education and training in Britain and Ireland, comparative formal instruction did not exist for the Jewish community and there was no rabbinic training available in any English-speaking country. Instead, Australian (and British) congregations relied on informally educated British-born religious functionaries, or imported European Rabbis with various degrees of skill and learning.\textsuperscript{739} Those serving the Melbourne communities all had connections to a variety of congregations, universities and communities through England, Europe, the Americas and South Africa as well as to the other Australian colonies. However, until the appointment of Rabbi Dr Joseph Abrahams in 1882, none of those acting in rabbinic roles in Victoria were trained rabbis. Isaac Pulver arrived in Victoria in 1854, having previously held positions in Cheltenham, England and Cape Town, South Africa. Pulver acted as a member of the Melbourne Beth Din and for seventeen years, until his retirement to Hobart in 1871, he acted as Shochet for the Melbourne community. The Reverend Moses Rintel, a Scottish-born and educated son of a Polish Rabbi, migrated to Sydney in the early 1840s, where he served the Sydney Congregation in the roles of Mohel, Shochet and Principal of the Hebrew School (Figure 5.4). In 1849 he accepted an appointment in Melbourne as Reader for the newly formed Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, eventually resigning and forming the East Melbourne Congregation in 1857.\textsuperscript{740} The [ultimately] controversial Dr Dattner Jacobson held a doctorate from the University of Vienna and had been previously employed in a number of Austro-Hungarian congregations as a Chazan, Mohel and Ba’al Kore, prior to journeying to the United States and on to Melbourne.\textsuperscript{741}

\textsuperscript{739} In 1960 Rabbi Dr John Levi became the first Australian-born ordained Rabbi.
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Important Jewish religious thinkers, particularly within the English-speaking world, were reported widely in the Jewish Press. Isaac Lesser (1806-1868), a Philadelphia-based Jewish lay minister, author, translator, editor and publisher, was a frequent contributor to the Anglo-Jewish press and his writings were widely quoted particularly in debates on divorce.\textsuperscript{742} The young Harriet Levien (1835-1905) corresponded with Lesser on issues of Jewish Law. She also read the works of other American Jewish philosophers and founded a Hebrew Sunday School in Geelong based on a Philadelphian model, established by Rebecca Gratz (1781-1869).\textsuperscript{743} Levien came from a family with vast international connections. Her mother Elizabeth Lindo, was the daughter of a wealthy Jamaican family of traders, privateers and planters and her grandmother Henrietta Salomons, was the daughter of Yehiel Prager, head of a multi-national trading empire and this background perhaps influenced her expansive correspondence.

\textsuperscript{742} The South Australian Advertiser, 7 May 1886.

From the 1870s Australian Jewry was also connected to the Jewish world through the Anglo-Jewish Association, established initially in England, with a remit to promote the welfare of Jews in the Middle East, North Africa and Eastern Europe through ‘the removal of the disabilities of the Jews, their social, moral and intellectual progress, the granting of aid to those who may suffer through being members of the Jewish race and to promote the production of works calculated to advance these objects’. The Anglo-Jewish Association was modelled on the French Alliance Israélite Universelle, founded a decade earlier with similar goals of advancing the status of Jews in the Middle East and North Africa. The Anglo-Jewish Association not only sought to alleviate distress, but saw structural change as vital to the advancement of Jewish communities, particularly the acculturation of these communities through education, language and dress. They considered Jewish emancipation a two-way responsibility, requiring a more outward engagement by Jewish communities. The Association considered that Anglo-Jewry’s acculturation and subsequent rise in social position had been achieved through education. In public meeting in London in 1875, the Reverend Professor D. W. Marks spoke:

…I look back …and think what forty years have wrought, I am constrained to be thankful and to take courage. At that time there was scarcely a boy who was old enough to sell an orange or a pencil in the street that ever was sent to school; and when I think that at the present time there is not an adult here who has not at his command the stepping-stones to all improvement, the common branches of education, reading and writing, and when I think what you have done more than all the grandees of your people would have done—by cultivating that education to raise the Jewish people, I stand awed at the contrast which presents itself—a contrast brought upon entirely by education…We wish our brethren abroad to understand this: that if they want to be considered citizens of the country in which they live, they must do like we do; they must identify themselves with the interests and advantages of that country. They may be as strict in the observance of the precepts of their religion as they like, but in this country a man finds that he can be a Jew and
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744 Argus, 16 July 1872, 1.
dress like an Englishman, speak English like an Englishman; he can be a Jew and yet be ready to stand up whenever his arm is called for and defend the liberties of his county, aye, and if necessary, to bleach his bones in common with his non-Jewish subjects in defence of their alters and hearths!\textsuperscript{745}

The Anglo-Jewish Association linked Orthodox and Reform Jews into an institution which ‘could share in the formal and visible management of British Jewish Affairs.’\textsuperscript{746} This connection between the Reform and Orthodox was followed in Melbourne, where for several years the agitator for religious reform, Isaac Jacobs, chaired the Melbourne branch of the Anglo-Jewish Association. The meetings and campaigns of the organisation were widely reported in the general press and across the Jewish world. In Melbourne, the \textit{Argus} reported these under a ‘Summary of Europe’, recognising the international reach of the organisation. With the formation of committees in Melbourne, Bendigo and Ballarat, the Association’s first action was to support a petition from the English branch addressed to the Shah of Persia requesting protection for the Jews in his realm.\textsuperscript{747} A year later the \textit{Argus} reported on the success of the Anglo-Jewish Association in procuring an agreement form the Sultan of Morocco to improve the conditions of Jews in that country.\textsuperscript{748}

\textbf{Freemasons}

As self-funded settlers rather than impoverished immigrants, many of the Jewish community arrived in Victoria with financial resources and English at their command. Although pockets of anti-Semitism existed, Jews were largely accepted within civil society, participating in a range of private clubs and associations. Membership of such bodies expanded their connections and broadened business, personal and cultural life. They offered a space for Jews to develop greater levels of intimacy with their non-Jewish peers, and created an outlet for aspirational men wanting to connect with the wider community.\textsuperscript{749}

\textsuperscript{745} \textit{Jewish Chronicle} 29 Jan 1875, 702-703.
\textsuperscript{747} \textit{Illustrated Australian News for Home Readers}, 15 July 1874, 111.
\textsuperscript{748} \textit{Argus}, 26 Sept 1874, 4.
\textsuperscript{749} Marion A. Kaplan, "Friendship on the Margins: Jewish Social Relations in Imperial Germany," \textit{Central European History} 34, no. 4 (2001): 475.
Freemasonry is based on the principle of universalism and belief in a Supreme Being, a conviction which does not differentiate between differing faiths and aims to transcend particular religious beliefs. The Masons’ core values include the concept of a supreme universal being, personal self-development, charity and support of the community, obedience to national laws and a responsibility to safeguard the reputation of the fraternity. Internationally, Freemasonry maintained values of universalism and cosmopolitism, while simultaneously considering the nation as ‘a site where virtue and merit should be rewarded’. It promoted a ‘form of cosmopolitanism…a supernational identity, a mode of seeing oneself as being connected to communities that extended beyond the British nation’. The religious neutrality of the Masons afforded intellectual, spiritual and social connections, offering opportunities to connect locally and internationally to those within the city and more widely through its international network. For the traveller, Freemasonry facilitated contacts and opportunities through fraternities of Masons across the globe. Connections were maintained by reciprocal rights at Lodges and through publications that linked members internationally, identifying lodges across the globe, promoting renowned local members and at times providing practical information such as coach times and fare prices.

---

Figure 5.5. Gabriel Marks and his wife Marion Alexander at the Coronation of George V

There were costs associated with membership and the activities of Freemasonry and it attracted prominent members of society. For Jews, the fraternity afforded an entrée, connections and acceptance which might not otherwise have been possible. Jews had been Freemasons since the early eighteenth century, participating in general lodges as well as developing predominantly Jewish ones. These provided a social circle for their members, and Jews established their own, enabling the more observant to maintain their strict dietary laws, while participation in other lodges supported broader networks within the city. The Old Testament symbolism of the Masons was also familiar to Jewish participants, and the prayers contained nothing at variance with Jewish traditions. Melbourne’s Jewish community engaged with Freemasonry at all levels, allowing Moses Rintel to preside as Grand Chaplain,

753 Whereas Kaplan illustrates how acceptance or otherwise of Jewish Mason can be indicative of waves of Anti-Semitism in nineteenth-century Germany. Kaplan, "Friendship on the Margins: Jewish Social Relations in Imperial Germany," 488.

in which ceremonial role he laid the foundation stone for both the Benevolent Asylum (1851) and the Freemasons Alms House (1867).755

The connections between Freemasonry and the Empire were strong. Freemasonry assisted in the transformation of a new and strange place into a recognisable outpost of British Society; and the Masonic hall was often the first building erected in a new colony, providing a focal point for recreational, civic and business gatherings.756 The international appeal of Freemasonry proffered social and business networks for those Jews who utilised the Empire to expand their careers. In 1910 two Jews were elected Mayors in Fiji, Melbourne-born Gabriel Jacob Marks (1870-1914) in Suva and New Zealand-born David Jaffa Solomon (1859-) in Levuka.757 Marks had settled in Fiji, where he was a director of Henry Marks and Co, a merchant firm belonging to his brother Sir Henry Marks (1861-1938) (Figures 5.5 and 5.6).758 While in Fiji, he became actively involved in the range of secular, religious and philanthropic institutions available to a colonist, not only as Mayor of Suva but also as Master of the Lodge of Fiji. While on a world tour, Marks and his wife drowned in the sinking of the Empress of Ireland off the coast of Canada. Such was their connection to the community in Fiji that their bodies were taken there en route to Melbourne, where they were to receive a formal Jewish funeral. In a major public event in Suva, the Fijian Masons held a preliminary Masonic service over the bodies, and then the staff of Henry Marks and Co transported them to the wharf for the trip to Melbourne. The ecumenical nature of the day was captured by the press:

As the procession left the Hall, the bell of the Church of England was tolled by the vicar. The coffins were followed by a large crowd...All the stores closed at 4pm for the remainder of the day, and flags were flown at half-mast. The “Last Post” played by a bugler and the coffins were taken abroad the ship, and the scene at this, the most affecting stage of all, was both sad and impressive.759


756 Harland-Jacobs, Builders of Empire: Freemasons and British Imperialism, 1717-1927, 53.

757 West Australian, 6 April 1910, 7.

758 Sir Henry Marks was also a Mayor of Suva and member of the Fiji Legislative Assembly, Argus 7 June 1938, 2.

759 Jewish Herald, 14 August 1914, 11.
Although Jews were active settlers in Melbourne and the British Empire, they rarely assumed pioneering roles in opening up new territory. Rather, they operated within the Empire, utilising networks and structures for their internal and external interactions. The dual sense of identity, as Jews belonging to an interconnected diaspora and as members of the Empire, provided unique connections that opened broader opportunities at an intellectual, personal and business level. These connections were employed both to develop a viable cultural community and assisted with the building of the economic, political and civil institutions.
Chapter 6 Urbanism

I charge Mr John Batman with leaving out the name of one of the partners joined with him in the land buying speculation, and this very man, who is Mr John Batman's particular friend, then was, or lately had been, a convict, viz, Joseph Solomon of Launceston. The supposed reason which actuated Mr John Batman in suppressing his partner’s name, was that of Solomon being a prisoner of the Crown.

Letter from Fawkner to Lord Glenelg of 20 July 1837

A friend before whom the claim was once made that there was a building designed by Mr Barnet in every street and thoroughfare in Melbourne promptly challenged it with the nomination of Carpentaria place, a byway without a building…‘You are wrong’, replied Mr. Barnet ‘You have overlooked the cabmen’s shelter, the gift of an anonymous donor. I built that’.

Argus, 2 September 1931, 5

Excluded from property ownership and with restricted employment opportunities, Jews have historically been inhabitants of urban centres. Although the ghetto was a physically restrictive place and a sign of subjugation, cities have been considered conducive to Jewish life, providing opportunities for education and culture unavailable in smaller centres. The freedoms brought by emancipation intensified this response and Jews flocked to European capitals, taking advantage of their social, political and economic opportunities. Here, the spatial conditions of industrialisation, urbanisation, enlightenment ideas and secular culture were elements in the forging of a new modern Jewish identity, ‘ripe with the promise of modernity’. Jews identified with the specific cultures of their chosen city, forging an


761 Lowenstein, "Was Urbanization Harmful to Jewish Tradition and Identity in Germany?" 81.

identity shaped in response to the perceived uniqueness of these places. In central Europe, in cities such as Vienna and Berlin, the Jewish community’s contribution to the urban fabric and cultural production is widely acknowledged; a parallel attribution has not been considered in Melbourne.

As settlers to Melbourne, these experienced urban dwellers carried with them a positive perception of urbanism. This is in contrast to their non-Jewish British contemporaries for whom urbanism was fundamentally shaped by the dichotomy of the city as ‘an integral part of national life’ but one in which ‘they shared an age-old aversion to urban living’.\(^{763}\) Davison, for example, sees a linear migratory narrative, with urban living in Melbourne as the final stage in a progress from a rural birth in Britain to a temporary residence in a large English city.\(^{764}\) As a new settler society, Melbourne does not reflect a single national spatial framework. Consideration of the diversity of experience brought by the Jewish settlers, their values and sense of place, therefore enables us to define more clearly how Melbourne developed its unique form. Building on this conceptual framework, the chapter will explore three interrelated themes—places, people and religious space—to establish how Jewish ideas, Jewish capital and Jewish social values, were influential in shaping the city.

The nineteenth century witnessed the rapid urbanisation of old and new world cities. London expanded from 1.1 million to 7.3 million, Manchester from 75,000 to 714,000 and Paris from 547,000 to 2.9 million, while in New York the population rose eighty fold, from 60,000 to 4.8 million. Immigration rather than natural growth drove this expansion, in Europe stemming from internal migration of populations and in the New World through transnational immigration.\(^{765}\) The discovery of gold fuelled the remarkable and rapid growth experienced in Melbourne, as settlers flocked to the colony seeking the riches offered. In the decade after 1851, the population rose from 77,345 to 540,322 and Melbourne developed into an ‘instant city’, in the process maturing

---


from an unknown pioneer settlement into a proud metropolis. In London, Hamburg, Boston and Canton, Melbourne became the name synonymous with fame and fortune, and at the peak of its meteoric rise in 1852 and 1853 more British emigrants bought tickets to Melbourne than to any other destination in the world.\textsuperscript{766}

This evolution shares many parallels with other nineteenth-century Pacific Rim cities which rapidly advanced as commercial and economic centres for their hinterlands. These have been styled ‘instant cities’ where, unlike the organic growth of old world cities, the whirlwind of urbanisation and industrialisation were brought into intense focus.\textsuperscript{767} The speed of development of gold-rush cities such as San Francisco and Melbourne left them devoid of a strong agricultural or manufacturing base, whilst simultaneously lacking a developed communications or transport infrastructure connecting them to the world. These were cities stretched by their meteoric success, unable to adequately develop infrastructure to keep pace with growth.\textsuperscript{768} Melbourne was founded for commercial opportunity, with an economy reliant on raw material—wool and gold—and fuelled by immigration. As a consumption economy dependent on importation rather than production, this provided possibilities for enterprising merchants to gamble, not on digging for mineral wealth, but on supplying the new markets with consumer goods. From barely fifty merchants and commission agents operating in the city prior to the gold rush, the number exploded to over three hundred employing 7,687 by 1854.\textsuperscript{769} Jewish businessmen, who had honed their skills in other cities or were enterprising enough to see potential scope in the new and ravenous markets, could prosper in meeting the demands of this voracious new economy.

The laying out of Melbourne’s grid by Robert Hoddle reflects a philosophical, commercial and aesthetic sensibility employed in many New World cities. Structurally the grid was an outward manifestation of an imperial dialogue, defining the polarity between chaos and civilisation through a recognisable and familiar authority based on eighteenth-
century classical principals of social order, defining and manipulating the quality of space. Within the imperial context, grids delineated colonisation through the inclusion and exclusion of land ownership, thereby excluding indigenous people from its definition.\textsuperscript{770} Colonisation was also defined by creating both ‘placelessness’ and a ‘place of equalised parts’, applying structural uniformity to the ‘elimination of viewpoints…and indeed history…Located against the imaginary grid, the blankness of unexplored country was translatable into a blueprint for colonization: it could be divided up into blocks, the blocks numbered and the land auctioned, without the purchasers ever leaving their London offices’.\textsuperscript{771} The grid reinforced a rationality and order to space, defining the boundaries of private property for this speculative venture and producing a spatial design considered ‘indicative of ambition and expectation of a great future’.\textsuperscript{772}

The implementation of this rigid structure in a society hungry for speculation, not only overrode existing topography, but resulted in an emphasis on private ownership over urban planning, developing a homogeneous urban form, unrelieved by squares or open space. As most investors were at some distance from the site, urban amenity was not their primary concern. Thus a grid produced an expedient uniformity of blocks, suitable to those clambering for the opportunities offered by speculation. These were land gambles by men largely uncommitted to personal settlement, their colonial experiment undertaken in the hope of making a fortune and ‘going home’.

Following the first land sales in 1837, the most desirable blocks were those bordering the future business centre, nearest the wharf at the junction of William Streets with Flinders and Collins Streets, while the Churches at the eastern end of Collins street required parishioners to go ‘bush’ for worship. By the 1860s the business centre had repositioned north to the corner of Elizabeth and Collins Streets, the General Post Office at the corner of Bourke and Elizabeth Streets ‘laid claims to being Melbourne’s symbolic centre’, while

\textsuperscript{771} Paul Carter, Road to Botany Bay: An Exploration of Landscape and History (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 204.
Collins Street was acknowledged as the primary street in the city. The various streets were recognised for their specialities: ‘Bourke Street for palatial hotels, grand restaurants, Cobb’s coaches, theatres and concert rooms—pretty barmaids to the east, horses to the west; Collins Street for fashion ‘at the longest credit and…the highest price’—doctors to the east, bankers to the west’. The plan whereby the deep rectilinear allotments were designed with their short side to the street inevitably led to the subdivision of blocks and the creation of small right-of-way’s to service these. Before the advent of mass public transport in Melbourne, like other contemporary cities, workplace and residence were combined, located in the most advantageous position for undertaking the specific occupation. The back streets became the location for workshops and noxious industries while stratification was manifest in the wealthy who occupied the main streets and the poor in the less desirable smaller streets and laneways behind. Thus the Amsterdam-born optician Moses Kasner (c.1788-1870) and his family lived above the business premises of Kasner and Moss at 17 Collins Street, while the family of hawker and general dealer Solomon Isaacs (1833-) lived in Foundry Lane off Little Lonsdale Street, along with a number of other poorer Jewish families.

Establishing Melbourne

First Settlement

As with the settlement of Australia, Jews were at the very beginning of the formation of what would become the Colony of Victoria and at the foundation of its new capital Melbourne. The initial settlement was not sanctioned by the British Government or either of the colonial administrations which governed the surrounding colonies of New South Wales or Van Diemen’s Land; rather the outpost was technically illegal and spearheaded by a cohort of Tasmanian businessmen and speculators investing in the potential for land expansion. Amongst these were the convict Joseph Solomon and his extended family. From the first land sale of 1837 and in subsequent sales, Solomon was one of a number of intra-colonial speculators purchasing parcels of land. Solomon’s acquisition was initially made under stealth and auspiced by Batman, but by the second sale of 1 November 1837, he acquired property

---
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in his own right, paying £39 for lot number 7 in Bourke Street between Elizabeth and Queen Streets.\textsuperscript{775}

Following the 1837 sale, auctions were moved to Sydney, affording financial opportunities for a broad array of investors. Those purchasing land at these sales were not settlers bound for Melbourne; rather, they possessed sufficient capital to speculate across the colonies, recognising the potential of new colonial outposts. Apart from Joseph Solomon, others acquiring land in the first five land sales were Joseph Barrow Montefiore (1803-1893), the brothers David (1815-c.1885) and Solomon Benjamin, purchasing as individuals and in partnership, as well as another brother Samuel Benjamin (1804-1854) and his business partner and brother-in-law Elias Moses (1809-1874). Following his immigration in 1843, their fourth brother Moses Benjamin also became a substantial landowner in Melbourne.

This initial cohort displayed shrewd business skills and prospered in Australia, with all but Elias Moses and Moses Benjamin returning to London after making their fortune in the colonies. Joseph Barrow Montefiore arrived with already-established wealth and connections, commanding significant capital and colonial networks through the family’s West Indies and London enterprises. His career was launched in 1826, when as a nineteen-year old he was admitted to the London stock exchange, paying £1,500 for the privilege of being one of only twelve ‘Jew Brokers’ allowed to trade. Three years later, lured by the experience of another Jewish former London stock broker Lionel Samson (1799-1878), he applied for a grant in New South Wales, sailing for Sydney with his wife Rebecca Mocatta (1810-1886), two daughters, his brother-in-law George Mocatta (1815-1893) and David Rebeiro Furtado (-1869) and his wife Sarah Egras (c.1803-1879), forming the nucleus of Jewish free settlement to the colony.\textsuperscript{776} Montefiore arrived with £10,000 to invest and a recommendation from the treasury describing him as ‘most respectable’. His request for a land grant stated:

\begin{quote}
I am now desirous of removing there with my family to establish myself as an agriculturalist I respectfully solicit a grant of five thousand acres of land my means are entirely adequate I propose taking with me an experienced
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{775} Cannon and MacFarlane, \textit{Historical Records of Victoria. Foundation Series}, 84-85.

agriculturalist in all its branches and as I have resided many years in the West Indies I anticipate being able to develop the cultivation of drugs, marino (sic) sheep, breeding of horses and cattle.\textsuperscript{777}

Montefiore was granted land at Wellington, and by 1838 he had amassed 12,502 acres by grant or purchase, as well as further land at Maitland in partnership with David Rebeiro Furtado and Philip Joseph Cohen (1802-1864). Although processing significant pastoral holdings, his agricultural ambitions were not his prime focus. Rather, perceiving opportunities for expansion into newly opening markets, he invested in the Port Phillip District, purchasing land in Williamstown, Geelong and Portland. While Furtado also made his way to Melbourne where by 1847 he appears in the directories as a merchant with property in Richmond and Flinders Lane, he too eventually left the Australian colonies and died in France.\textsuperscript{778}

The Montefiores were active across public, cultural, political and commercial spheres and this activity shaped the structure and institutions of a number of the Australian colonies. Significantly Joseph’s Barbados-born brother, Jacob Barrow Montefiore (1801-1895), was one of the eleven commissioners of the South Australian Colonisation Commission, appointed by King William IV to plan and administer that colony and was praised for being ‘indefatigable in his efforts for the advancement’ of South Australia.\textsuperscript{779} Together, the brothers formed a partnership as J. B. Montefiore & Co., investing in real estate and instrumental in the foundation of the Bank of Australasia, a conduit through which English capital contributed to the pastoral expansion and speculative boom of the late 1830s.\textsuperscript{780} Although bankruptcy during the downturn of the 1840s saw Joseph temporarily retreat to England and Jacob to Madras, this did not halt their colonial ambitions.\textsuperscript{781} Jacob settled in Melbourne as a financial agent of the Rothschild’s, and as J. Montefiore & Co., acting as a gold buyer and trading in a variety of products across the gold fields. Joseph Montefiore later

\textsuperscript{777} Levi, \textit{These Are the Names: Jewish Lives in Australia, 1788-1850}, 580; State Records Authority of New South Wales, "New South Wales, Australia Historical Electoral Rolls 1842-1864," (1842-1864).

\textsuperscript{778} "New South Wales, Australia Historical Electoral Rolls 1842-1864."

\textsuperscript{779} \textit{Southern Australian}, Friday 2 June 1843, 2.

\textsuperscript{780} Getzler, "Montefiore, Joseph Barrow (1803-1893)."

\textsuperscript{781} Returning to Australia in 1846 Joseph’s family now comprised nine children, while his baggage indicated some intention at permanence, arriving with a vast array of luggage including a harp, a piano and 300 packages.
settled in Adelaide, where he became active in politics and established a new mercantile firm of importers and shipping agents in partnership with his Barbados-born nephew and son-in-law Eliezer Levi Montefiore (1820-1894), husband of his daughter Esther Hannah Barrow Montefiore (1829-1882).

Eliezer was active across three of the colonies, beginning in the fledgling Adelaide Jewish community where he was a trustee for the Jewish section of the cemetery and a founder of the Adelaide synagogue. In 1849 his partnership with Joseph brought him to Melbourne, and he was later engaged as a director of the Australian Fire and Life Insurance Company of Melbourne and the Pacific Fire and Marine Insurance Company of Sydney. But it is in the intellectual sphere that he made his greatest contribution. An artist of note, he became trustee of the Public Library, a member of the establishment council of the Victorian Artists Society, a Magistrate, and an agent for Victoria at the Inter-Colonial Exhibition of 1875. His most notable cultural achievement occurred following his relocation to Sydney in 1870, as a board member and the first director of the National Art Gallery (now the Art Gallery of NSW).782

Intimately involved in the shaping of Melbourne over two generations was another Sephardi family, the Benjamins (Figure 6.1). As some of the earliest investors in Melbourne, they purchased land in the 1839 and 1840 sales. Samuel, the eldest brother, arrived in Sydney on the Anna in 1833. This ship contained a number of Jewish settlers including his brother-in-law Elias Moses.783 As business partners, Samuel and Elias established commercial ventures in Sydney, Goulburn and Windsor, correspondingly purchasing property in each location.784 Shifting their attention to Victoria, they acquired land in Melbourne 1839 and two years later in Williamstown and Portland. As further colonies were established they expand their portfolio, purchasing in Brisbane in 1842.785

783 Sydney Morning Herald, 14 November 1833, 2.
784 Sydney Monitor, 13 February 1836, 2; Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser, 22 March 1836, 4; 4 March 1837, 4; 15 December 1840, 4.
785 Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser, 30 March 1841, 4; 24 April 1841, 4; Sydney Morning Herald, 4 December 1842, 2.
Following Samuel, his brothers David and Solomon arrived in 1838 on the *Henry*, already prepared for their future business, with luggage comprising ‘21 cases (of clothing) and 6 bales of slops’. The pair moved to Launceston where they opened *Tamar House* with the slogan ‘Small profits quick returns’. Expanding to Melbourne in March 1839, they launched a second store, *Cheapside House* in Collins Street, initially in David Benjamin’s name, but a year later amending the partnership to *D & S Benjamin*. In 1843 Moses Benjamin, his wife and six children also reached Melbourne, likewise opening a drapery business at *Albert House*, 7 Collins Street, where he advertised that his shop had ‘no connections with any other house in Port Phillip’. Moses eventually reconciled with his brothers, joining them in *Cheapside House*, and in 1847 diversifying from a retail focus, advertising to “Trade, Hawkers and Up-Country Storekeepers” that they would instead be importers of ‘British and Foreign Merchandise’. It was in the Benjamin’s *Cheapside House* that Melbourne’s first Jewish services were held for The New Year and Day of Atonement 5601-1840.

Moses Benjamin, the only sibling to remain in Melbourne, became a significant landowner and the most prosperous of the family. At his death in 1885, his estate was valued at
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£201,504, including several residential, commercial and retail properties in Bourke Street, Collins Street, Little Collins Street, Spencer Street, Flinders Lane, Victoria Parade, Williams Street, East Melbourne, North Melbourne, South Melbourne, Williamstown, six acres of land in Prahran and 126 acres in Derrimut and further land in Geelong. His home was an elegant and austere ten-roomed villa at the eastern end of Collins Street, with a rusticated base and an entrance flanked by Doric columns (Figure 6.2).

Figure 6.2. Moses Benjamin’s home Collins Street

791 Will of Moses Benjamin PROV Index to Wills, Probate and Administration Records 1841-2009, VPRS 28 P0000 365.
By the mid-1840s land was changing hands so fast that ‘buyers and sellers found it difficult to know to which category they belonged’. Due to uncertainty of title, building was further hampered by the reluctance of banks to provide loans, this was somewhat alleviated by the introduction of deed registration in 1851, but it took into the late 1850s and early 1860s until the Torrens system of registration provided greater certainty and accurate information on property ownership. Conversely this headlong development was hampered by the paucity of available tradesmen to construct suitable dwellings for the rapidly expanding population. Although the impact of the discovery of gold took nearly a year to effect population growth, the economic dislocation was swift. In 1852 only forty-one buildings were erected in the city, although the following year this was somewhat normalised with the construction of 1,027 in the first six months alone. Although during the 1850s ‘permanent’ dwelling increased from 10,935 to 78,336, this was not enough to keep pace with population expansion, continuing the housing shortage and resulting in high rents. This is clear in the 1861 census, where in each small residence of less than three rooms, occupation density was two people. Almost a third of the Victorian population was living in huts and tents, primarily on the goldfields, but also in Melbourne. Here the Government agreed to allow a ‘tent city’ on the south bank of the Yarra, providing temporary accommodation at 5 shilling per week. Forewarned and enterprising settlers such as the Silberbergs sought a pro-active approach, arriving with prefabricated housing (in this case from France) which could be erected on landing. As with land speculation, this laissez faire response to the city’s growth reflected the short term thinking of the many, whose intention
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was to reap the rewards of the colony and return ‘home’ in comfort. For Jewish settlers, Melbourne offered freedom and stability and the majority stayed.

Australia has historically been a country of urban dwellers. As early as 1850, forty percent of the Australian population resided in cities, a density which continued to increase, until by the end of the century the number rose to seventy percent, a density comparable to England, and markedly higher than the United States, where six percent of the population could be considered urban. At the same time, Melbourne’s rateable value was surpassed only by that of London. This preference for urban living was often at odds with the expectations of those promoting immigration who imagined settlers would be hoping to escape the evils of the big cities and were amazed to discover that these were recreated. New immigrants arriving in the 1850s initially settled in Melbourne, before fanning out to the mining districts, lured by the prospect of gold. The mining centres did not provide a long-term place of residence for the majority of Jewish families. Mining created unattractive environments and Melbourne was a more appealing location. From the 1860s there was a steady drift of families back to the metropolis. Although religious law defined the distance a person could travel on the Sabbath and therefore the distance from a synagogue, the size of the mid-century city was such that walking was feasible in all areas. In Britain the structure of the ‘closed domesticated nuclear family’ was the dominant form; this is not reflected in the predominantly Anglo-Jewish community, where families lived in close proximity to each other, either in suburbs such as St Kilda, Fitzroy, Emerald Hill, Carlton or East Melbourne, or even in the same street or terrace complex. As the city developed, so too did the spread of the community. Although noticeable pockets of residential space founded on occupation, social status, family or business connections can be discerned, their variability parallels the
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social and economic aspirations of the wider community. What has not previously been considered is how the specific densities of Jewish residence have contemporaneously formed the urban fabric of Melbourne, or how this has been adapted for the specific cultural, social and political needs of the community. By undertaking an examination of this phenomenon a clearer understanding of Melbourne’s structure and development is revealed.

East Melbourne

East Melbourne, immediately to the north east of the city, became a favoured location for a number of Melbourne’s affluent Jews. The Jewish presence was established with the initial land sales of 1852–1854, when Jews became the leading property investors. Solomon Benjamin acquired twelve parcels of land and his brothers another five, while the next most significant purchases were Morton Moss (1800-1879) who bought three in his own name, and another seven in partnership with the Barnard Isaacs. Moss, a Tasmanian emancipist and future father-in-law of Sir John Monash, was a major Melbourne property investor, while Isaacs was a gold buyer and importer. Between 1857-1863 Moss secured at least another forty-six parcels of land, particularly in Carlton, Fitzroy, Northcote and Emerald Hill. For Moss and Isaacs their purchase in East Melbourne must have been a quick speculative venture, as by 1858 neither is listed as owning any property in this suburb, while Moss himself lived in Alfred Place. Notwithstanding Moss and Isaacs’s sale of their East Melbourne holdings, Jewish investment in the suburb continued and in 1858 the Benjamin family, Michael Cashmore and the Henriques family owned substantial property across the suburb (Figure 6.3).
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806 This can be compared to Washington and Vienna, where many of the Jewish community were also merchants and Jewish residential location was also occupational and class based, rather than ethnically defined. Sherman E. Silverman, "Early Jewish Neighborhoods in Washington DC," in Land and Community: Geography in Jewish Studies, ed. Harold Brodsky (Bethesda: The University press of Maryland, 1997), 245, 248; Silverman, "Jewish Memory: Jewish Geography," 184.


808 James Butterfield, The Commercial, Squatters and Official Directory for 1854 (Melbourne: James Blundell & Co, 1854). John Needham, Melbourne, Commercial, Professional and Legal Directory (Melbourne: James Blundell & Co, 1856). Moss showed rapid social advancement, having been convicted in 1825 for stealing two bags of seeds valued at eight shillings. His brother George was also a convict after being convicted of stealing a watch. George became a repeat escapee and was fatally shot after an attempted escape from Norfolk Island. Levi, These Are the Names: Jewish Lives in Australia, 1788-1850, 620.

809 Age, 26 November 1857, 4; 23 October 1857, 4; 28 November 1857, 4; 17 March 1860, 4; 23 June 1863, 4; 23 October 1863, 5 and Argus, 29 September 1859, 6.
Figure 6.3. East Melbourne 1858, Jewish landownership, C. C. Horrel, surveyor
In 1847 prior to the first land sales in East Melbourne, land on Eastern Hill had been granted to the Catholic Church and in 1858 William Wardell was commissioned to design a cathedral for the site. The subdivision of East Melbourne set aside land for the various Christian denominations, although not all built upon their allocations. The 1858 Horrell map shows land around the parliamentary precinct for the Church of England including St Peters’ Church, the Lutheran and Unitarian Churches, a Presbyterian Church, a Free Church and St Patricks Cathedral. A number of other religious and philanthropic institutions spanned either side of Victoria Parade including St Vincent’s Hospital, a Congregational Church, as well as a number of denominational schools including St Patricks’ College, Scotch College and the Presbyterian Ladies College (the latter two becoming popular educational establishments for local Jewish children). With a grant to the Church of England for the establishment of an Episcopal residence, Bishopscourt in Clarendon Street, the cache of the suburb rose further.

Victoria Parade became an area particularly favoured by Jewish residents, both as landowners and tenants. The western end from Nicholson to Regent Streets was initially owned by the pastoralist Josh Bear who in the 1850s subdivided and auctioned it as ten titles, and substantially purchased by the extended Benjamin family and tenanted by Jewish residents. These included the London-born merchant Henry Horwitz (1842-1916); Samuel Levy, who was later a resident in Glass’s Brunswick Street development; Benjamin Nathan (1827-1902), and the birthplace of his son, another Benjamin (1864-1935); the future owner of Rippon Lea, while Abraham Emanuel (c.1814-1907) a Professor of Music, tenanted a timber house owned by Josh Bear (Figure 4). The Benjamins’ commitment to East Melbourne was not only financial, but as long-term residents. In 1870 Moses’s son Benjamin Benjamin (1834-1905) moved from Victoria Parade to Canally, a twelve-roomed mansion designed by Reed and Barnes on the corner of George and Powlett Streets, and named after a cattle station jointly owned by Benjamin and his brother-in-law Edward Cohen.

810 Ibid.,
812 H. D. G Russell, Surveyor, "Plan of Building Allotments and of Premises, Lately Occupied by Mr. Bear, at the Western End of Victoria Parade," (1852 or 1858).
813 This relationship was cemented with the 1883 marriage of Moses, granddaughter Kate Hart to Henry’s son Louis Howitz. Fitzroy City Council, "Rate Books," ed. City of Fitzroy (Fitzroy Library, 1858-1949).
Melbourne’s fourth Jewish marriage was that of Isaac Hart (1820-1899) to Rachel Benjamin (1832-1881), the daughter of Moses Benjamin. This family was to become the long term occupant of *Walmer House*, a substantial ten-room house, erected in 1853 for Sir Thomas A’Beckett and purchased by Hart in the mid-1860s. This was one of the most extensive properties on Victoria Parade, occupying a large allotment with a frontage of 60 feet and a depth of 270 feet, with an entrance to Mason Street at its rear.⁸¹⁴

---

⁸¹⁴ Miles Lewis, "Melbourne Mansions," (Miles Lewis); Melbourne and Metroploitian Board of Works, "City of Collingwood, Detailed Plan No 1208," (Melbourne: MMBW, 1899).
Throughout this period, a number of Jewish investors, financiers and architects helped shape Melbourne’s urban fabric through the creation of a range of commercial and residential buildings, and their impact requires some consideration. An early example is Burlington Terrace, designed by Charles Webb, a row of sixteen, eight-roomed houses elegantly curving around the corner of Albert and Lansdowne Streets, and built for the London-born developer, Henry Philip Harris (1831-1892) in 1866 (Figure 6.5). As would be typical for Melbourne, the population was always mixed, with an average of just over half of the houses leased to Jewish occupants. The non-Jewish residents included several ministers of religion, two Police Superintendents and the Italian Consul, while the Jewish residents ranged from the publican Barnet Isaacs, and the financier and clothier Lawrence Benjamin (1836-1898), to the Reverend Ornstein (1836-1895) of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation and the journalist Maurice Brodzky (1851-1919).

Figure 6.5. Burlington Terrace, 1866

816 Sands and McDougall Directories 1868-1883.
The Jewish presence in Victoria Parade was consolidated with the building of a number of mansions for Jewish clients. Many of these were designed by the architectural firm of Crouch and Wilson, including Ensor, 1875 (Figure 6.6) for Joseph Levy and later the home of Benjamin Fink. Flanking Ensor and also designed by Crouch and Wilson, Lawrence Benjamin erected Rosenau in 1881, while a few doors up Alfred Kursteiner designed a house for James Simeon Raphael (c.1826-1895). Previously Kursteiner had been employed as the architect for a house on the corner of George Street occupied by Raphael’s brother Henry (c.1825-1894) as well as the more reserved Linden in Acland Street, St Kilda for Moritz Michaelis and his wife Rachel Gotthelp.

Figure 6.6. Ensor, 1875
Victoria Buildings

Although by the 1860s Melbourne’s demographic centre had shifted north towards the corner of Collins and Elizabeth Street, the area around A’Beckett Street was still considered on the periphery. 817 Victoria Buildings was erected by the owner-builder James Lawrence in the 1860s and faced Queen Street spanning the block between A’Beckett Street and Franklin Street, just south of the market and became another population concentration of Jewish residents (Figure 6.7). The terrace may have been built in two sections, as the rate books reveal that the houses 1-4 were of seven rooms with stables and 5-8 were of five rooms with a kitchen. 818 The building includes a curiously numbered 5A or sometimes 5 1/2, and a surviving photograph shows a row of double storied blue-stone terraces with timber detailing to their balconies, broken by a lighter coloured double storied premises flush to the street. 819 Throughout the 1860s and 1870s half the residents of this terrace were Jewish, and it was home to many small business people including jewellers, outfitters, importers and other merchants, although none appear to have stayed long in this location.

---


Fitzroy

In the 1850s the suburbs immediately surrounding Melbourne were ‘a rural-urban fringe, more rural than urban’, developing to absorb new arrivals as the population increased. The neighbourhood which became Collingwood and Fitzroy was not initially intended for dense residential development, but apportioned into large parcels of between 100-230 acres, changing hands and subdivided many times before evolving into its present configuration. The outcome of this was a street pattern designed by individual developers, rather than planned as an overall coherent strategy. In the mid-century a concentration of Jewish residents occurred in King William Street. This street was initially a part of parcel 71 and sold in the 1838-1839 land sales and not further subdivided until 1850-1851 at which time a number of small wooden stores and dwellings were erected. The street was rebuilt in the 1860s when these flimsy structures were replaced by more substantial brick and stone dwellings, and it was at this time that the Jewish community took up residence. Of particular favour was Carlton Terrace, a building or group of buildings which appears to have continued to be constructed throughout the 1860s until it covered almost the entire south block from Nicholson to Fitzroy Streets. A number of owners and occupiers of this block shared the surname Levy or Levi and their exact relationships cannot be unravelled. Henry Levy owned at least half a dozen properties in the 1860s and many were leased to Jewish tenants, including Lewis Levy a Commercial Traveller and Joseph Benjamin (1831-) a Tobacconist. A family which was interconnected is that of Nathaniel Levi and John Levy (1797-1870). John a merchant and magistrate had settled in Melbourne by 1841 and became father-in-law to his cousin on the marriage of his daughter Sarah (1837-1864) to Nathaniel in 1855. While also neighbours in King William Street were another of John’s daughters Esther (c. 1836-1884) and her husband, Devon-born Fitzroy City Councillor Simon Cohen (1832-1895), at

821 Ibid. 19; Fitzroy City Council, "Rate Books."
822 Butlin, *Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900*, 227. The extent of this ‘Terrace’ is difficult to determine, as the house of Nathaniel Levi at number 6, appears to have been one of the first to be built, while its action notice of 1876 describes a cemented bluestone residence of five bedrooms with drawing room and dining room on a block 19’5” with a depth of 100’. *Argus*, 8 Dec 1876, 2.
823 Fitzroy City Council, "Rate Books."
the time a partner in John Levy and Sons and owner of both 10 King William Street and 3 Carlton Terrace.

Another extended family group living in King William Street was the Phillips family. London-born Solomon David Phillips (1810-1877) and his wife Caroline Solomon (1813-1904) were resident in King William Street by 1854. Solomon and Caroline Phillips immigrated to Sydney in 1833 where Solomon accepted the position as the assistant Jewish minister for the Bridge Street Synagogue, later moving to a new congregation in Parramatta. In 1849 Phillips applied for the position as Reader for the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, but he was ‘was not qualified to fulfil all the duties required’.824 The high regard to which the Sydney community held him is reflected in the presentations made to him on his departure for Melbourne two years later when he was presented with a silver cup engraved in Hebrew and English and a ‘suburb purse’ bestowed in expression of their esteem for his services.825 The creation of a Jewish environment was important to Phillips and in 1855 The Argus published notification that he was to establish a Jewish School in Melbourne, aimed at ensuring that Jewish youth ‘not only obtain a liberal English education, comprising those branches taught in the highest establishments, but also instruction in the tenets and principles of the Jewish faith and a tougher knowledge of the Hebrew language’.826 Two years later the Argus reported a public presentation from the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, commending Phillips publically for his role as reader, mohel and committee member.827

825 Argus, 17 June 1851, 2.
826 Also on the committee were the Rev. Rintel, Michael Cashmore, Elias Ellis, Isaac Lyons, Nathan Salmon, Dr Solomon Ifilla Isaac Hart, Eliezer Levi Montefiore and Simon Hamburger. Argus, 24 July 1855, 5.
827 Argus, 28 July 1857, 8.
By the 1860s the extended Phillips family were also settled in King William Street (Figure 6.8). Hannah (1846-1920) and Angel Ellis, lived at 56 King William Street, while at number 41 resided Hannah’s sister Rosetta (1834-1916) and her London-born photographer husband Alexander Fox. Life as a photographer on the gold fields had been somewhat peripatetic, and the couple moved from Bendigo to Melbourne where Fox had struggled to make a living. In 1865 while resident at 41 King William Street Alexander and Rosetta gave birth to their son, the artist Emanuel Phillips Fox. Apparently unable to support his family, Fox separated and reunited with his wife, finally abandoning Rosetta in the position of an Agunah.828

Fitzroy became a favoured location for ‘city gentlemen’ seeking to live outside the central business district in town houses on its gentle slopes and expansive thoroughfares.\textsuperscript{829} Aside from central Melbourne, this suburb acquired more buildings by prominent architects than any other place in Victoria.\textsuperscript{830} Of those, two designed by Charles Laing for the developer Hugh Glass abut each other on the corner of Gertrude and Brunswick Streets. Glass Terrace facing Gertrude Street was built in two sections between 1854-1856, the later stage designed by Laing and the earlier by David Ross, beside the grander unnamed terrace built in 1856 at numbers 39-49 Brunswick Street.\textsuperscript{831} Many Jewish tenants progressed from one Jewish enclave to another and 45 Brunswick Street demonstrates this social mobility. In 1875 Morris Cohen (1828-1896), relocated from Brunswick Street to the more fashionable Burlington Terrace, in parallel with a change in occupation from furniture broker to financier. His house was then occupied for the succeeding five years by Joseph Benjamin, formerly of King William Street.

Whereas English suburban development has been described as ‘a convergence of aristocratic preference and middle-class needs’, in Australia, suburbia became an intersection


\textsuperscript{831} Fitzroy City Council, "Glass Terrace, 64-78 Gertrude Street, Fitzroy, Victoria, 3065: A Report on Its Architectural Significance and Historic Merit," (Fitzroy: The Sub-Committee of the Fitzroy City Council, 1977), 12.
of democratic political values and Chartist sympathies, structured within a less rigidly defined class system. This produced a society of ‘proprietorship and respectability’ allowing for a diversity of suburban expansion. Glass’s two developments display the heterogeneous nature and social fluidity of mid-century Melbourne. Glass Terrace has been described as the home of professionals, especially doctors and those of the upper-middle class. The rapid social mobility of gold-rush society can here be seen in two interconnected convict families (Figure 6.10), the children of those convicted for the Great Gold Dust Robbery, families who had swindled each other in the process of the crime, but who became neighbours (and mishpacha) in Glass’s two properties.

Figure 6.10. Relationships between Casper and Moses families in Fitzroy

Carlton

Following the 1852 land sales, Carlton grew as a suburban extension to the city of Melbourne. Its initial conception was to resemble the formality of British developments, particularly London’s Bloomsbury or Edinburgh’s New Town, with prominent architects arguing for ‘controlled and homogenous design’ of terrace houses and squares. Although a number of squares were built, the housing was not designed or assembled as those in London or Edinburgh; rather, developers often constructed houses in sequence, creating

---

terraces not necessarily of uniform floorplan, often ‘only welded into an architectural unit when the central pediment was finally added’.\(^\text{835}\) Morton Moss and Mark Moss (1831-1901) as financiers and developers were responsible for significant development in Carlton and Fitzroy as well as holding substantial rural and other urban property. Mark Moss operated principally as a financier, entering into a partnership with Barnard Isaacs in 1865, as the Equitable Loan and Investment Company of Victoria Monte Pieta.\(^\text{836}\)

Miles Lewis describes the southern end of Drummond Street as Carlton’s ‘architectural heartland’ and it was here that the Jewish community concentrated in the block bounded by Victoria and Queensberry Streets.\(^\text{837}\) From the 1860s to the 1880s these terraces were the home to many Jewish families of merchants, hoteliers, pawnbrokers and Rabbis. Such was Melbournia Terrace 1874-1876 built by the developer Woolf Davis (1828-1902), a fancy goods importer (Figure 6.11). Two of his first tenants reflect the economic position of many in Melbourne: Lewis Allan (c.1824-1880) was employed in London as a cigar maker and after arriving in Victoria he established himself as one of a number of Jewish pawnbrokers in the city. By the mid-1860s he was operating a new commercial enterprise as wine and spirit merchant, before returning to his previous occupation, this time titling himself ‘money lender’. Another tenant Hanoverian-born Louis Waterman (c.1821-) a cap maker, married in Liverpool, immigrated in 1871 with his Scottish wife Grace (1833-1883) and six children on the Cospatrick.


\(^{836}\) Argus, 22 April 1865, 7. Although a financier by occupation, Moss became insolvent in 1893, having previously transferred his house Rosebank, Clarendon Street East Melbourne to his wife and died intestate with assets valued at £20. Table Talk, 4 May 1894, 7 and Probate of Mark Moss, PROV Index to Wills, Probate and Administration Records 1841-2009, VPRS 28 03 1399.

\(^{837}\) Lewis, ”Terrace Houses and Gothic Splendour: The Architecture,” 454.
Other than the rows of terraces, two villas of architectural significance stand adjacent on the east side of the Drummond Street (Figure 6.12). *Rosaville*, built for the Harris family, and *Benvenuta* (now Medley Hall), built for Leah Solomon (1832-1914). *Rosaville* completed in 1883 and designed by the Jewish architect Nahum Barnet for Abraham Harris (1853-) and his wife Rose Davis (1857-1894), previous tenants of *Victoria Buildings*. This house is a striking amalgam of Boom Style architecture made exotic through mannerist details to the façade and an elaborate ornamental grill screening the two floors. In 1893, next door Walter Law Scott designed the grander and more flamboyant *Benvenuta*, in high Victorian Baroque style. Leah Solomon was a pawnbroker and the widow of the small arms dealer and pawnbroker Henry Abrahams (c. 1828-1886), the house contained a dining-room, drawing-room, billiard-room, six bedrooms and in light of her occupation a purpose built strong room. 838

838 Henry Abrahams was the son of Alice Abrahams and grandson of Emanuel ‘Money’ Moses of the Great Gold Dust Robbery.
St Kilda

St Kilda was the home of the ‘mercantile community’, consisting of a core group of merchants who had established themselves in the early 1850s, consolidating their position over the following thirty years. Amongst these were a large number of interconnected Jewish families, and their prominence led to Marcus Clarke disparagingly referring to the area as ‘the second Canaan’.

Again, Jews had been at the establishment of the area. In 1857 the architects Ohlfen-Bagge, Spenser and Kursteiner designed a terrace in Barkley Street for German-born merchant Paul Joske (1826-1898), becoming the first terrace constructed east of the Melbourne Town reserve. It can be assumed that Joske’s land ran through to High Street (now St Kilda

---


841 Howard Raggatt, "A Study of the Development of St. Kilda from Its Beginning Till 1873" (University of Melbourne, 1978), 47.
Road), as backing on to the terraces he subsequently developed a row of five shops, which by 1872, appear in his wife’s name. Jews were early residents as well as developers and in the 1850s the suburb was home to Solomon de Beer (1821-1894) and his wife Louisa Hart (1829-c.1909) at Park Terrace, a row of thirteen, six-roomed brick houses in Fitzroy Street; Casper Marks (1793-1879) and his wife Julia Isaacs (c.1797-1874); Gibraltar-born Henry Cohen Pirani (1819-1894), Moritz Michaelis and his family; as well as James Simeon (c.1815-1874) and his wife Eleanor Saunders (c.1826-1910). Eleanor was the niece of Judah Solomon’s de facto wife Elizabeth Howell, and the birth of their son resulted in a meeting of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation ‘to consider the propriety of making guersits’. Unable to secure a conversion for his wife and children in Melbourne, Simeon and his family returned to Europe where Eleanor and four children were converted in The Hague. Returning to Melbourne they were remarried under religious law in September 1854.

---

843 Interestingly Eleanor was not buried as a Jew. Levi, *These Are the Names: Jewish Lives in Australia, 1788-1850*, 745
Significant villas were owned by Moritiz Michaelis (Figure 6.17) and his nephew Isaac Hallenstein, David Rosenthal (c.1826-1910), Israel Bloomington (c.1825-1878), Nathaniel Levi (Figure 6.20), Isaac Jacobs and his brother-in-law Hyman Levinson (Figure 6.17), as well as the architect Nahum Barnet. Between 1864–1890, St Kilda was also a preferred address for forty-four architects including the business partners and popular architects to the Jewish community, Thomas Crouch and Ralph Wilson, of Crouch and Wilson. In St Kilda they built a number of substantial villas from the 1868, including Toldara (Figure 6.13), in Alma Road for the manufacturing jeweller David Rosenthal and Rodebosch (Figure 6.14), in Chapel Street for Israel Bloomington. Both houses share stylistic similarities, being double-storey neo-classical colonnaded buildings, while Rodebosch appears lighter due to the combination of wrought iron and solid columns on the upper floor, creating a delicacy lacking in the heavier Toldara with its symmetrical paring of Doric columns on the lower colonnade with Corinthian on its upper.

Figure 6.14. Rodebosch, 1868

845 Toldara, still exists behind a 1960s block of flats, while Rodebosch is now incorporated into St Michael Grammar School.
Figure 6.15. Northampton Buildings, c.1858

The tight endogamy of the Jewish community can be witnessed at Northampton Buildings, a row of terraces built by 1858, owned by Isaac Jacobs and Abraham Benjamin (Figure 6.15). Manchester in the 1830s and 1840s had experienced the immigration of a number of German Jewish families, fleeing political oppression, often from areas where the Jewish population was engaged with the radical sentiments which finally erupted in 1848. Amongst those who fled to Manchester at this time were a group who became prominent jewellers in the city, including Bromberg-born David Falk (1816-1858) and his kinsman Louis Beaver. By 1851 David Falk operated a business employing another Prussian-born Manchurian, Isaac Jacobs. A year later, Jacobs arrived in Victoria representing the Falk’s firm, eventually forming a partnership with Philip and Salis Falk as P & S Falk, general merchants, which they operated from Manchester, Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney. Meanwhile, another Manchester-based jeweller, Abraham Benjamin (c.1832-1912) and his wife Theresa Falk (c.1837-1907), arrived in Melbourne aboard the Somersetshire. He too later formed a partnership with Phillip and Salis Falk as P Falk and Co, while a nephew, Salis Schank (1839-1892), operated the Adelaide side of the business. In 1870 Northampton

---

846 Argus, 26 June 1858, 3 and J.E.S. Vardy, Surveyor &c.
Buildings hosted a double wedding, that of Salis Schank to Laura Beaver, the other couple being Laura’s elder sister Evelyn who also married a German-born spouse, Julius Salenger (1831-1910). These family connections were further cemented with the employment of their brother Albert, a manager of Phillip Falk and Co (Figure 6.16).  

The initial establishment committee of the St Kilda Hebrew congregation represents a microcosm of the demographic make-up of the St Kilda community; of the ten members of this committee, five were born in Germany or Prussia, two in Australia and one in Wales. David Abraham (c.1830-1898) was a money broker, while the other committee members were manufacturers and merchants in jewellery, tanners, and in the tobacco industry. Moritz Michaelis and Isaac Hallenstein were uncle and nephew, Nelson Marks (1836-1908) and Isaac Jacobs were brothers-in-law, while the Hon. Secretary, Hyman Hart (1846-1931) represented Melbourne’s earliest settlement, the son of Edward (1818-1854) and Isabella Hart (1827-1910), whose 1844 wedding was the first Jewish marriage to take place in  

---

Figure 6.16. The interconnected Falk family

---

Victoria. The establishment of the synagogue and its location further encouraged the community to congregate around this pocket of St Kilda.

The Land Boom

The Developer

As the children of gold immigrants reached adulthood, the 1880s saw a second phase of rapid development in Melbourne, the city being again rebuilt, creating an urban fabric of extensive public buildings and modern infrastructure. Public and private growth was funded through substantial borrowings. Across Australia in the thirty years between 1860–1890 gross residential investment represented one third of capital formation.\textsuperscript{849} This was underwritten by loans from Britain; in the four years from 1886 these were estimated to be worth £20,000,000 annually, with considerably more than half flowing into Victoria. In the decade prior to 1891, this funding subsidised Melbourne’s residential expansion, increasing Melbourne’s dwellings by more than forty thousand.\textsuperscript{850} Public borrowing was supported by private borrowing and the influence of the private ‘financiers’ and large scale pawnbrokers of Melbourne in supporting the boom is an area which requires further research.\textsuperscript{851} By 1893, in

\textsuperscript{849} Butlin, \textit{Investment in Australian Economic Development, 1861-1900}, 211.


\textsuperscript{851} Charles Coppel has written on such an investor-his grandfather Albert Coppel (1872-1950), pawnbroker turned financier and land developer of the early twentieth century. Charles Coppel, "The Rise and Fall of Albert Coppel," \textit{Australia Jewish Historical Society} XXII, no. 1 (2014).
Benjamin Fink was one of the greatest speculators of the boom period, and his activities are described by Michael Cannon: ‘Nobody else...started so many billowing companies, borrowed so heavily, speculated so widely, failed so disastrously, or left such a swathe of ruin and despair.’ At the same time Benjamin Fink epitomises the integrated nature of place making of Victorian Jewry. Born in Guernsey in 1847 to Prussian parents, Moses Fink (1810-1885) and Gertrude Ascher (1821-1893), Benjamin Fink was educated on the island, before being sent to London to attend the Jews College. The family immigrated in 1861 to join his uncle Hirsch Fink in Geelong, and Moses took to the road as an itinerant hawker, but within a few years was describing himself as a ‘merchant’ and ‘financier’. At sixteen Benjamin Fink sailed to New Zealand to begin a career as a produce dealer. Returning to Victoria two years later, he accepted a position with Maurice Aron (c.1844-1918) at the furniture firm Wallach Bros in Elizabeth Street, and quickly rose to be a partner. In 1880 he secured a loan of £60,000 to buy out his partner and expanded Wallach’s to Sydney where he opened two stores. At the height of the boom he spent £120,000 rebuilding Wallach’s Melbourne emporium, expanding it to provide floor space of two and half acres. The business was further enlarged by the purchase of Steinfeld Levinson and Company, a furniture manufacturing firm owned by the brothers-in-law Emanuel Steinfeld and Hyman Levinson, as well as through the purchase of Steinfeld’s warehouse in Elizabeth Street. Fink further grew his business with the acquisition of another neighbouring furniture emporium W.H. Rocke, the oldest furniture business in the city.

Furniture was only one of the many enterprises Fink undertook. His career has been detailed by Michael Cannon, but a summary will explain the complex web of investments

---

852 *Argus*, 4 March 1893, 6.
853 Cannon, *The Land Boomers, the Complete Illustrated History*, 281.
855 Leavitt, *Australian Representative Men*, 217.
856 *Table Talk*, 10 March 1893, 11-12.
and speculations which created so much, but ultimately left a trail of ruin. The 1880s saw him acquire interest in coal-mines, gold-mines and pastoral properties. He established a private bank—the Joint Stock Bank of Ballarat—which within twenty four hours of establishment had ‘£100,000 of paid-up capital with a reserve fund of £12,500’. He later merged this with the City of Melbourne Bank, creating the colony’s largest gold buying concern, and providing Fink with credit to undertake further activity.

In 1883 he was elected to the Legislative Assembly representing Maryborough and Talbot, the electorate in which his mining interests were located. This was not a stellar career, and his was described by Leavitt as a ‘silent member’, but ‘respected for his independence, truthfulness and utter incorruptibleness’. The 1880s saw Fink turn his attention to speculation and he began a project to rebuild large parts of central Melbourne, erecting Fink’s Building on the Corner of Flinders and Elizabeth Streets at a cost of £110,000, creating the Block Arcade as one of Melbourne’s leading shopping hubs and rebuilding Georges Ltd (Figure 6.18). Other ventures included the purchase of Coles Book Arcade at a cost of £40,000, Gresham’s buildings for £52,000, and he successfully convinced the Stock Exchange to relocate and build on his land reaping a further profit of £55,000. He also converted a number of sites into shops and offices and invested in a series of Melbourne hotels, purchasing the Ballarat Star, Albion, Saracen’s Head, Governor Arthur and the Rose and Crown. After purchasing McCracken’s Brewery in 1888 for £250,000 he attempted a public float of £2,000,000. His biggest speculative venture was the Mercantile Finance Co, Ltd which he formed in 1885 taking over the accountancy firm of Andrew Lyell and J.M. Howden and floating it on the Stock Exchange. There was little interest in this venture, until it began returning investments of forty and fifty percent, in what turned out to be an elaborate Ponzi scheme and market manipulation.

Reforming a partnership with Maurice Aron in the furniture trade, the pair established three public companies as equal shareholders, Wallach & Co, W.H.Rocke Ltd

---


858 Leavitt, Australian Representative Men, 218.

859 Ibid., 218.
and Maurice Aron & Co, incorporated with capital of £700,000 of which £350,000 were in shares in the names of Fink, Aron and their nominees. This attempt at a monopoly of the furniture trade may have succeeded, but coincided with a down-turn in the economy, which was followed by depression. The entire empire was funded through a complex network of cross-financing which on collapsing was never fully untangled. At the time of his insolvency in 1892 he owed somewhere in the vicinity of £1,500,000-1,820,000, but it would appear that before his ruin, he had transferred considerable property to his wife Catherine Fink (1854-1943). Throughout the next fifteen years Catherine resold parts of the empire in her own name. The couple fled the country after claiming an assassination attempt and in 1901 they were living in the Russell Hotel, Bloomsbury.\textsuperscript{860} It was in London that Benjamin died intestate in 1909.

\textit{Figure 6. 18. The Block Arcade, 1892}

\textsuperscript{860} 1901 Census for England and Wales.
Space can be physical and intellectual, and the society magazine *Table Talk*, established in 1885 by Maurice Brodzky, provided both. Within the magazine’s coverage of Melbourne’s social life, it fully integrated that of the Jewish community, reporting marriages, balls and other gatherings alongside those of Melbourne’s non-Jewish society. Throughout the landboom, the magazine was particularly influential in its investigation and coverage of the speculative land developers. Articles alerted readers to the shady financial dealing which funded this surge of building and widely reported the subsequent economic crash in the early 1890s. This was achieved through Brodsky’s close association with the Fink brothers, particularly Theodore Fink (1855-1942). It has been speculated that Theodore, an insolvency and company lawyer, politician and for nearly fifty years the owner of the influential *Herald and Weekly Times* group of newspapers provided capital for the publication. 861 Theodore Fink also provided much of the insider information published, reflected in the oft quoted phrase ‘Information in the hands of Fink, Best and Phillips is understood’. From 1891, the magazine focused more and more on company manipulations and less and less on society gossip and cultural interests. 862 As investors sought to understand the machinations of the speculation occurring around them, the circulation of the magazine rose rapidly, but this was equally matched by a decrease in advertising revenue.

Brodzky’s cosmopolitan education and career provided a level of depth and sophistication, which is reflected in the diversity of his output. His life reads something like an adventure story: apparently pulled from a burning house shortly after birth; educated in London, Vienna and Paris, he fought as a volunteer for France in the Franco-Prussian War; and on arrival in Victoria was shipwrecked. 863 Although initially beginning a career as a teacher of Hebrew, French and German in Melbourne, it was the English-speaking world which facilitated his multinational journalism career which took him to Melbourne, Sydney,
Queensland, London and New York. His marriage to Florence Leon (1861-), whose brother Samuel (1849-) married Theodora Fink (1851-), initially provided the connection to the Fink brothers. His journalism career was launched through his initial employment at Theodore Fink’s Herald newspaper, and in addition he was engaged as the Australian correspondent for the Daily Telegraph, further developing his international connections. While employed at the Herald, Brodzky also published two books with an Australian Jewish theme, Genius Lunacy & Knavery: A Story of a Colonial Physician (1876), the life of Dr David Hailperin, a Rabbi of Polish birth, who in the 1850s claimed to be able to detect the divine location of gold, but proved to be a fraud, and another entitled Historical Sketch of the Two Melbourne Synagogues (1877). Brodzky was twice declared insolvent, in both instances due to the loss of libel cases. The first in 1885, just prior to founding Table Talk, was against the Reverend Elias Blaubaum of the St Kilda Hebrew Congregation. In 1902 he lost a second case, after claiming that the State labour leader was an accessory to a criminal act. The outcome of this second insolvency was the forfeiting of the magazine. Yet again he was saved, inheriting $1,000,000 on the suicide of a wealthy nephew. The family travelled to San Francisco where they survived the 1906 earthquake before relocating to New York, where Brodsky died in 1919.

The Investor

Searching the directories indicates the great fluidity and social mobility of the residents of Melbourne. Although many families appear to be constantly shifting house, this was not always due to economic necessity; rather, a number of wealthy individuals moved with great regularity. Particular amongst these is Lawrence Benjamin (1836-1898), who from the 1870s and especially in the heady 1880s, built a large portfolio of investment properties and dwellings. As a financier, he arranged many private mortgages for commercial and residential building projects and was responsible for the collection of rents for others. London-born

---

865 Cannon, The Land Boomers, the Complete Illustrated History, 132.
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Benjamin immigrated in 1852 on the Cambridge, marrying his first wife Elizabeth Solomon (1830-1877) at the Melbourne Hebrew Congregations in 1856. Starting a family and in business as a clothier, he lived in the Victoria Buildings before moving to the more desirable Burlington Terrace. Two years later he again shifted house, this time to Fontainebleau in Victoria Parade, before returning with his family to London where he was now sufficiently wealthy to occupy a house in Upper Bedford Place, Russell Square. On his return voyage in 1877, Elizabeth died on-board ship and the widowed family settled again in Melbourne. Engaging the architects Crouch and Wilson, Benjamin built Rosenau in Victoria Parade. Following his 1891 remarriage to Clara Benjamin (1864-1937) he commissioned a new and grander house Clarence in Queens Road, designed by John Beswicke, and here he died seven years later.869 Benjamin’s probate lists a considerable fortune of £215,980 including a large property portfolio valued at £138,321 comprising his home in Queens Road, the Beehive Chambers, Wuballow St Kilda Road, Witherleigh, Evelina Road, Toorak, Roseau Dalgety Street St Kilda, another timber house in Brunswick Street, Fitzroy, brick warehouses in Flinders Lane, two shops in Elizabeth Street, two city hotels, vacant land in Moonee Ponds and South Melbourne, as well as four two-storeyed buildings in North Melbourne and Collins street.870

Figure 6.19. Clarence, 1891

869 Ibid., 3.7.
870 Will of Lawrence Benjamin, PROV Index to Wills, Probate and Administration Records 1841-2009, VPRS 28 P0000 906.
Not all families survived the crash. In 1888 David Rosenthal’s firm Rosenthal and Aronson had one hundred employees.\textsuperscript{871} In 1893 when he drafted his will he had substantial assets to distribute, but on his death seventeen years later he left no property and a personal estate valued at only £120.\textsuperscript{872} Benjamin Benjamin lost the £60,000 inheritance from his father and was in turn declared insolvent, when he naively floated a bank with unscrupulous advisors and partners.\textsuperscript{873} For those families who did survive the crash, consolidation of their property holdings could be achieved through intermarriage. This can be vividly observed in the fascinating collection of auction notices retained from the firm Sydney, Arnold, Best and Co, held in the University of Melbourne Archives. Although Lawrence Benjamin’s son Randolph (1868-1959) was his principal beneficiary, his daughter Jane (1858-1909) and her financier husband Bernard Marks (1852-1915) built upon Benjamin’s legacy. The Marks portfolio at the time of their deaths included Nestlwood, a two-story eleven-roomed residence at 187 George St East Melbourne, another family home of equal size Branda in Mitford Street, St Kilda, factories and warehouses in Niagara Lane, Little Bourke Street and Crossley Street, Melbourne, a row of shops in High Street, Malvern and other shops in South Melbourne and St Kilda, vacant land in St Kilda and a hotel and warehouse complex in Lonsdale Street.\textsuperscript{874} The marriage in 1900, between Lizzie Marks (1877-1936) and Joseph Isaacs (1865-), the grandson of Elias Moses, saw the amalgamation of two dynasties of Melbourne property investors (Figure 6.19).


\textsuperscript{872} Will and Probate of David Rosenthal, PROV Index to Wills, Probate and Administration Records 1841-2009, VPRS 28 P0003 129 and VPRS 7591 P0002 447.

\textsuperscript{873} The case is laid out in detail in Cannon, \textit{The Land Boomers, the Complete Illustrated History}, Chapter 28.

\textsuperscript{874} Sydney Arnold and Best Collection, University of Melbourne Archives, 1968.0012 Unit 3.
The Jewish Architect

From the middle ages, Jews had been excluded from guilds throughout Europe and thus training and practice in architecture and building were also barred to them, further restricted by the necessity for articled pupillage. The first modern English Jewish architect was David Mocatta, articled to Sir John Soane in 1821. Architectural practice requires patronage by the client and this again has historically precluded Jewish involvement. Throughout the nineteenth century only one Jewish architect practised in Victoria, and his career spanned the boom and its aftermath. He was perhaps the most influential Jewish creator of space. Nahum Barnet, born in Melbourne and educated at Scotch College and the University of Melbourne, was a public figure, a frequent contributor to the press, writing on issues as diverse as building style, the provision of open space, public transport, public health, the provision of public art, Jewish ritual and practice and labour politics and involved in a number of Jewish cultural and charitable organisations. As an architect, his interest was in buildings suitable for an Australian climate. This is particularly evident in his residential designs, where his preference was for materials which would maximise climate control, reinforced by designs which shielded interiors from harsh light. In his attempts to design...

---
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for Australian conditions he stylistically evolved, moving from Gothic Revival and Romanesque to Classicism and Art Nouveau. This interest is evident in the incorporation of Australian motifs in schemes such as the capitals of the *Allen’s Building* designed with Terry & Oakden in Collins Street in 1887.878

Barnet’s career was launched in 1883 when he won a competition to design the Working Men’s College in partnership with the firm of Terry and Oakden with whom he had undertaken his articles.879 As a prolific architect, designing everything from theatres to shops, synagogues, office buildings, houses, factories and warehouses, his vision and expertise shaped the fabric of Melbourne. His private clients included a number of Jewish families, in 1888 for Nathaniel Levi he designed the architecturally restrained *Liverpool*, Princess Street, St Kilda, and named after Levi’s place of birth (Figure 6.20). Projects for other Jewish clients included a factory for David Rosenthal in Lonsdale Street, a house in Hotham Street, East Melbourne for David Benjamin, extensions and alterations to Theodore Fink’s house in Walsh Street, South Yarra, and as we will discuss, his extension and rebuilding of the St Kilda Hebrew Congregation and the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation.

![Figure 6.21. Liverpool, 1888](image)

---
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Barnet’s career and public writing show him a man of empire, simultaneously British and Australian, while being staunchly ‘ethnically’ Jewish. Although creating architecture which was self-consciously Australian, his allegiance to the British Empire was strong, witnessed in his Presidency of the Anglo-Jewish Association, in his description of himself as a ‘British’ Australian, and in his assertion that Australian Jewry should maintain loyalty to the Chief Rabbi Dr Herman Adler. This duality is seen in his debates promoting adaptation of synagogue services and ritual to ensure contemporary Judaism remained relevant and engaging to the local community.880

Religious Space

As equal citizens in a free society, Melbourne Jewry has claimed space and equality for their religious requirements. The stylistic choices and selection of architects for their public building and private dwellings were a public affirmation of the community as sophisticated and educated equals. This is particularly apparent in the synagogues created for and by the community. Synagogues have a three-fold purpose: as a place of congregational worship, as a space for study and as a centre for communal activities. Being neither hierarchical nor centralised, Judaism is based around the congregation and each synagogue preserves the faith, laws and traditions of its community. Thus the synagogue’s sanctity comes from the activity undertaken within it, rather than the building itself, and as has happened in Melbourne, synagogues can be sold or rebuilt if their purpose is no longer being fulfilled.881

The founding of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation raised the one issue which challenged the equality of Jewish space—the recognition of Judaism under the Church Act. Within the Australian Colonies no official declaration or legal enactment defining the position of Jews was made, and this was assumed to be an indirect indication of equal rights.882 As Gretzler notes, the deed of grant for the allotment of a synagogue in Melbourne explicitly accepts Judaism as an element in society:

880 Jewish Herald, 1 February 1901, 14; October 1910, 10 and 20 January 1888, 7.
882 Getzler, Neither Toleration nor Favour; the Australian Chapter of Jewish Emancipation, 51.
Know ye that in order to promote Religion and Education in our territory of New South Wales We of our Grace have granted...all that piece of parcel of land...for the errection thereon of a synagogue for the use if the Members of the Jewish Persuasion and for no other purpose whatsoever\textsuperscript{883}

Concern arose over the payment of religious leaders, which for the Christian communities were subsidised under the Church Act of 1836. The original drafting by Governor Bourke had ‘granted assistance systematically to more than one Church… a claim is given to assistance upon the same principal to every Congregation of Dissenters and of Jews’. But when the Act was passed, it had been diluted to provide for ‘for the advancement of the Christian religion’ and thus Jews were excluded. Israel Getzler argues that this change arose from an attempt to be inclusive of Catholics and Dissenters in the Colony, at a time when the Jewish community of un-organised convicts was so small that the omission was not considered relevant. Although aid was granted through other acts and charters, the battle for equal recognition of Jewish interests simmered for the next thirty years, as concepts defining a Christian state within the framework of a disestablished Church were debated. This issue was still unresolved in 1851 when Victoria separated from New South Wales.\textsuperscript{884}

As members of society and as tax payers, it was argued that the Jewish community:

considered themselves loyal subjects of the British crown, with the rest of their fellow-colonists and contributing alike with them towards the support of the State, deem themselves justly entitled to a share of the revenue raised in this colony, to assist them in maintaining their religious establishments.\textsuperscript{885}

In a parliamentary debate on the matter, John Pascoe Fawkner summed up the favourable position of the community: ‘The Jews were as quiet and orderly a class of men as any in the British dominions, and were entirely free from vagabonds and beggars. Our book of religion was received from the Jews, and if on that ground alone, we ought to admit them to equal privileges with ourselves. The Jews are very liberal with their charity even to those persons

\textsuperscript{883} Quoted in ibid., 83.

\textsuperscript{884} Ibid., 19-20.

\textsuperscript{885} Jewish Chronicle, 25 April 1851, 230.
who were not of their own communities.\textsuperscript{886} Although the Victorian parliament removed oaths of allegiance, supremacy and abjuration in 1856, it took until 1862 for aid to be granted to the Jewish community.\textsuperscript{887}

In pre-emancipated communities, synagogues were generally externally discrete, and in many places were prohibited from possessing facades facing public streets, resulting in the sophistication of the architecture and richness saved for the privacy of their interiors. Emancipation allowed communities to utilise this public face, to communicate their cultural sophistication and social respectability, while simultaneously announcing their ‘Jewishness.’ Throughout Europe, Jewish communities initiated building projects that ensured synagogues became visible components of the urban landscape, proclaiming their presence through size, architectural distinctiveness, location, religious symbols, and rituals.\textsuperscript{888}

No one architectural style was developed to characterise synagogue architecture; rather communities employed a variety of rival styles ranging from Classical to Romanesque, Greek to Egyptian to symbolise the cultural and political aspirations of their communities in the new post-emancipation world. Hobart Synagogue, erected in 1842 and the oldest surviving Australian synagogue was built in an Egyptian revival style, as were those of York Street, Sydney (1843) (Figure 6.21); Launceston (1844) and Adelaide (1850). Egyptian revival was a style made fashionable by Napoleon’s conquest of Egypt in 1798, and reinforced through the symbols of Freemasonry, and particularly spread through the British colonies, by architects who subscribed to Freemasonry. Others considered it to be the architecture of Solomon’s Temple and therefore suitable for synagogue architecture. Egyptian revival was deemed a suitable architectural style as ‘an expression of the desire to make an identity statement in open societies where Jews faced little discrimination but where Jewishness was subject to rapid evaporation’.\textsuperscript{889} Many Old and New World Ashkenazi synagogues chose a Moorish revival style, reflecting the ‘oriental’ roots of Judaism, and forging a perceived link

\textsuperscript{886} \textit{Argus}, 11 September 1852, 4-5.
\textsuperscript{887} Getzler, \textit{Neither Toleration nor Favour; the Australian Chapter of Jewish Emancipation}, 107.
to the cultural esteem of Spanish Jewry and to the Muslim world. Moorish architecture had
the added cache of aristocratic flamboyance, as expressed in the Brighton Pavilion.\textsuperscript{890} Although a few Moorish Revival Synagogues appeared in England, synagogue architecture
here tended to be more restrained, conforming to the existing urban fabric, ‘reflecting the
internalised contemporary Victorian codes regarding appropriate public and private display,
and in synagogue design this translated into aesthetic composure rather than flamboyance,
into a religiously distinctive interior and a typically English exterior’.\textsuperscript{891} This was an
architecture reflecting the level of acculturation of British Jewry through ‘dimensional space,
structure, form and style’.\textsuperscript{892}

\textbf{Figure 6.22. The Sydney Synagogue, 1848}

In a society where ‘architectural tone and style’ were considered to be indicative of
the character of a community, the first two synagogues in Melbourne exhibited a particular
Anglo restraint, an expression of the community’s outward projection of decorum and good
manners. In 1844 the first of these, the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, received a land
grant for a building in Bourke Street adjoining St Patrick’s Hall (Figure 6.23).\textsuperscript{893} Responding
to the symbolic importance of design, the community commissioned all seven synagogue

\textsuperscript{890} Ivan Davidson Kalmar, "Moorish Style: Orientalism, the Jews and Synagogue Architecture," \textit{Jewish Social Studies} 7, no. 3 (2001): 70-77.

\textsuperscript{891} Snyder, \textit{Building a Public Judaism: Synagogues and Jewish Identity in Nineteenth-Century Europe}, 17.


buildings from notable contemporary architects. This began in the 1840s, with the appointment of Charles Laing to design the first synagogue building. Laing not only designed the synagogue, but was also engaged by a number of Jewish developers, particularly Solomon and Moses Benjamin for their private schemes.894

Figure 6.23. The Melbourne Hebrew Congregation and St Patrick’s Hall

By the 1850s the synagogue had become too small and for the High Holidays of 1852-5613 the community was obliged to fit 100 members into a space initially designed for 70 and accommodate another 70 in the school room, set up as a temporary synagogue for the purpose.895 To remedy this, they decided to rebuild an enlarged synagogue. In 1853 they established a building fund, and commissioned Charles Webb to be the architect. Webb designed a Greek Revival temple, graced by imposing double height Doric columns supporting a pediment roof. Greek Revival was a style used for non-conformist Christians in

895 *Jewish Chronicle*, 21 January 1853, 127.
Britain and unusual for synagogue architecture (Figure 6.24). The building lacked any Jewish distinctiveness, which was left for the interior arrangement, as reported in the Argus:

The interior of the synagogue is of a striking character-lofty, roomy, and richly ornamented. At the extremity opposite the entrance is the ‘holy of holies’, surrounded by gilded Corinthian pillars and foliated frieze work, and reached by a short flight of broad steps. An inscription in Hebrew signifying ‘Remember before whom thou standest’, is placed immediately over the ark or ‘holy of holies’, and above this appear twin tablets bearing the ten commandments. Inside the ark the sacred scrolls, enveloped in velvet wrappings and with silver bells and pointers attached, are deposited. The doors of the ark are concealed by a beautiful curtain appropriately embroidered. On either side of the recess containing the ark appear, respectively, Hebrew and English versions of the Jewish formula of prayer for the royal family…

The ladies who attend the synagogue are provided with a gallery for their especial behalf… a common thing in English synagogues to place a somewhat intricate iron railing in front of the gallery, so that the fair occupants are almost concealed from the view of their brethren below. Here, however, the committee has had the good taste to omit this apparently grotesque and unnecessary screen.

---
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After seceding from Melbourne, the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation initially operated from a hall in Lonsdale Street. Two years later the community also received a land grant for a property in Stephen Street (now Exhibition Street), on the corner of Little Lonsdale Street, commissioning a design by Kerr and Knight, architects of Parliament House. The Victorian Heritage Register defines the architectural significance of this building ‘as an interesting example of the conservative Classical style, unusually applied to a Synagogue, and of the small scale work of Knight and Kerr. The conservative Classical style was more commonly used by the Methodists and Baptists’. The citation continues by comparing this small and restrained building to Knight and Kerr's major and parallel commission, that of Parliament House, the first stages of which were being designed concurrently with the that of the synagogue. 898

Also outgrowing this initial iteration, in 1877 the congregation moved from the less desirable Stephen Street, to a substantial new building in Albert Street, East Melbourne, closer to its wealthy congregants. This location situates the synagogue squarely in the middle of the religious and parliamentary precinct of Melbourne, flanked by the Roman Catholic Cathedral and a number of other important churches of various dominations. This affiliation with the religious establishment was reinforced through the selection of the architects for

898 Victorian Heritage Register, "Former Mickveh Yisrael Synagogue and School (Sic)," (Heritage Council of Victoria, 2015).
this project, Crouch and Wilson. Not only were they fashionable architects of residential developments, but due to Thomas Crouch's strong Wesleyan-Quaker background, the partners were particularly noted for their ecclesiastical work, responsible for over forty churches in Victoria and Tasmania. 899

An outward expression of emancipation was a change in synagogue form from being subtle and hidden in the urban fabric, to proudly proclaiming their presence through their architectural significance and outward symbolism. 900 Although the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation is of neo-classical design flanked by squat mansard towers, it projects overtly Jewish symbolism on its exterior, with a Magen David in the middle of the pediment front and its Hebrew name proudly emblazoned on the banding between the floors.

In his discussions of synagogues within an emancipatory environment, Lerner describes a new confidence in the public's imagination, for synagogues '[t]he signifying power … derived in a large part from its role in a larger story…In the speeches of the community presidents and patriotic Rabbis, the story is often of Progress of Civilisation in which emancipation constitutes the key event, the proof of the gradual improvement of the lot of humankind'. 901 In a similar vein, the consecrations of Melbourne's synagogues and other public Jewish institutions were widely reported in the press, underpinning the integrated nature of the community, with particular attention drawn to the non-Jewish dignitaries in attendance.

Whereas many have observed that population growth in England and Europe was not matched by a growth in religious institutions, particularly churches, this was not the case for the Melbourne (or Victoria) where the Jewish community had established two Synagogues by the 1850s expanding and rebuilding these and establishing a third by the 1870s. 902 Synagogues were also established in Bendigo, Ballarat and Geelong, with Sefer Torah, being lent (at a cost) to smaller regional centres on the goldfields.

899 Goad and Willis, The Encyclopedia of Australian Architecture, 183.
By the 1870s there was a Jewish population in St Kilda significant in size to warrant the creation of a third synagogue in the city. At a meeting at Israel Bloomington’s home Rodebosch, a committee chaired by Moritz Michaelis was formed to inaugurate a new community. Like its sister synagogues, the first services, for the High Holidays of 1871-5632, were held in the local Town Hall, with a foundation stone and a new building being laid the following year. Again Crouch and Wilson were selected as architects, although their design was made architecturally more substantial with the addition of twin towers by Nahum Barnet in 1904. By the 1920s this building in Charnwood Road was also considered too small and the site was sold and a new synagogue erected across the road, designed by Joseph Plottel (1873-1977) and based on the model of a synagogue in Chicago (Figure 6.25).

Figure 6.25. The St Kilda Synagogues 1880 and c.1930

---
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As early as 1874, the committee of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation had considered moving the synagogue to a more populous part of the city. This was not achieved for another generation following the residential depopulation of central Melbourne, relocating in the early twentieth century, moving to a socially prominent position just behind Melbourne’s premier boulevard St Kilda Road, and immediately behind the Anglican establishment’s school Melbourne Grammar. This new building was designed by Nahum Barnet, and as with its sister congregation in St Kilda, in scale this new building was a ‘cathedral’ which through the incorporation of religiously neutral classical architecture, echoed the monumental synagogues of post-emancipation Europe, particularly those of Berlin, Florence and Rome (Figure 6.26).

![Figure 6.26. The Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, 1930](image)

As the Jewish community grew in tandem with the rest of the city, the land acquired by grant or purchase connected the community into Melbourne’s social, cultural and political power structures in a way that would not have been possible in old world cities. Not only

---
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were Jewish architects, developers and clients active creators of public and private architecture within the city, but through the location and siting for these buildings, the community was able to make a public and conscious decision to align themselves with the powerful and the fashionable within the city. While this influence is often subtle and reflects adaptability to social and cultural requirements, it is that of an independent and emancipated community continually shaping space to meet their contemporary demands.

Like their contemporaries, the community lived dispersed throughout the city, settling in new areas as these were established. What can be observed is a preference to live in neighbourhoods connected by various forms of endogamy, in close proximity to their immediate families or business partners. This is not a ghetto formation; rather it reflects the interconnectedness of a community, at once prepared to engage with the opportunities that the city offered, while supporting and maintaining a minority community.

As a city grows and develops, its early form is lost and transformed. This applies equally to the Jewish presence in Melbourne, with synagogues growing and expanding to meet new demands, and as this organic growth occurred the initial two synagogues were rebuilt or sold. In some cases the Jewish presence has been obliterated. What was initially Synagogue Lane had by 1868 become Little Queen Street (later renamed Bourke Lane). In other areas, the presence has been transformed; the Knight and Kerr synagogue in Exhibition Street is now a restaurant, and its statement of significance describes its progressive use as a venue for social welfare activities.907

William Westgarth commenting on early Melbourne suggested that new societies in a state of flux exhibited no cohesion and unity.908 The observations gained from the Melbourne Jewish community, through their patterns of residential location and architecture, would seem to dispute this. This was a community expressing its pride and wealth through the built environment, while contemporaneously maintaining tight family endogamy and shaping the city to their requirements.

907 Brown-May, The Itinerary of Our Days: The Historical Experience of the Street in Melbourne, 1837-1923, 160; Victorian Heritage Register, "Former Mickveh Yisrael Synagogue and School (Sic)."

Chapter 7 Public Office

In pre-emancipation societies, ‘the political status of Jews was inseparable from their religious status’, although subject to similar political and economic frameworks, Jews and Christians operated within two distinct societies.\textsuperscript{909} Lacking exclusion from political participation in the unfettered society of the Australian colonies precipitated a flowering of civic participation by the small Jewish community. For colonial development, their cosmopolitanism and their multifarious relationships delivered to these isolated communities a diverse intellectual and economic resource. From the mid-nineteenth century Victorian Jewry engaged in active citizenship, volunteering their service and providing expertise in a range of civil, political and communal organisations.\textsuperscript{910} Internationally their skills and connections were also employed by governments in research and strategy, as advisors and members of Royal Commissions, as Commissioners in the inter-colonial and international exhibitions in Melbourne and as consuls representing foreign Governments. For ambitious and socially aware Jews, participation brought not only social recognition but also an opportunity for meaningful influence over the shape of this new society and a concrete representation of the values of \textit{Tikun Olam}.

Those seeking public office were on occasion subject to anti-Semitic attacks in the press, but these were sporadic and do not appear to have unduly influenced public opinion. The community responded to such attacks less as a serious threat to their civic status; rather, such attacks were considered to be undermining of the dignity that the community were seeking to establish, a dignity which was recognised as a challenge to the bigotry witnessed in Europe.\textsuperscript{911} The disproportionately large number of people engaged in public office would indicate that anti-Semitism did not hinder participation or support for candidates.

Unlike in Europe, where political emancipation was slow and often non-linear, the process of colonisation and the establishment of representative government within the


\textsuperscript{910} For a discussion on active citizenship see David Cesarani and Mary Fulbrook, \textit{Citizenship, Nationality, and Migration in Europe} (London; Routledge, 1996), Chapter 4.
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colonies caused a unique and somewhat contractionary response to Jewish civil participation. The colonies were settled and established during the final push for emancipation in Britain. This was a political issue revolving around the necessity to undertake the Oath of Abjuration, whereby office holders were required to swear as an Anglican and subsequently following the Catholic Emancipation Act, as a Christian. The Oath not only excluded Jews from holding office under the Crown, but also from any roles in civic government, parliament, or employment in the administration of justice.\(^9\) This was an indirect form of exclusion, which Anglo-Jewry strove to overcome in other areas, partaking in social and economic life, demonstrating in a practical sense their integrated nature within British society.\(^9\) In Australia, the establishment of representative government caused a unique and somewhat contractionary response to Jewish civil participation, coinciding with the final push for emancipation. Emancipation is considered complete in 1858 when Lionel Rothschild was able to take his seat in parliament, a seat won ten years previously, and which although re-elected on several occasions he was unable to fulfil due to the restrictive nature of the oath. With the establishment of the Australian colonies, English law was transferred, and then subsequently overwritten or adapted by colonial legislatures. This included the swearing of oaths of office, formally excluding all who were not members of the Church of England. Although application of these restrictions was applied as a form of social or class hegemony, they do not appear to have been strictly enforced as Jews were not excluded from civic office. In 1843, fifteen years before Lionel Rothschild was able to take his seat in England, Saul Samuel (later Sir ) (1820-1900) was elected to the first Legislative Council in New South Wales, representing the Counties of Roxburgh and Wellington. In Victoria, Jews stood as candidates in local government almost as soon as Melbourne was granted representative government in 1842, and David Roberto Furtado was elected auditor for the city of Melbourne (a role he refused) in 1852. It was not until 1857 and 1858 that South Wales and Victoria introduced acts officially removing the religious considerations for the swearing of oaths,\(^9\) the Victorian Act reading:

Whereas the civil and religious rights and liberties of all Her Majesty’s subjects in Victoria are and ought to be absolutely equal irrespective of their faith or form of belief…it is expedient to provide and establish two uniform oaths or affirmations of allegiance and office respectively in lieu of the oaths and declarations now by law required in that behalf.915

Melbourne Jewry kept up a constant flow of information about communal affairs through reports to the London-based Jewish Chronicle. In the 1860s the correspondents were commenting on local conditions. ‘All denominations being placed upon equal footing, Jews here could hold the highest office in the State.’916 ‘Every position a citizen can hold, is occupied by our co-religionists—magistrates, legislators, city and municipal councillors, and chairmen of municipalities.’917

Although the goldfields attracted numerous ‘Chartists and continental revolutionaries’, it cannot be established how many of the Jewish population had Chartist sympathies or had immigrated as a result of the revolutions of 1848.918 What is clear is that in a society without racially based enfranchisement, the Jewish community took up the opportunities offered with alacrity. By the mid-1850s, European-born Jewish merchants in the gold towns were eagerly taking up naturalisation, with bundles of interrelated applications submitted from across Victoria. With naturalisation, these men could purchase property, becoming rate payers and eligible to vote, a civic duty unavailable in most parts of Europe. Thompson asserts that commercial occupations were generally incompatible with political leadership, where ‘the colonies were mere milk cows.’919 This was not the case in Melbourne where the Jewish community principally consisted of merchants and manufacturers; and it was merchants who dominated the political institutions of Melbourne.920 Although excluded from some of the more establishment institutions such as
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the Melbourne Club, these men could join their colleagues in active participation in civic affairs.

Local Government

Municipal government afforded another avenue for aspiring politicians and as has been noted, the issue of oaths appears to have been overlooked, whereas in England it still presented an obstacle. In 1835 David Salomons (1797-1873) was elected Sherriff of London, (although some opposition had been expressed on religious grounds) but unable to take up the position due to the requirements of the Oath of Office. To resolve this problem, parliament quickly passed the Sherriff's Declaration Act allowing special provision for persons elected to this task. But this exception was uniquely defined to the Sheriff's role and thus when Salomons was elected an Alderman the following year; he was unable to assume his office. It was not until 1845 with the introduction of the Jewish Disabilities Removal Act, that municipal and judicial functions were open to Jews. In 1855, David Salomons was elected Lord Mayor of London ‘thereby setting the seal on the municipal emancipation of English Jews.’

In Melbourne the trajectory was very different. With the establishment of the Council of the City of Melbourne in 1842, Jewish participation occurred almost immediately, with the nomination of Asher Hymen Hart as a candidate, although unsuccessful in this and a subsequent election of 1845. Michael Cashmore, representing the La Trobe Ward, became Melbourne’s first Jewish councillor, before resigning in January 1848. These initial attempts at representation were quickly followed by others across metropolitan Melbourne and regional centres, as Jewish men, and later women, were elected both as councillors and as Mayors. In 1862 Edward Cohen became the first Jewish Mayor of Melbourne, and twenty-five years later, his brother-in-law Sir Benjamin Benjamin, first elected for the Albert Ward in 1870, became the first Melbourne Mayor to be knighted. Benjamin, as an observant Jew, ensured that the 1,000 dignitaries at his inaugural banquet were served only kosher.
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Political participation was not restricted to men: Ada Marks (1865-1929), a long-term Councillor for St Kilda served on the council alongside her brother-in-law Henry Florin Barnet (1859-1933) acting as Mayor when Barnet was unavailable. For Solomon Iffla, accepting the mayoral robes of Emerald Hill in 1880 would have been inconceivable at the time of his birth in Jamaica, where the ‘racial privilege’ of self-government was a dual process, through Jamaica’s relationship to the Crown, and particularly the disenfranchisement of its Jewish population.

Judiciary

Justice in Victoria was administered through appointed court officers who were formally selected by the monarch, while governors were responsible for the appointment of Justices of the Peace, coroners and constables of police. Stipendiary Magistrates, also called ‘police magistrates’, combined the functions of preservation of peace, detection of crime and apprehension of offenders, as well as the duties of sentencing and punishing. These were paid officers, appointed by the Governor-in-Council and ‘usually taken from the ranks of the existing civil service’. While the role of Justice of the Peace dates back to pre-Norman times, initially an appointment of the Crown, performing administrative and judicial duties, by the nineteenth century Justices of the Peace provided judicial functions for the courts of Petty Sessions. In England eligibility for appointment as Justices of the Peace required a property qualification, a further restriction on Jews where the legal status of Jewish property ownership was unclear. Again, in Victoria the situation was markedly different, Jews were neither restricted from property ownership, nor was this a prerequisite for office. Here the
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role was honorary, but in reality only available to men of independent means, who were able to devote the requisite time to their duties. The title was also conferred on shire presidents, mayors of cities, towns and boroughs, indirectly providing a greater diversity to those presiding over the lower courts. From the mid-nineteenth century, dozens of Jewish men across Victoria were appointed Justices of the Peace. Those holding office were rarely lawyers and many appointees served a number of public functions across government, the judiciary and consular roles. As a form of patronage, these duties not only carried the responsibility of office, but also conveyed social kudos.

For a new and expanding economy such as Victoria, the international connections that the Jewish community were able to provide were harnessed for both importing and exporting knowledge and colonial development. American-born Henri John Hart (1820-1884) was one of the first of the community to arrive with at least some legal training, having been educated at a Grammar School attached to Columbia College, New York, where his education was directed to the legal profession. This expertise had been further developed through his employment in the office of the Attorney-General Hugh Maxwell. Hart left New York for England and from there to Australia, where he was established in Melbourne by 1849. Sensing that the discovery of gold in New South Wales was a threat to the Victorian economy, in 1851 he established the Gold Committee offering a £200 reward for the discovery of gold in this colony. He exploited a trip to England in 1852 to further Victorian interests and was elected a member of a committee of Australian colonists, established to diffuse information regarding the colonies. A patron of the arts, this trip enabled him to further his interest while gaining useful contacts and he was elected an honorary corresponding member for the Society of Arts of England, an organisation under the Presidency of Prince Alfred. At a Royal Levee he was presented to the American Ambassador, which led to his appointment in 1866 as acting Consul for the United States, followed by a similar role for Italy. Hart returned to Melbourne in 1854 in the company of the new Governor, Sir Charles Hotham, and this provided further opportunities for local and international representation. Prior to sailing to the United States the following year, he was appointed a ‘Commissioner of the Supreme Court, with jurisdiction throughout the

United States of America’ and in 1857 was gazetted a territorial magistrate for Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland and was also appointed a Justice of the Peace. Engaged in local affairs he was widely involved in charitable activities in the city and was for many years President of the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation, under the leadership of his brother-in-law Moses Rintel (Figure 7.1).

Figure 7.1. Epergne presented to Henri Hart by the East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation

The Public Service

Although the judicial roles and charitable engagement that many in the community were engaged in could broadly be termed ‘public’ activities, Jews do not appear to have been employed in the public service in Victoria. Whether this is a translation of the historical exclusion of Jews from the civil service into Victoria is unclear. A search of the Parliamentary Blue Books indicates only one member of the community took the opportunities of the expanding civil services, Louis Ellis (1833-1917) being the notable
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exception. Ellis was employed from at least 1856 until his retirement in the Sheriff’s Office, as Deputy Sheriff and later Acting Sheriff.

Colonial Legislature

Having been excluded from Parliament in Britain as elsewhere, Jews in Australia almost immediately followed Lionel Rothschild’s lead, standing for parliamentary election in Victoria and the other colonies. Between 1860, when Nathaniel Levi became the first Jew to sit in the Victorian Parliament, until the federation of the Australian colonies forty years later, Victoria had seventeen Jewish Parliamentarians, representing the upper and lower houses, rural and metropolitan seats. This was by far greater a representation than in Britain, where from a Jewish population of up to 430,000, eighteen Jewish parliamentarians were elected in the thirty years following Lionel Rothschild’s accession to his seat. Unlike in Britain, these politicians were not from wealthy banking or legal dynasties, and while their British counterparts were noted for their lack of political accomplishments, many of those in Victoria were particularly vocal on a number of important issues. This period saw the formation of a number of political dynasties, and this was equally true for the Jewish community, with half the Jewish politicians in the Victorian government having brothers or brothers-in-law also sitting in the house. The place of birth of these parliamentarians is indicative of the community: ten were British-born, although five of these had settled as children and been educated in Australia, five had been born in Victoria and two were German. Two represented families whose presence in Australia was due to a family member being transported as a convict, both being families of Sephardi origin: Felix Australia Levien, the first Jewish child born in Victoria, and Edward Cohen, parliamentarian and Mayor of Melbourne. A property franchise defined suitability for office and thus this group represented individuals who had acquired wealth in the colony. Suzanne Rutland defines Australian Jewish politicians as those who represented Jewish interests ‘Jewish Politicians’


938 Clark, "Jewish Identity in British Politics: The Case of the First Jewish MPs, 1858-1887," 96.
and ‘those politicians who might be Jewish’. I believe this is a simplistic interpretation, lacking an understanding of their motivation for Jewish participation, and as an important symbolic expression of acceptance of the community. In a society where Jews were not set apart from other citizens, ‘Jewish solidarity’ becomes more complex as individuals express themselves as citizens, articulating their interest in the social and communal activities of society. This becomes apparent when considering the two areas in which Jewish parliamentarians were prominent, that of public education and taxation reform.

Education is a quintessential Jewish preoccupation and within emancipated societies, structuring an education which would provide for secular and religious knowledge proved a complex problem. To ensure an engaged and educated Jewish community, the various synagogues in Victoria established a number of day schools and after school programs with varying degrees of success. Simultaneously the issue of free secular and state education was one which occupied the attention of a number of Jewish politicians: Charles Dyte, whose focus was free education, with an emphasis on access to self-education through public libraries; Emanuel Steinfeld, who was able to apply his international connections undertaking research and providing advice as a member of a Royal Commission on Technical Education; and Edward Cohen, a passionate advocate for secular education. London-born Cohen was a major figure in mid-century Melbourne. A City Councillor, and the first Jewish Mayor of Melbourne while concurrently holding a seat in state parliament, he maintained various business interests in banking, real estate, insurance and grazing. He arrived in New South Wales following the transportation of his father Henry Cohen (1790-1867). Henry Cohen was an ostensibly prosperous clothing retailer from Paddington, London who claimed a turnover of £4,000-£5,000 per annum. In 1833 Henry was charged with passing forged promissory notes, his fourth such offence and transported for fourteen years to New South Wales. Like many Jewish families, Henry’s wife Elizabeth Simmons (1792-1866) chose to join her husband, sailing with nine of her children, arriving by a separate ship the same year.
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The Cohen family prospered in New South Wales developing shipping and retail enterprises. In 1842 their oldest son Edward (Figure 7.2), seeing the possibilities of the newly-settled district of Port Phillip, relocated to Melbourne, establishing a firm of auctioneers and tea merchants and quickly becoming involved in politics. In 1871, the Australasian Israelite described Cohen as ‘the public Jew of Victoria, par excellence…Genial in manner, of an affable disposition, and easily accessible to all persons of all creeds and climes, Mr Cohen as a public man, is the central figure around which our community revolves.’

Figure 7.2 Edward Cohen

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, churches had been the primary providers of education, but by 1861 it was recognised that only half the children of school age were literate and a new system was required. Implemented first in Victoria, free, compulsory and secular education became an important reform movement across the Australian colonies. As elsewhere it was considered that universal literacy would solve a number of social issues: improving economic prospects for children, encouraging vocational training,
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and reducing crime. For those interested in furthering democracy, education was essential in the development of active citizenship, and the study of history formed a central element in this ideal. For a new and emerging society, it was recognised that an educated populace was important for efficient government, national prosperity and to alleviate child labour. The expense of a passage to Victoria and the limited criteria for assisted immigration ensued that those settling in Victoria, generally had a basic level of education. In 1867 a Royal Commission was established to examine alternatives for education reform and to assess the structural arrangements of the education system. The report recognised the advantage of the educational standard of the population, expressing the belief that as educated parents, they would be conducive to educating their children. Concern was raised that without suitable and effective educational opportunities, subsequent generations would not have the same levels of literacy as their parents. ‘The comparatively high degree of education of the present adult class’, argued the Royal Commissioners in 1867, ‘seems to make the adoption of such means less difficult than it would be in the mother country, or than it may yet become in this colony, if we do not speedily turn our present opportunities to account’. To ensure efficient learning, stress was placed on regular attendance, but achievement of this goal was difficult to enforce.

Although the Jewish community aimed at a combined Jewish and secular education for its children, free and secular education was judged as a way of safeguarding basic learning. From a religious perspective, secular education without a syllabus dominated by Christianity provided a guarantee of independence, ensuring the recognition of the pluralism inherent in Victoria. In its research phase, the Royal Commission consulted the Jewish Community with the Reverend Ornstein of the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation acting as an expert witness. Ornstein had considerable experience as an educator, having previously held the positions of Principal of the Birmingham Jewish School and Assistant Principal at the London Free School. He argued for a separation of secular and religious education, emphasising the

947 Victorian Parliamentary Debates, October 2 1872, 1628.
importance of shared community values based on common ideals of morality. These were universal values, in variance to religious instruction which was specific.

Morality is the laws which govern us according to our duty to our fellow men; but religious instruction would teach us a different thing...I think the same laws of morality hold good, whatever a man’s religious belief may be. I think that this is the great point that should be observed. A pupil may be taught to be moral without having any sectarian differences imparted to him.\textsuperscript{949}

Five years later, the issue was still unsolved. Cohen was a vocal and keen supporter of secular education, as both a social responsibility and as a pragmatic response to the alternative of an education system defined and controlled by religious partisanship. Regarding religious education as a private matter, he deemed education an issue of justice within a diverse community and as a way of protecting freedom of religion. As he asserted in a parliamentary debate:

\begin{quote}
the state shall teach all those who require teaching, and who can’t afford to pay for it, and it leaves those who want dogma, and can afford to pay for it, to do so. All sections of the community will be able to go to the schools provided by the State, because those schools will be completely unsectarian. What religion would the honourable members have taught in schools? Who shall say which religion is right? Who shall say that this religion is truth, and that every other man’s religion is in error? It is a subject which people can no more agree here than the can in any other country.\textsuperscript{950}
\end{quote}

In his role as an architect of public policy, Cohen openly used the historic perceptions of Judaism and Judaism’s relationship to other parts of the community to influence his fellow parliamentarians, hoping to avoid the mistakes of the past in shaping a modern society:

\begin{quote}
I assert that, whenever a church has had power in any State, it has been persecuting and intolerant to all opposed to it. I can speak on this subject freely...I am descendant from a race that has been persecuted more than any
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{949} Ibid., 3955, 235.
\textsuperscript{950} Victorian Parliament, Parliamentary Debates, October 3 1872, 1673-1674.
other race under the sun. And for what reason? Because we chose to worship God after our own hearts, according to the laws of our fathers. This being a new and free country, let us leave behind us all the superstitious nonsense of the old world. Let us meet here on common ground.\footnote{Ibid.}

In an article published in the Jewish press, Cohen is quoted at length elaborating these views: ‘It was quite proper for us, as Jews to wish for a distinct school, and it is quite proper that we should have it…we should put our hands in our pockets and pay for it ourselves’.\footnote{Australian Israelite, 7 March 1873 as reproduced in Albert Gordon Austin, Select Documents in Australian Education, 1788-1900, Pitman Pacific Books (Carlton: Pitman, 1972), 212.} Further in this article Cohen stated rhetorically that ‘were we not satisfied with some amount of liberty as was enjoyed by our fellow citizens’, continuing that he ‘has no other home…than Victoria’, and that he considered it his duty to serve his co-religionists.\footnote{Australian Israelite, 7 March 1873 as reproduced in ibid., 212.} In order to protect the secular basis of the Victorian education system, the community assumed a monitoring role. The Reverend Ornstein took a public stance, writing to the Minister of Education to draw attention to an inconsistency in the text books being used in Victorian schools, which he believed where not in accordance with this secular position.\footnote{Jewish Chronicle, 28 November 1873, 583.}

Where Cohen was able to shape his society through education reform, the next generation of politicians were also actively engaged in contemporary political issues. The two German-born parliamentarians unfortunately did not live long after their respective elections, but each was influential outside of elected office and brought new and innovative ideas from their place of birth.
Max Hirsch, perhaps the most internationally influential Victorian Jewish politician of the nineteenth century, is now largely forgotten (Figure 7.3). Holding office only briefly between 1902-1903, during his lifetime it was his political activism and writings for which his local and international reputation was made. Hirsch’s Australian work is responsive to the social and political conditions of the 1890s. The speculation of the land boom had been funded through extensive and unsustainable borrowings, and the subsequent financial crash lead to severe depression, with Melbourne experiencing particularly high unemployment (Figure 7.4).

Prior to Federation, the individual colonies had been founded on differing economic and social conditions and governed by separate legislatures, each with its own tax base. Land distribution was an issue in many of the colonies, with property having been initially deemed by grant or acquired by wealthy ‘squatters’ who secured vast tracks of arable land, leased at low rates from the crown, before purchasing it later in the century. As a result, later settlers were largely excluded from land ownership in the most fertile parts of the colony. At an economic level, many considered that trade was hampered by the many taxes and tariffs due on goods shipped between the colonies. Taxation and its corollary
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protectionism became one of the principal debates surrounding Federation, although politicians such as Nathaniel Levi had argued as early as 1870 that tariff protection hindered trade.\textsuperscript{957} Two factional issues characterised politics, those of the ‘protectionist’ landed lobby on one side and the more radical who considered taxation and land reform imperative to a functioning society. As depression struck in the early 1890s, these issues came into stark relief.
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\caption{Melbourne Punch, 6 April 1893}
\end{figure}

Two organisations formed the most radical elements of these debates: the Free Trade League and the Single Tax League, who had similar but slightly differing reform agendas, both focused on taxation of land. The Free Tax League sought the removal of restrictive tariffs and duties, particularly those which were related to manufacturing and trade; abolition of special privileges accorded to landowners in the recovery of rents; reform of insolvency laws and the federation of the colonies.\textsuperscript{958} The Single Tax League was more narrowly focused, takings its lead from the American Single Taxationist Henry George, seeing reform to both society and the economy through the removal of all duties and tariffs and the introduction of a single tax on land. The Single Tax League perceived that the depression


\textsuperscript{958} Free Trade, Platform adopted at the General Conference of delegates held Melbourne 28 August 1894, in the Beacon (no date), but appendix to Worrall, "Single Tax and Free Trade: Victoria, 1890-1900."
resulted from land speculation, which it blamed for an increase in property prices.\textsuperscript{959} The League was supportive of Australian federation which it considered a ‘triumph over protection’.\textsuperscript{960} There was crossover not only of philosophical views between these two organisations, but of leadership as well. Cologne-born Max Hirsch headed the Single Tax League while concurrently holding an Executive position as Vice President of the Free Trade League. Hirsch, studied commerce at the University of Berlin, before gaining a transnational perspective through his career as an international trader in Germany, England, Russia, Central Asia, North Africa, and Ceylon.\textsuperscript{961} He first visited Australia in 1879, before settling in Melbourne in 1890, where he became passionately involved in radical taxation issues, arguing that ‘the removal of the veil which hides from workers the fact that they pay the bulk of all taxes, will teach workers the true theory of taxation’.\textsuperscript{962} Hirsch believed the benefits from Single Taxation included the elimination of land speculation resulting in full land utilisation; reduction in rent and building speculation; increases in wages through expansion of effective demand; stimulation of production, and full employment; increased wages and a parallel decrease in class divisions; and the reform of working conditions. These changes would stem the flow of people from the country to the city and generally result in greater social justice.\textsuperscript{963} In his book \textit{Protection in Victoria}, Hirsch argued that protectionism decreased wealth by diminishing the purchasing power of wages, created debt and did nothing to dissuade emigration.\textsuperscript{964}

Protection obstructs the production of wealth and alters the distribution of wealth unfavourably to the interests of the working classes…But a system of free trade, the removal of the veil which hides from workers the fact that they pay the
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bulk of all taxes, will teach workers the true theory of taxation and will cause them to place taxation where it belongs on the rental value of land...not created by any one individual, but by the community as a whole.\textsuperscript{965}

Hirsch’s political awakenings have been attributed to his experience in Ceylon during the 1870s, where he was incensed by the unfairness of a ‘paddy tax’.\textsuperscript{966} On returning to England, and with assistance from the Cobden Club, Hirsch prompted a resolution through the House of Commons abolishing this tax.\textsuperscript{967}

Contemporary newspaper coverage of Hirsch’s many public speeches make no mention of his Judaism, but he assumes Judaeo-Christian metaphors to convince his audience of his views. A report in a regional newspaper describes at length a speech Hirsch delivered:

He was one of those who believed that God made the world; and had therefore to show them that God did not make the world and its luxuries and comforts for one class of men; that he did not intend that opportunity to live in contentment should be monopolised by a few, while the many should toil in penury to supply those who did not work with opulence and wasteful luxury.\textsuperscript{968}

Hirsch’s writing received wide circulation during his lifetime and following his early death on a trip to Vladivostok. This was achieved through his numerous public addresses reported in the press, as a correspondent to the British Board of Trade, and through the Max Hirsch Commemoration Essay prize, established after his death as an annual honour to his legacy of economic thought.\textsuperscript{969} As an economic theorist his influence was extraordinary and
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the approximately twenty books he published in his short time in Victoria and in Germany were distributed throughout universities, as far afield as Japan.970

Hirsch was not the only Victorian Jewish parliamentarian involved in these issues. By 1894 there were eight sitting Jewish Victorian parliamentarians, of whom six were identified by the Single Tax journal the *Beacon* as publically supporting free trade and taxation reform, and of these, four were further identified as supporting taxation on land.971 Single Taxation has been described ‘as a “ghetto” for Jewish radicalism’.972 This interest could be perhaps better explained as the response of urban based politicians, reflecting not just a pragmatic and nuanced response to the important economic and political issues of the day, but importantly, a response of urban Jews to an issue of social justice, taking a lead from the fundamental premise of *Tzedakah* of social justice and charity.

**International Stage**

Many of the international networks of the community were applied to colonial development, with the Jewish community prominent in the representation of foreign governments at an honorary consular level. Whether from an individual’s place of birth, or another location, Jews represented Prussia, America, Denmark, Italy, the United States and Japan. Those such as Jacob Cohn, representing Demark, or Moritz Michaelis Acting Consul for Prussia, held these posts with some connection to their place of birth, while others were connected to their international experience and networks. The irony for Michaelis was that in Prussia it would have been almost impossible for a Jew to have a diplomatic posting, while as an Australian Jew, he could represent the Kingdom.973

The international networks of the community were applied in other areas of colonial development. In 1880 Alexander Marks (c.1839-1919) was appointed Consul for Japan. The somewhat peripatetic early life of New York-born Alexander Marks perhaps prepared him for his life as a trader in Asia and as the long standing Consul to Japan. His entrepreneurial father Casper Marks was born in Pest, and migrated to New York, where he married and

971 *Beacon* Vol II, No 6, October 1894.
began a family. Leaving America, the family travelled to Manila before arriving in Sydney in 1842, where Casper began business as a dealer, selling clothing, tea, sugar, American pork and beef, but almost immediately became insolvent and all his household furniture was sold. This charge was further upgraded to ‘fraudulent insolvency’ after it was discovered that he had concealed two sovereigns prior to sailing to Bombay. The family then spent several years travelling between Sydney, Melbourne, Tasmania, Manila and California. In 1851 Casper Marks’s irregular business practices again caught up with him while in Honolulu, when he and his sons were charged in a case of conspiracy over the alleged sale of gold dust, although Casper claimed that he was in Sydney at the time. By the 1858 he was resident in St Kilda and in 1860s he is listed as the principal investor of the North Mount Useful Quartz Mining Company at Donnelly’s Creek, and could afford a £5 donation to the Melbourne Hebrew Congregation. During the 1860s the Marks’s sons moved to Yokohama to establish a trading concern, providing Casper with stock for a new business venture in Sydney, a shop in King Street specialising in Japanese goods. The retail side of this enterprise was not successful, and within months, the whole stock was auctioned. The son’s Japanese trading arm appears to have prospered, maintained until Alexander’s death in 1919.

In 1890, Alexander Marks’s long-term connection to Japan resulted in his appointment as the Japanese Consul. Interviewed in 1902, he described having spent forty years in the country and subsequently revisiting it every eighteen months to keep abreast of the current situation. His experience trading and representing Japanese interests gave him a political perceptive at odds with the establishment. Marks was strongly opposed to the White Australia Policy, and actively supported Japanese immigration and investment in Australia, in particular, of a proposal for Japanese agricultural investment in northern
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Along with his co-religionist E.L. Zox (1837-1899), he was appointed a Commissioner for the 1880 Melbourne International Exhibition and his connections to Japan facilitated participation and significant financial contribution from the Japanese Government for this event. His international perceptive embraced issues of interest to the Jewish community; after consultation with the West Australian Minister for Lands he promoted a proposal to purchase tracts of Western Australia for the settlement of Russian Jewish refugees.

An international perspective could flow, not only from the colonies, but towards the metropole, and this is witnessed in the careers of members of the Phillips family, who produced a generation of high achieving cousins: Constance Ellis (1872-1942), the first female Doctor of Medicine from the University of Melbourne and a senior medical officer and pathologist at the Queen Victoria Hospital; Isabella Phillips (1891-1973), a surgeon at the Melbourne Hospital and the hospitals first female superintendent; the artist Emanuel Philips Fox; and Marion Phillips (1881-1932), British social reformer and politician. Both Marion and Emanuel’s influence was on the international stage, Emanuel as an artist in Paris and Marion as a politician in Britain. Educated alongside her female cousins at the Presbyterian Ladies College and the University of Melbourne, her intellectual and scholastic abilities were recognised, winning the inaugural Wyselaskie Scholarship in Political Economy, the Cobden Medal and a scholarship to complete a PhD at the London School of Economics. Here she wrote a thesis entitled ‘A Colonial Autocracy: New South Wales under Governor Macquarie 1810-1821’, receiving another award, this time the Hutchinson Medal. In 1906 she began her working life as a research assistant for Beatrice Webb on the Royal Commission of Enquiry into the Working of the Poor Laws. The poverty she witnessed further galvanised her political views, resulting in a lifetime involvement in British Labour politics and social reform, particularly as it affected women and children. It has been argued that her greatest contribution to Labour Party policy was her attempt to correlate the needs of housewives and children to socialist philosophy. She was aware of the dichotomy in
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the fight for women’s wage equality, at a time when men were arguing for a living wage at a level that would support a wife and children at home. She perceived the needs of family planning, a nutritional diet and labour-saving assistance. These she believed could be achieved through the provision of municipal laundries, restaurants and communal kitchens and through careful planning of housing, designed to meet minimum standards. Her influence was wide and she took on many official responsibilities including secretary to the Women’s Labour League. Throughout the First World War she was a member of the Workers National Emergency Committee, secretary of the Joint Standing Committee of Industrial Women’s Organisations, while the position as Chief Women’s Office for the Labour Party, gave her third place on the party’s official letter head. This political activity culminated in 1929, when she was elected Member for Sunderland. Phillips became the first Australian woman to win a seat in a national parliament, and only one of two to have been elected to the House of Commons.

Figure 7.5 Marion Phillips
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Until the graduation of Melbourne-born and educated Felix Meyer (1858-1937) in the 1880s, the limitations on Jews entering the major universities of England resulted in only one Jewish doctor in Melbourne: Glasgow trained but Jamaican-born Solomon Iffla, an active member of Melbourne’s scientific community. His younger colleague Louis Henry (1854-1929) represents the shaping of Melbourne through both his international connections and in response to limitations imposed by establishment anti-Semitism. Henry, born in Melbourne to a German mother, was educated at Scotch College, but received his medical training in Heidelberg and his Doctorate in Wurzburg, followed by employment in hospitals in Berlin, Vienna, Dublin, Manchester and London. Returning to Melbourne he attempted to join the Medical Society of Victoria, the professional association for Victorian doctors, but was black-balled.

As the practice of medicine became more scientifically based, the medical community witnessed a period of turmoil and personal and professional rivalries. This culminated in Henry’s ostracism, which incensed his friend and colleague Dr James Neild, then Honorary Secretary of the Society, lecturer in medicine and one of Melbourne’s most eminent doctors. Together they decided to apply to London to establish a branch of the British Medical Association as an alternative representation for Victorian doctors. Louis Henry sailed to England and secured authority for this venture, returning in 1879, and establishing the Melbourne Branch with Neild as President and Henry as its first Secretary, before becoming President himself in 1886 (followed by Felix Meyer in 1894). The Association’s aims were the advancement of medicine, ensuring best practice and the professional conduct of doctors as well as overseeing their appointments to public institutions, while the society saw its strength in enabling international communication for the medical profession. In promoting their cause, Henry argued that the British Association was superior to its Victorian rival, as it provided a network of over 9,000 affiliates and ‘in respect to social power, scientific progress, and moral advancement’ it offered its members ‘the advantage of
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mutual communication and support, through the columns of the British Medical Journal’. Associating itself with the Royal Society, whose rooms were used for meetings, the association also took on a number of public causes, the first of which was the conditions at the Kew Lunatic Asylum. The two professional bodies operated in parallel until 1906, when they were amalgamated to form the British Medical Association, Victoria Branch.

Figure 7.6 James Neild and Louis Henry

Consideration of Melbourne Jewry’s participation in public life encapsulates many of the wider themes explored in this thesis: in particular the ways in which this acculturated community seized the opportunities available to them to shape the society in which they lived, recognising that in Melbourne, their past experiences and their values were not dismissed but valuable in shaping the wider values of society. Other than the Church Act, there were no formal restrictions on Jewish participation in either civil or political life and few issues of concern directly relating to the community. Where perceived injustices occurred, the community was quick to raise its voice and remind the wider community of their equality and worth. Saying that, the issues that Jews chose to engage with, and the

energy they showed in public participation, could be viewed within the framework of wider Jewish traditions of social justice and *Tikkun Olam*. As educated citizens they provided an intellectual construct, supplemented through their international and transnational experiences, to communicate within an environment far larger than the city of Melbourne.
Conclusion

He was, perhaps, the greatest Australian of our time, or any previous time. His life was in large part dedicated to the service of the public and his country.


Under clam and grey skies more than 300,000 people gathered to-day to do honour to the memory of General Sir John Monash. From Parliament House, where the body lay in State, to the Brighton Cemetery the roads were thronged. It is estimated that 10,000 men marched in the funeral procession from the Shrine of Remembrance, where a special service was held. An unbroken chain of watchers could be seen from St Kilda Junction to Collins-street.


This thesis has contextualised the settlement experience of the Jewish community of Melbourne, a community which developed within a new settler society to become an integrated and influential element of the city. It has explored how the values brought from previous places of residence and the networks Jewry maintained were utilised in shaping the physical and intellectual space of Melbourne. As settlers within a new society, every aspect of the Jewish community’s communal and religious life had to be created anew—from their responses to the demographic challenges of society numerically dominated by male settlers, to the establishment of philanthropic organisations suitable to servicing the community’s needs. Creating a new society in a new city provided opportunities to establish a Jewish environment of modernity and relevance, and although this was a difficult task, this outpost of Judaism managed to create a viable communal structure in which the majority maintained their attachment to Judaism.
Urbanism

Immigration, industrialisation and the economies of empire all underpinned the development of nineteenth-century cities. While subject to similar stimuli, those cities of the New World were less constrained by their history. For ‘instant cities’ such as Melbourne, development was fuelled by commerce and immigration, but with a social demographic of both free settlers and emancipists, historic restrictive attitudes of class and prejudice were reduced, resulting in an egalitarian respect based on participation and success. This thesis has argued that in order to overcome previous stigmatisation and exclusion, Jews embraced modernisation and urbanisation with enthusiasm and in large numbers. This required new ways of imagining a place within society, requiring adaptations to develop new modalities of community and identity. Unlike other cities where rural Jews internally migrated to live in pre-existing urban settings, in Melbourne the Jewish community developed alongside the city itself. This organic evolution enabled a different perception of place and space, with Jews as integrated insiders to the settlement process, creating a new attachment to a city where they were free to make their mark.

Space and place

Jews were some of the first to purchase land within Melbourne, and this research has identified the scope of participation by Jewish developers and investors within the city. While the (often largely anecdotal) literature on newly-arrived Eastern European Jewish immigrants of late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century inner Melbourne paints a picture of communal solidarity founded on adversity, the experience of the establishment and development of the affluent inner suburbs of East Melbourne, Fitzroy, Carlton and St Kilda by Jewish developers and investors has remained unnoticed. Analysis of the physical fabric of Melbourne has shown that the Jewish community was spread and locations were selected for class and desirability rather than from the development of any core area of Jewish habitation. Within this dispersed pattern can be identified specific buildings and city blocks particularly favoured as residences by the community. These concentrations reflect tight family connections, often with several generations living in close proximity to one another.

990 Hitzer and Schlor, "Introduction to God in the City: Religious Topographies in the Age of Urbanization," 824.
What can also be witnessed is a recurring preference for specific locations, as residents moved through a trajectory of upward social mobility, especially from Victoria Buildings to Burlington Terrace and ultimately to Victoria Parade. Previously unacknowledged in the urban history of Melbourne is the Jewish influence on the establishment of early suburbs such as East Melbourne, an area traditionally associated with establishment Melbourne, and the southern portion of Carlton, with Jews at the forefront of development. Likewise the Jewish presence in the ‘gentlemen’s residences’ and the commercial sector of Fitzroy has also been long unrecognised. The symbolic and physical placement of the principal institutions of Melbourne Jewry assert the community’s position within the city, with structures built in locations of power and influence, making it clear to Jews and non-Jews alike that the community were equal citizens with the same aesthetic tastes as their neighbours. Taking a lead from other post-emancipatory societies, these buildings, designed by prominent architects, express a fashionable architectural elegance similar to other secular and ecclesiastical buildings within the city.

Family Identity

Within a small society, great importance was placed on maintaining Jewish and family identity. In a similar way to processes noted in the literature on urban Berlin, the Jews of Melbourne have previously been considered not from the communal structures the majority created, but from the loss of Jewish identity by a minority. Considering the frameworks put forward by Meltzer and Lowenstein for Berlin, we can see that individuals within Melbourne Jewry went to lengths to maintain in-marriage, expending energy, anxiety and debate considering the implications and pragmatics of non-endogamous marriage, particularly for their sons, disinheritting children who married outside the faith and attempting to find ways of making their religion relevant and meaningful to their contemporaries and their children.991 In maintaining Jewish familial relationships and traditional forms of endogamy, the community was prepared to step outside, ignore or circumvent the legal restrictions of British and Australian law, while the close family endogamy, witnessed through marriages
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and business partnerships, indicates allegiance based on cultural and economic solidarity.\footnote{Mosse, “Judaism, Jews and Capitalism Weber, Sombart and Beyond,” 11.}
This thesis has identified that over several generations numerous families found marriage partners from a small and repeating family and occupation cluster, while concurrently those from the non-English Ashkenazi minority rarely married partners based on a previous place of birth and unlike American cities these settlers did not create ethno-specific communal organisations.

**Empire Historiography**

Contemporary historiography of empire has shifted attention from a model which sees information and ideas flowing from the metropole to the periphery, to one which sees the networks and connections across and through the empire. This model has had limited application within Jewish historiography, and particularly for that on Australia. Australian Jewish history has previously positioned the Australian colonies not only on the physical periphery of space but on the periphery of Judaism itself, exemplified by the title of Suzanne Rutland’s history of Australian Jewry *Edge of the Diaspora*.\footnote{Rutland, *Edge of the Diaspora; Two Centuries of Jewish Settlement in Australia*.}

By exploring the experiences of Jewish settlement within the frameworks of empire history and of the English-speaking and wider Jewish diasporas, this thesis is able to elucidate how Melbourne Jewry became players in a multi-layered communication of ideas, goods and people between the old and new centres of the Jewish and imperial worlds. Jews have been described as ‘the quintessential “service nomads” of the modern period because they were outsiders—urban, literate, peripatetic, and in possession of kith and kin over seas, oceans, and political boundaries’.\footnote{Stein, *Plumes: Ostrich Feathers, Jews, and a Lost World of Global Commerce*, 9.}

This thesis identifies how for a new and developing city, the community’s connections were harnessed for personal, professional and colonial development. Connected transnationally, the values and preoccupations of Judaism informed their perceptions, enabling them to express interest in issues wider than the empire. These international connections also furnished information and strength, providing resources to agitate at a political level to further Jewish causes. Educated Germans such as Emanuel Steinfeld and Max Hirsch were able to use their European connections for policy and implementation of a range of
economic development issues. The broad Australian and European education of Louis Henry allowed him to circumvent anti-Semitism, establishing a new medical association and in so doing connected the medical fraternity of Melbourne to the international developments within their field. The networks maintained across the diaspora circulated information on issues affecting the Jewish world, enabled the establishment of international philanthropic activities, and offered intellectual insights for the delivery of communal activities.

The majority of settlers to Melbourne were British by birth or education and were English speakers. Whereas by 1861 only half the children of school age in Victoria were able to read and write, almost the entire Jewish population were literate in English. Their linguistic ability in Hebrew, Yiddish or other languages, however, is only hinted at through the very few surviving letters and the minutes of communal organisations. 995 Arguments over the importance of language in defining nationalism have been subtly used against these and other New World communities to dismiss their relevance as central to Judaism, but English enabled a new and wider diaspora, replacing the older transnational languages of Yiddish and Ladino for international trade and communications. 996

Networks

International philanthropy and international news tied the Jews of Australia to the wider Jewish diaspora and in so doing, formed a transnational community. 997 By considering the community beyond the empire, we can perceive this flow of ideas—from the Australian colonies, across the colonies and to Britain and the wider Jewish diaspora. This thesis has identified the networks of international trade, intellectual thought and international influence exhibited by Melbourne’s Jewish community. Families such as the Montefiores and the extended Joseph /Nathan family were able to use these spaces for mercantile and commercial pursuits. With the discovery of gold in California, Moses Joseph was able to capitalise using his pre-existing shipping fleets to distribute goods and expand trade. His cousin in New Zealand and innovative entrepreneurs such as the Tallerman brothers could

995 Macintyre, A Concise History of Australia, 116.
997 Kobrin, Jewish Bialystok and Its Diaspora, 16.
exploit their networks and British origins to assist with enterprises which eventually became multi-national companies, exporting products manufactured from the raw materials of empire. Enterprising Melburnians used their international trade connections to represent foreign governments at a consular level, in ways unthinkable in many of their countries of birth. Rabbinic figures such as Jacob Frankel moved from his birth place in Posen, to England, Australia and to California before returning and settling in New Zealand, creating and maintaining religious and intellectual connections for Jewish communities across the English speaking diaspora.

Cultural Identity

In 1848 Rabbi Leopold Stein said ‘From now on we do not recognise our case as being special… we are Germans and want to be nothing else! We have no other fatherland than the German fatherland and we wish for no other! Only by our faith are we Israelites, in every other respect we belong with the devotion to the state in which we live’, a statement that could equally apply to nineteenth-century Melbourne Jewry. Integration within society does not itself lead to a diminished attachment to culture and religion. Rather, the assertion of this community for equality within society required the establishment of new ways of maintaining their faith and for the construction of a functioning community. This integration is witnessed in the business partnerships between Jews and non-Jews and in the financial support by non-Jews for Jewish causes. At the most symbolic level the election and appointment of officials culminating in the elevation of Sir John Monash as commander of Australian troops during World War One and the appointment of Sir Isaac Isaacs as Australia’s first Australian born Governor General are testimony to this integration. The creation of any new society on distant shores is a hazardous undertaking, causing displacement for the individuals involved. The many social, cultural and philanthropic organisations established by the community reflect a community of self-identifying individuals, who took a communal responsibility for each other, ensuring that they could provide some level of social, cultural and philanthropic support and comfort.

998 Pulzer, Jews and the German State: The Political History of a Minority, 1848-1933, 81.
Yoseph Yerushalmi, in describing a Jewish sense of exile and place, illustrates how the historical lessons Jews experienced enabled communities to fashion any location to feel ‘at home’, supported through study and observance, with religion as a tool to place making itself.\footnote{Yerushalmi, "Exile and Expulsion in Jewish History," 14-15.} The Jews of Melbourne established and maintained three synagogues, which are still in operation today, while their brethren in regional centres established several more. Aware of their isolated status, the early communities were regular correspondents with the Chief Rabbi, seeking guidance to ensure that their behaviours and activities were in line with halacha. Reform congregations developed in America, Britain and Germany throughout the nineteenth century, and in Melbourne the majority remained staunchly orthodox. Agitation for reform was founded on a concern for the maintenance of communal solidarity, and that it was largely unsuccessful is perhaps a reflection of innate conservatism or the strong connections they held to their English routes and the Jewish symbols of the Empire. By the 1930s, differing social and philosophical issues led to the formation of the first Reform congregations.

Consideration of the community within the framework of urbanisation allows their responses to be measured against other centres of urban Jewish life. These settlers saw themselves as equal and contributing members of Melbourne and they expected to be treated as such. This thesis demonstrates that Jews in Melbourne self-consciously tried not only to define their religious identity, but recognised the challenges wrought by modernity and attempted to adapt institutions and liturgy, recognising the distractions that a modern city created. Within the unique set of challenges, the community did not hide their Judaism; rather they integrated it into their lives and the lives of the city. Benjamin Benjamin was able to serve kosher food at his inaugural manorial reception; Reverend Ornstein’s experience as an educator within British Jewish schools could provide valuable insights for the shaping of Victorian education policy; and newspapers could print advertisements with Hebrew typeface. Anti-Semitism existed, but it did not hinder the development of Melbourne or ultimately the position of this community.
Appendix 1-Instructions for opening the Database

The database requires Microsoft Access to operate.

The database is in two forms, the full database and an HTML version. The HTML version is easier to navigate but is in a slightly flattened format, while exploration of the full version enables a more complete understanding of its structure and provides a clear indication of how the data was has been arranged.

The Database contains three abbreviations based on the data sources:

- A  Melbourne Hebrew Congregation
- B  East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation
- C  St Kilda Hebrew Congregation

**HTML Version**

To open the HTML version simply click on the ‘Web’ folder and go to the final file marked ‘Index’. From there, individuals and their families can be followed and examined.

**Full Database**

For the full database go to the ‘Data’ folder.

Copy the data folder and add the location of the file on your c:\ drive

There are five MS Access files:

- JSMMarc2000.mdb
- JSMMdat2000.mdb
- JSMPub2000.mdb
- JSMSys2000.mdb
- JSMSpn2000.mdb

Depending on the set up of individual computers the instructions will vary.

Open the JSMSys2000.mdb MS Access file.

Depending on your set-up you may get an error message asking you to Stop All Macros, if so just close this.

If asked, Enable content

If prompted, go to: File > options > trust centre > trust centre settings > trusted locations > add new location.
Close the database
Open the database again

You will be asked a series of setup questions.

- Setup of OHRM Linked Tables. Do you wish to continue? YES
- Do you wish to use the existing Setup? No
- Do you wish to import the previous setup? No
- Enter the prefix for the OHRM data files: JSMM
- Enter a valid path for the OHRM data files: [enter the file path for the ohrm\data folder on your computer]
- Enter version for the OHRM data files: 2000

The OHRM will now open. You will be taken to a 'User Name and Setup' window. Click 'Close' without adding information, ignore question about the web folder.

Click on 'Entities' to view the data.

To find a specific individual, go to the ‘Add-Ins Tab’ and click ‘Quick Search’

Each individual has potential information on three screens ‘Details’, ‘Occupations & Events’ and ‘Related Entities’.
To follow family connections go to the ‘Related Entities’ Tab:

Alternatively, to view the next record, simply click on bottom arrow:
Appendix 2-List of names referred to in thesis

David Abraham c.1830-1898
Abraham Abrahams 1797-1865
Dinah Abrahams 1827-1899
Esther Abrahams 1775-1861
Henry Abrahams c.1828-1886
Jacob Abraham 1813
Joseph Abraham 1731-1794
Alexander Alexander 1844-
Marion Alexander 1873-1917
Moses Alexander 1844-
Lewis Allan c.1824-1880
Rabbi Solomon (Zalman) Ansell,
Maurice Aron c.1844-1918
Gertrude Ascher 1821-1893
Charlotte Barnard c.1826-1968
Henry Barnet 1859-1933
Nahum Barnet 1855-1931
Elias Barnett 1862-1942
Elizabeth Barnett c.1789-1969
John Barnett 1804-1887
Sarah Barnett 1836-
Josh Bear
Albert Beaver 1851-
Evelyn Beaver 1847
Laura Beaver 1852
Louis Beaver 1820-1879
Mr Beck
Solomon Belinfante 1813-1884
Abraham Benjamin c.1832-1912
Amelia Benjamin 1844-
Benjamin Benjamin 1834-1905
Clara Benjamin 1864-1937
David Benjamin
Jane Benjamin 1858
Jane Benjamin 1858-1909
Joseph Benjamin 1831-
Lawrence Benjamin 1836-1898
Maurice Benjamin 1848-
Moses Benjamin 1805-1885
Rachel Benjamin 1832-1881
Randolph Benjamin 1868-1959
Samuel Benjamin
Simeon Benjamin
Solomon Benjamin 1818-1888
Emma Bensabat 1811-1898
Jacob Bensabat -1827
Reny Bensabat 1814-1874
Sarah Bensabat 1828-1854
Aaron Bernstein
Philip Blashki 1837-1916
Reverend Blaubaum 1848-1904
Eliza Blockhouse
Israel Bloomington c.1825-1878
Adolphus Boyd
Maurice Brodsky 1851-1919
Hermann Buttner
Alice Cashmore 1842-1932
Joseph Michael Cashmore 1843-1886
Julia Cashmore 1780-1855
Michael Cashmore
Elias Casper 1784-1862
Grace Casper 1828-1881
Hannah Casper
Lewin Casper 1812-1842
Rebecca Casper
Sarah Casper 1826-1907
Louisa Jane Cheetham 1842-1875
Caroline Chisolm 1808-1877
Annie Agnes Cohen 1849-1902
Annie Cohen 1861-1939
Daisy Cohen 1873-1924
Edward Cohen 1824-1877
Henry Cohen 1790-1867
Hyman Cohen 1849-1906
Maurice Cohen 1828-1896
Phillip Cohen 1802-1864
Samuel Cohen 1812-1861
Simeon Cohen 1832-1895
Solomon Cohen 1846-
Simon Cohen 1825-1890
Henry (Samuel Isaac) Cohn 1826-1874
Anthony Cotterall
Elizabeth Crownson 1848-1935
Phoebe Crownson 1852-1890
Rachel Crownson 1841-1909
Louisa Darcy
Henry Davis 1797-1843
Lewis Davis 1806-1875
Moss Davis 1846-1933
Rose Davis 1857-1894
Woolf Davis 1828-1902
Henrietta de Banco
Solomon de Beer 1821-1894
Solomon de Beer 1841-1917
Ada de Leon 1833-1917
David de Leon 1803-1871
Noel de Leon 1841-1931
Charles Dyte 1819-1893
Sarah Egras c.1803-1879
Abraham Elias
Angle Ellis 1831-1916
Constance Ellis 1872-1942
Elias Ellis 1796-1866
Louis Ellis 1833-1917
Maurice Ellis 1830-1887
Ray Ellis 1872-1942
Abraham Emanuel c.1814-1907
Elias Emden 1810-1888
Sarah Emden 1857-1888
Louis Eskell 1827-
Louis Philip Eskell 1853-1925
David Falk 1816-1858
Theresa Falk c.1837-1907
John Pascoe Fawkner 1792-1869
Benjamin Fink 1847-1909
Catherine Fink 1854-1943
Hirsch Fink
Moses Fink 1810-1885
Theodora Fink 1851-
Theodore Fink 1855-1942
Isaac Fonsaker
Leah Fonseca 1828-1902
Alexander Fox 1830
Emmanuel Philips Fox 1865-1915
Sarah Frances
Jacob Frankel 1814-1899
Simeon Frankel 1840-1928
Louisa Fredman 1862-1946
David Rebeiro Furtado -1869
Reverend Goldreich
Rachel Gotthelp 1829-1901
Rebecca Gratz 1781-1869
Isaac Greenfield 1837-
Sarah Green c.1827-1890
Adeline Gross 1858-1951
Isidore Gross 1838-1886
Truda Gross 1879-1975
William Gross 1840-
Amelia Ha Levy 1773-1842
Dr David Hailperin
Isaac Hallenstein 1830-1911
Bendix Hallenstein 1835-1905
Moritiz Hallenstein 1831-1904
George Halinbourg 1818-
Abraham Harris 1853-
George Gershon Harris 1825-
Henry Phillip Harris 1831-1892
Rebecca Harris 1817-1882
Samuel Henry Harris 1815-1867
Eva Harris 1851-1934
Agnes Hart 1836-1878
Alice Hart 1826-1873
Asher Hyman Hart 1813-1871
Edward Hart 1818-1854
Henri Hart 1820-1884
Hyman Hart 1846-1931
Isaac Hart 1820-1899
Isabella Hart 1827-1910
Louisa Hart 1829-c.1909
Sophia Hect 1822
Abraham Q Henriques -1890
Alex Lindo Henriques 1839-1869
Benjamin Henriques 17877-1860
Joe August Henriques 1823-
Joseph Henriques -1872
Moses Henriques 1808-1860
Rachel Henriques 1816-1874
Louis Henry (1854-1929)
Isaac Herman 1835-
Herman Heynemann 1828-1902
Elizabeth Howell
Hannah Howell
Ludwig Hyman 1833-1913
Solomon Iflla 1820-1887
Anna Imergud c.1832-1920
Abraham Benjamin Isaacs 1828-1902
Abraham Isaacs
Barnard Isaacs
Barnett Isaacs 1822-1884
Caroline Isaacs 1848-1925
Clara Isaacs 1828-1877
Isaac Isaacs 1855-1948
Jacob Andrade Isaacs 1831-1876
Joseph Isaacs 1865-
Julia Isaacs c. 1797-1874
Solomon Isaacs 1833-
Woolf Barnett Isaacs 1844-1905
Augusta Jacobs 1842-1923
Betsy Jacobs 1837-1908
Elias (Ripinski) Jacobs
Isaac Jacobs 1834-1914
Jane Jacobs 1839-1908
Leah Jacobs 1847-1941
Lesser Jacobs 1852-1911
Rebecca Jacobs 1844-
Sophia Jacobs 1850-1921
Daughter Jacobson
Dr Dattner Jacobson
Mrs Jacobson
Sarah Clara Johnson 1827-1891
Aaron Joseph 1845-
Jacob Joseph -1903
Moses Joseph 1803-1889
Solomon Joseph 1834-1900
Solomon Joseph 1834-1900
Hyman Joseph 1831-1875
Leon Josephson 1855
Paul Joske 1826-1898
Moses Kasner c.1788-1870
Isaac Katzenstein
Joseph Katzenstein 1825-1901
Abraham Kornblum 1780-1854
Alfred Kornblum 1855-1932
Ernest Kornblum 1860-1942
David Langley 1812-1882
James Lawrence
Jonas Lazarus
Judith Lazarus
Moses Lazarus -1870
Henriette Leishershonn c. 1811-1899
Florence Leon 1861-
Samuel Leon 1849-
Szymanski Leon 1811-1882
Isaac Lesser 1806-1868
Godfrey Levi 1824-1883
Isaac Levi 1822-1888
Nathaniel Levi 1830-1908
Levi Joseph 1796-1874
Benjamin Goldsmidt Levien 1806-1890
Harriet Levien 1835-1905
John James Levien 1815-1877
Jonas Levine 1840-1906
Bertram Levinson 1977-1961
Eva Levinson 1854-1920
Hyman Levinson 1833-1905
Mark Levinson 1847-1912
Michael Levinson 1812-1862
Michael Maurice Levinson 1863-1918
Rosetta Levinson 1865-1935
Barnett Levy 1833-
Dinah Levy 1858
Esther Levy c.1836-1884
Henry Levy
John Levy 1797-1870
Lazarus Levy 1817-1884
Louis Jacques levy 1869-
Louis levy 1863-
Phillip Levy 1801-1888
Rabbi Aaron Levy
Samuel Lazarus Levy 1765-1849
Samuel Levy 1821-1870
Sarah Levy 1837-1864
Dr Bernard Lilienfeld
Isaac Lazarus Lincoln -1850
Alexander Lindo 1742-1812
Alexander Lindo -1838
Elizabeth Lindo 1804-1887
Leopold Lobascher 1865-
Isaac Lopez
Louisa Lopez 1821-1900
Rebecca Lopez 1805-18881
Ada Marks 1865-1929
Alexander Marks c.1839-1919
Bernard Marks 1852-1915
Casper Marks c.1793-1879
Casper Marks 1793-1879
Charles Marks 1801-1871
Dinah Marks 1838-1893
Edward Marks 1829-1900
Gabriel Jacob Marks 1870-1914
Henry Marks 1861-1938
Leah Marks 1870-
Lizzie Marks 1877-1936
Mary Marks 1833-
Nelson Marks 1836-1908
Reverend Professor D. W. Marks
Samuel Marks 1832-
Julius Mathews 1828-1900
Amelia Meanowiski 1846-1942
Louis Meanowiski 1821-1895
Barris Meir 1807-
George Mendes 1823-1901
Daniel Mendoza 1764-1836
Isaac Mendoza 1809-
Sophia Mendoza 1792-
Felix Meyer (1858-1937)
Moritz Michaelis 1820-1902
David Mocatta
George Mocatta 1815-1893
Rebecca Mocatta 1810-1886
John Monash 1865-1931
Louis Monash 1831-1994
Eliezer Montefiore 1761-1837
Emily Barrow Montefiore 1830-1917
Esther Hannah Barrow Montefiore 1829-1882
Jacob Barrow Montefiore
Joseph Barrow Montefiore
Judith Georgina Barrow Montefiore 1828-
Nathaniel Montefiore
Fanny Morelle 1850-
Elias Moses
Henriette Moses 1818-1884
Henry Moses
Mary Moses 1828-1904
Money Moses 1780-1841
Samuel Moses
Sarah Moses 1815-1847
Abagail Mosquita 1793-1857
Mark Moss 1831-1901
Morton Moss 1800-1879
Michael Myers c.1814-1869
Abraham Nathan 1858-1928
Alice Nathan 1796-1873
Benjamin Nathan 1827-1902
Benjamin Nathan 1869-1952
Chaim Nathan
David Nathan 1867-1940
Easter Nathan
Elizabeth Nathan
Salis Schank 1831-1910
Matilda Seba 1838-1917
Eureka Isobel Sicree 1873-1906
Lazarus Sicree 1838-1888
Montefiore Silberberg 1882-1959
Sciacob Silberberg 1815-1903
Bernard Silberfeld 1837-1923
Eva Silberfeld 1867-
John Silberfeld
James Simeon c.1815-1874
Abraham Simmons 1831-1908
Amelia Simmons 1826-1918
Barnett Simmons 1791-1680
Elizabeth Simmons 1792-1866
Levi Simmons 1829-
Moses Simmons 1822
Mr Simmons
Harriet Smith
John Soane
David Jaffa Solomon 1859-
Elizbeth Solomon
Elizabeth Solomon 1830-1877
Frances Solomon
Henry Solomon 1801-1843
Joseph Solomon 1780-1851
Joseph Solomon 1819-1890
Joseph Solomon 1826-
Judah Solomon 1781-1856
Michael Solomon 1815-1899
Samuel Solomon 1776-1864
Sarah Solomon
Caroline Solomon 1813-1904
Fanny Solomons 1858-1929
Leah Solomons 1832-1914
Newman Spielvogel 1830-1891
Emanuel Steinfeld
Daniel Tallerman c.1832-
Samuel David Tallerman c.1827-1895
Christina Van Eyl 1809-1879
George Victor 1835
Louis Vince 1827-1899
Johann Joseph Eugene von Guérard 1811-1901
Ferdinand Jacob Heinrich von Muller 1825-1896
Grace Waterman 1833-1883
Louis Waterman c.1821-
Jacob Wolffson.
Henry Wolff 1823-1859
Ephraim Zox 1837-1899
# Appendix 3-Interviewees and descendants contacted

## Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>15 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Casper</td>
<td>19 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>8 August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>26 August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>3 June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>2 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Coppel</td>
<td>29 July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>de Serville</td>
<td>13 August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Falk</td>
<td>2 September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgina</td>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>13 August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive</td>
<td>Fredman</td>
<td>25 March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Hallenstein</td>
<td>2 April 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Hatch</td>
<td>6 August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn</td>
<td>Hyams</td>
<td>22 December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Hyams</td>
<td>15 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>30 July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Lipshut</td>
<td>2 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>18 October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>26 August 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Walters</td>
<td>9 August 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Wolff</td>
<td>7 July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Zyniger</td>
<td>28 May 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Private Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loris</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Levinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Silberberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Sources

Archives and Museum Collections

*Australian Jewish Historical Society*

**Adelaide Hebrew Congregation**

Marriage Register of the Adelaide Hebrew Congregation

**East Melbourne Hebrew Congregation**

Birth registers 1857-1930
Marriage Registers, civil 1857-1890

**Melbourne Hebrew Congregation**

Book used to record donations or offerings on Sabbath and Festivals- “Lace Book”
Certificates of consent to marriage of minors 1873-1890
Index of Births 1844-1890
Index of Deaths 1844-1930
Marriage registers, 1844-1890

**St Kilda Hebrew Congregation**

Marriage Registers, 1876—1890

*City of Melbourne*


*Fitzroy City Council*

Fitzroy City Council, "Rate Books." 1858-1949.

*Jewish Museum of Australia*

Ketubah, 1891, 1493, Donated by Mr Y Taub
Melbourne Hebrew Congregation

Melbourne Hebrew Congregation Minute Book 1847-1851
Sub Committee Minutes and Reports, Melbourne Hebrew Congregation 1857-1891

National Gallery of Victoria

Edwards Claret Jug, D364-1980

Port Philip City Council

Port Phillip City Collection, sm1119.1-2

Public Records Office of Victoria

Divorce Case Files
- Levy vs Levy 1895 VPRS 283 P00000 92
- Lobascher vs Lobascher 1894 VPRS 283 P0000 80

Index to Assisted Inward Passenger Lists to Victoria 1839-1871, Public Record Office of Victoria

Index to Unassisted Inward Passenger Lists to Victoria 1852-1923

Index to Wills, Probate and Administration Records 1841-2009
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 28 P0003 Unit 1399
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 28 P0000 Unit 906
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 28 P0000 Unit 365
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 28 P0003 Unit 129
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 7591 P0002 Unit 447
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 28/P02, Unit 625
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 28/P01, Unit 1045
- PROV Probate and Wills VPRS 28/P02, Unit 26

Royal Historical Society of Victoria

Collins Street–Town of Melbourne, Port Phillip, NSW, 1840, Elisha Noyce, Lithographer.
The Melbourne Hebrew Congregation and St Patrick’s Hall.

State Library of Victoria

Minute Books of the Melbourne Jewish Philanthropic Society SLV Box 4252/1 MS 15380
Minutes Books of the Hebrew Ladies Benevolent Society AJHS MS 9352A Picture Collection

*University of Melbourne*

Sydney Arnold and Best Collection, University of Melbourne Archives, 1968.0012 Unit 3

**Databases**


Founders and Survivors http://www.foundersandsurvivors.org/

Jewish Gen, http://www.jewishgen.org/


Lindo, Donald, Genealogy of Jamaica, database (on disk)


Tasmanian Archives https://linctas.ent.sirsidynix.net.au/client/en_AU/names/


**Tasmanian Convict Records:**


Founders and Survivors, Australian life courses in historical context 1803-1920 http://www.foundersandsurvivors.org/

*Available through ancestry.com*

**Australia**

Australia, Birth Indexes 1788-1922

Australia, Marriage Indexes, 1788-1950

Australia, Death Indexes 1787-1985

Australia, Electoral Roll, 1903-1980-

Victorian Electoral Roll
State Records Authority of New South Wales. "New South Wales, Australia Historical Electoral Rolls 1842-1864."

**England**

England & Wales, National Probate Calendar (Index of Wills and Administrations), 1858-1966.

Census for England, 1841, 1851, 1861, 1871

England and Wales Deaths, 1837-1915

England and Wales Births, 1837-1915

England and Wales Marriages, 1837-1915

1870 United States Federal Census

**United States of America**


United States Federal Census

**Directories**


Kerr's *Melbourne Almanac and Port Phillip Directory, 1841-1842*

Melbourne Commercial Directory including Collingwood and Richmond, and almanac for the year 1853

Melbourne Commercial, Professional and Legal Directory, 1856

New South Wales and Port Phillip General Post Office Directory for 1839

Port Phillip Almanac and Directory for 1847

Port Phillip Patriot Almanac and Directory for 1847

Port Phillip separation merchants' and settlers' almanac, diary and Melbourne directory, 1844

Port Phillip separation merchants' and settlers' almanac, diary and directory for Melbourne and the district of Port Phillip, 1845


Sands and McDougall Directories, 1864-1895

Squatters' directory, containing a list of all the occupants of crown lands in the intermediate and unsettled districts of Port Phillip, 1849

Victorian Directory, 1851
Legislation and Government Publications


———. "An Act to Simplify the Oaths of Qualification for Office." In IX, 1857.

———. "An Act to Simplify the Oaths of Qualification for Office." In IX, 1857.

Parliament for Victoria, Statistics for Victoria 1861- Population No 9

———. "An Act to Assimilate and Simply the Oaths of Qualification for Office." In Vic XLV. Melbourne: Government Printer, 1858.


———. "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Laws Affecting the Solemnization of Marriage." Parliament of Victoria, 1859.


———."Report of the Royal Commission appointment by his Excellency to Enquire into and Report upon the operation of the system of Public Education together with minutes of evidence and Appendices, Presented to both Houses of Parliament by his Excellence on Command." 1867

———. Parliamentary Debates, October 3 1872.

———. "An Act to Make Valid the Marriage of a Man with the Sister of His Deceased Wife." In CCCLIII. Melbourne: Parliament of Victoria, 1873.


Legal Proceedings

Old Bailey Trails Online:

- Trail of Nathan Nathan alias Nathaniel Newton, 4th December 1799 (t17991204-46).
- Trail of David Langley 14th January 1830, t18300114-135

Maps

H. D. G. Russell, surveyor, Plan of building allotments and of premises, lately occupied by Mr. Bear, at the western end of Victoria Parade, 1852 or 1858


Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works detail plan, 1208, City of Collingwood


Newspapers and Journals

Adelaide Observer
Advertiser
Age
Argus
Auckland Star
Australasian
Australian Israelite
Australian Leather Journal
Ballarat Star
Beacon
Brisbane Courier
Capricornian
Courier
Daily Standard
Geelong Advertiser
Geelong Advertiser and Squatters’ Advocate
Gippsland Times
Goulburn Evening Penny Post
Hebrew Standard of Australasia
Illustrated Australian News for Home Readers
Jewish Chronicle
Jewish Chronicle and Hebrew Observer
Jewish Herald
Launceston Examiner
Mail
Maitland Mercury and Hunter River General Advertiser
Maitland Weekly Mercury
Melbourne Punch
Newcastle Morning Herald and Miners Advocate
Port Phillip Gazette
Port Phillip Patriot and Melbourne Advertiser
Prabran
Press
Richmond River Express and Casino Kyogle Advertiser
Riverine Herald
Rockhampton Bulletin
Shepparton Advertiser
South Australian Advertiser
South Australian Register
South Bourke Standard
Southern Australian
South-Western News
Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser
**Sydney Monitor**

**Sydney Morning Herald**

**Table Talk**

**Telegraph, St Kilda, Prabran and South Yarra Guardian**

**The Times**

**Voice of Jacob**

**Wallaroo Times and Mining Journal**

**West Australian**

**West Australian**

**Wodonga and Towong Sentinel**

---

**Private Letters**

Joan Flight, letter, undated, Private Collection

Levinson Family Correspondence, Private Collection

Steinfeld Family Correspondence, Private Collection

Email correspondence from Todd Endleman

---

**Published Reports**


Unpublished Manuscripts and Thesis


Freeze, ChaRan Y. "Making and Unmaking the Jewish Family: Marriage and Divorce in Imperial Russia 1850-1914." Brandeis University, 1997.


Books and Articles

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources


Leavitt, Thad. W.H. *Australian Representative Men*. Melbourne: Wells and Leavitt, 1887.
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———. Poor Australian Immigrants in the Nineteenth Century: Visible Immigrants: Two. Canberra: Division of Historical Studies and Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, 1991.


Sariel, Eliezer. "'In the East Lie My Roots; My Branches in the West'. The Distinctiveness of the Jews of Posen in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century." *Leo Baeck Year Book* 58 (2013): 175-192.


343


Author/s:
Silberberg, Susan

Title:
A networked community: Jewish immigration, colonial networks and the shaping of Melbourne 1835-1895

Date:
2015

Persistent Link:
http://hdl.handle.net/11343/91538

File Description:
Thesis Submission